Q1. Please state if you are responding:

As an individual

Q2. Personal Details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Cllr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Wendy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Marchant (received via email)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Line 3 (if this is not required, please write N/A)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Line 4 (if this is not required, please write N/A)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Code</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Number (if you do not wish to provide this information, please write N/A)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email address (If you do not wish to provide this information, please write N/A)</td>
<td>[redacted]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q3. Agent's Details:

No Response

Q4. To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate?

Paragraph -
Policy -
Policies Map Creeting St Peter

Q5. Do you consider the Local Plan is

No Response
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q6. 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.</td>
<td>Dear Mr. Gunby, SUFFOLK MINERAL + WASTE LOCAL PLANT – POUNDFIELD SITE, POTENTIAL GRAVEL PIT NEAR CREETING ST PETER + CREETING ST MARY I am emailing to say that I support Suffolk's Mineral Plan which proposes to exclude the Poundfield site of a potential gravel pit near to Creeting St. Peter + Creeting St. Mary. I am one of the District Councillor's for Needham Market, and this site which is on the edge of Needham Market affects Needham Market at the moment. However, if the Boundary Commission's proposals are accepted Creeting St. Peter and Creeting St. Mary will become part of the Needham Market Ward at the District Elections next year. Below is an email trail from concerned residents, which you are probably aware of already Thank you for your kind consideration. Kind regards, Wendy Mid Suffolk District Councillor Wendy Marchant – Joint Ward Member, Needham Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7. Please set out what modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the Matter you have identified at 5 above where this relates to soundness. (NB Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this 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.</td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8. SCC Response</td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9. If your representation is seeking a modification, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?</td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:</td>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11. Your details:</td>
<td>Name Cllr Wendy Marchant&lt;br&gt;Date 20 July 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Andy Rutter,

Thank you for your email, and ‘yes please’ include my comments as per email trail below.

Kind regards,

Wendy

Mid Suffolk District Councillor Wendy Marchant – Joint Ward Member, Needham Market.

Good Morning,

Thank you for your email, however because your comments were made before the start of the Submission Draft Consultation (11th June 2018 – 23rd July 2018 5PM) you will need to restate these comments.

If you would like me to include your comments please let me know.

Regards,

Andy Rutter

Planning Technician Apprentice
Planning Team | Strategic Development
Growth, Highways & Infrastructure
Suffolk County Council

TO: Graham Gunby, Esq., Development Manager, main author of Suffolk Mineral Plan.
Copied to Dis. & Town Cllr, Mike Norris, and Town Cllr. Steve Phillips, Needham Market.
Dear Mr. Gunby,

SUFFOLK MINERAL + WASTE LOCAL PLANT – POUNDFIELD
SITE, POTENTIAL GRAVEL PIT NEAR CREETING ST PETER + CREETING ST MARY

I am emailing to say that I support Suffolk’s Mineral Plan which proposes to exclude the Poundfield site of a potential gravel pit near to Creeting St. Peter + Creeting St. Mary. I am one of the District Councillor’s for Needham Market, and this site which is on the edge of Needham Market affects Needham Market at the moment. However, if the Boundary Commission’s proposals are accepted Creeting St. Peter and Creeting St. Mary will become part of the Needham Market Ward at the District Elections next year.

Below is an email trail from concerned residents, which you are probably aware of already. Thank you for your kind consideration.

Kind regards,

Wendy
Mid Suffolk District Councillor Wendy Marchant – Joint Ward Member, Needham Market

From: Gordon Crosby
Sent: 27 April 2018 17:38
To: Wendy Marchant
Cc: Mike Norris; S PHILLIPS
Subject: Re: FW: Suffolk Mineral + Waste Local Plan - POTENTIAL GRAVEL PIT NEAR CREETING ST PETER + CREETING ST MARY

Councillor

You may remember that back around 2005/6 there was an application made by Poundfield Products to extract gravel from a huge area of land beside the Gipping which they argued would reduce HGV traffic delivering gravel along Flordon Road. The reality was the plan, if allowed to go ahead, would have facilitated a more than doubling of production at their noisy plant, such that any reduction in deliveries of gravel would have been more than overtaken by an increase in deliveries of cement and an increase in vehicles carrying finished products. The company was recently sold, along with the premises and certain rights over the land.

You may also remember the three or four year battle to firstly get MSDC to take enforcement action over the construction of the two massive, bright yellow gantry cranes on the site, and subsequently to get them painted in a camouflage scheme, subsequently changed by "officer decision" to painting them grey.

Poundfield Products are responsible for a considerable volume of very large, heavy vehicles on Mill Lane and on Flordon Road. In fact they were supposed to have a traffic routing scheme in place to keep their lorries off Flordon Road but it simply does not work and SCC do not seem to have any interest in enforcement. I regularly encounter even Poundfield’s own liveries lorries on Flordon Road - and it is a VERY tight squeeze. I have had to reverse to allow lorries to pass several times.

Poundfield claim to be a large employer, and obtained planning permission quite recently to
construct a large office complex on their site in part on the basis that if they did not then jobs would move away.

They are in interesting company but located in the wrong place. They are effectively heavy industry, on a farm on a narrow, unlit country road - wholly inappropriate.

What has happened is SCC issued a draft of a new plan for mineral extraction for Suffolk. Poundfield had come to an arrangement with another party and they submitted a proposal that their land should be included as a mineral extraction site. The site is actually a series of sites spread over a large area, which are poorly connected. Their proposal was considered and rejected as part of the SCC work to develop the draft plan. That plan was issued for public consultation with very minimal publicity. One of the local residents heard that Poundfield intended to object to the exclusion of their proposed site, and with just days for the consultation to run the wider community became aware of the issue. The result was many members of the local community, some of whom are already greatly affected, badly, by the Poundfield site, made submissions agreeing with the draft plans and its exclusion of the proposed Poundfield site. Those comments have been considered and as you will have seen from the email the "plan" will soon be put to the Council for approval. What it says is yet to be shared with the public.

As you will probably have realised I am very against inclusion of the site and its use for gravel extraction. The Gipping Valley has suffered considerable development, inevitably. There are precious few lengths of valley where industrialisation is minimal. and the section between Needham through Badley to Muntons at Stowmarket is one of the last, and most precious sections. My own view is that the "planners" at all levels should now be protecting this against any intrusive development, and only encouraging limited development which enhances to the valley. I was very disappointed with the decision to allow the office block, supposedly built to resemble local vernacular barns, on top of the hills at the site. When have farmers ever built barns on top of hills?

The merging of the ward boundary to include Needham, Badley, Creeting St Peter and Creeting St Mary into one could present an opportunity for rather more joined up and long term thinking about how development of the area could be controlled to ensure this important landscape is protected from inappropriate development. It may also help with coordinating actions to reduce flood risk along the valley.

Regards

Gordon Crosby

On 27 April 2018 at 15:55, Wendy Marchant wrote:

Dear Gordon,

What are your views about this? Should the Boundary Commission recommendations be confirmed, then the Needham Market District Council Ward will include Creeting St. Peter, Creeting St. Mary, Badley, Darmsden, Baylham, and Needham Market itself of course. These new ward boundaries will come into force from the District Elections May, 2019.

Kind regards,  Wendy

From: Richard Hitt
Hi All - I spoke earlier to Graham Gunby - Development Manager for Suffolk County Council and main author of the Suffolk Mineral Plan - to get an update.

Broadly it's good news so far but we're by no means out of the woods - we will all need to voice our support for the plan as it is - excluding the CSM / CSP site from consideration in June / July when there is a public consultation.

Below is a brief outline of where we are now - together with an overview of next steps:

1. The Creeting St Peter / Creeting St Mary site is still not included in the plan - in Graham's opinion there remains too many problems with the site for it to be considered.
2. He has told Brett aggregates (the company which bought the mineral extraction rights for this site) this - and they no longer appear to be promoting the site - although it is not clear whether Poundfield - now under new management - will.
3. The current draft of the plan excluding this site has been agreed by the County Council Cabinet to be put forward to the full Council in May
4. If the plan is ratified by full council in May it will go to a 6 week public consultation period in **June / July 2018** - at which point
   a) any resident who registered their support for the plan to exclude the site back in December 2017 should receive notification from the council about this consultation and their right to register their support for the plan once again - and
   b) **it is still very much in local residents' interests to write in to the council again since Poundfield / Brett may well be lobbying for the site's inclusion at this point - so as many residents voices as possible will help retain the plan as it is with the site excluded.**
5. After the 6 weeks Public Consultation period - the Plan stays as it is now although SCC might propose relatively minor amendments to overcome some objections and will be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate - a national body working for the Dept of Environment
6. The Planning Inspectorate will conduct an Examination in Public of this final plan in Jan 2019 - where it will consider the objections made in June/July in public session
7. After the Examination in Public - the final version of the plan is scheduled for adoption in July 2019 - although this far out timings are not set in stone.

So there's no need to do anything right now - however in June / July - if you don't get notified by the Planning Office then I will certainly be drawing your attention to it - we have the opportunity once again to voice our support for the plan as it is - excluding the CSP + CSM site from consideration.

Any queries or suggestions - please do shout - and also do please spread the word locally - the
more people and organisations we can get on our side will be crucial in defending the future of our beautiful valley since:

- We will be up against many other sites across Suffolk also being considered for mineral extraction
- We won’t know whether Poundfield and / or Bretts Aggregates will be appealing for this site to be included - but if they do they will surely have large resources and consultants supporting them
- So the weight of our support for keeping the plan as it is will be absolutely crucial - every one of our voices and all of our efforts and ingenuity will be crucial

Thanks

Richard

Emails sent to and from this organisation will be monitored in accordance with the law to ensure compliance with policies and to minimize any security risks. The information contained in this email or any of its attachments may be privileged or confidential and is intended for the exclusive use of the addressee. Any unauthorised use may be unlawful. If you receive this email by mistake, please advise the sender immediately by using the reply facility in your email software. Opinions, conclusions and other information in this email that do not relate to the official business of Mid Suffolk District Council shall be understood as neither given nor endorsed by Mid Suffolk District Council.