# Minerals and Waste Local Plan Publication Stage Representation Form

## Page 1: Suffolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan Publication Stage Representation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q1. Please state if you are responding:</th>
<th>As an agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q2. Personal Details:</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q3. Agent's Details:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Mr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Philip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>O'Hear (received via email)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Title</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Southwold and Reydon Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Rowan Croft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>Rissemere Lane East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Line 3</td>
<td>Reydon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Line 4</td>
<td>Southwold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Code</td>
<td>IP18 6SW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Number (if you do not wish to provide this information, please write N/A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email address (where relevant - if this is not relevant, please write N/A)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and address of the person or organisation you are acting as an agent for</td>
<td>Southwold and Reydon Society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q4. To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paragraph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>MS7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies Map</td>
<td>Wangford</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q5. Do you consider the Local Plan is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Legally compliant</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Sound</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Complies with the Duty to co-operate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

The Southwold and Reydon Society, representing some 360 residents of our community, opposes this development as we believe it is contrary to Clause 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). It would result in unacceptable damage to Suffolk Coast and Heaths area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). We strongly support the detailed arguments supported by extensive evidence in the submission made by local residents Alieen and William Irving. Here we wish to reiterate the key points of our opposition.

1. Suffolk County Council (SCC) has failed to meet the tests required for an exception to the rules preventing industrial development in the AONB as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF Clause 116). 2. We accept that there is a national need for mineral and that mineral in this site is of good quality. However we do not agree that either SCC or Cemex in their submission have proved that the extension of Wangford Quarry into Lime Kiln Farm in Reydon is necessary to meet forecast local or regional need. 3. SCC’s Final Draft Plan would provide a 31% surplus of aggregate reserves over forecast demand. As forecast output from Wangford is 8% of total demand, Wangford could be excluded from the Plan while still maintaining a 23% surplus of reserves over forecast demand. 4. Alternative supplies of equivalent coarse aggregate to that occurring in Wangford Quarry could be produced from certain local quarries, marine dredging and/or imported crushed rock, including: a. Local quarries, such as Henham (where greater reserves remain than previously identified) and various nearby quarries in Norfolk, for example at Kirby Cane and Earsham. b. Greater uptake than at present of available marine dredged aggregate landed at Ipswich, Lowestoft and/or Great Yarmouth, especially as proposed by Brett Aggregates at the Western Dock in Ipswich and another operator at Great Yarmouth. c. General increased output from other land quarries, and possibly from increased quantities of imported crushed rock. 5. The Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) prepared as part of the submission by the Irvings shows that the area of the proposed development is a significant landscape. This makes it an important part of the AONB which should be given the full protection. Protection of the countryside surrounding the settlement of Reydon was identified as a high priority in the Reydon Village Plan in 2014 and is a consistently strong feature of the current consultation for the emerging Reydon Neighbourhood Plan. 6. The proposed development would result in unacceptable and irreparable harm to the Suffolk Coast and Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), both during excavation and afterwards. The proposed mitigation measures are completely inadequate. These conclusions, extremely well-evidenced in the submission by the Irvings, demonstrate that the Landscape and Visual Appraisal prepared by Crestwood Environmental for Cemex is deeply flawed. 7. The proposed development will bring limited benefit to the local economy and its overall impact is very likely to be negative since much of the prosperity of the area is derived from tourism, particularly wildlife and countryside tourism. 8. In the consultation on SCC’s First Draft Plan, there was widespread opposition to the extension of Wangford Quarry into Reydon from some 150 individuals, Reydon and Wangford Parish Councils, District and County Councillors, Therese Coffey MP and Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB. The proposal has not materially changed since then, so the opposition continues.
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.

1. This proposal and the related Policy MS7 should be deleted from the SCC’s Mineral and Waste Plan. There can be no doubt that the demand could be supplied from other sources if Wangford Quarry. For this principal reason and those related points made above, we consider that there is no case made for the exception to the rules protecting the AONB to allow this development. 2. Deleting this proposal and Policy MS7 would make the Local Plan legally compliant and sound.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q8. SCC Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q9. If your representation is seeking a modification, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q10. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We wish to ensure that the strength of feeling among our 360 members against this proposal is expressed and to challenge the case made by SCC and Cemex that the tests have been met for excepting this proposal from the rules protecting the AONB.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q11. Your details:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This form has two parts –
Part A – Personal Details
Part B – Your representation(s). Please fill in a separate sheet for each representation you wish to make.

**Part A**

1. Personal Details*

2. Agent’s Details

*If an agent is appointed, please complete only the, Title, Name and Organisation boxes below but complete the full contact details of the Agent in 2.

**Title**

Mr

**First name**

Philip

**Last Name**

O’Hear

**Job Title (where relevant)**

Secretary

**Organisation (where relevant)**

Southwold and Reydon Society

**Address Line 1**

Rowan Croft

**Address Line 2**

Rissemere Lane East

**Address Line 3**

Reydon

**Address Line 4**

Southwold

**Post Code**

IP18 6SW

**Telephone Number & Email Address (where relevant)**

Home: Mobile:

email:
Name or Organisation: Reydon Parish Council

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>MS7</th>
<th>Policies Map</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4. Do you consider the Local Plan is:

4. (1) Legally Compliant

[ ] Yes [ ] No

4. (2) Sound

[ ] Yes [ ] No

4. (3) Complies with Duty to co-operate

[ ] Yes [ ] No

5. Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan in 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 use this box to set out your comments.
The Southwold and Reydon Society, representing some 360 residents of our community, opposes this development as we believe it is contrary to Clause 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). It would result in unacceptable damage to Suffolk Coast and Heaths area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). We strongly support the detailed arguments supported by extensive evidence in the submission made by local residents Aileen and William Irving. Here we wish to reiterate the key points of our opposition.

1. Suffolk County Council (SCC) has failed to meet the tests required for an exception to the rules preventing industrial development in the AONB as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF Clause 116).

2. We accept that there is a national need for mineral and that mineral in this site is of good quality. However we do not agree that either SCC or Cemex in their submission have proved that the extension of Wangford Quarry into Lime Kiln Farm in Reydon is necessary to meet forecast local or regional need.

3. SCC’s Final Draft Plan would provide a 31% surplus of aggregate reserves over forecast demand. As forecast output from Wangford is 8% of total demand, Wangford could be excluded from the Plan while still maintaining a 23% surplus of reserves over forecast demand.

4. Alternative supplies of equivalent coarse aggregate to that occurring in Wangford Quarry could be produced from certain local quarries, marine dredging and/or imported crushed rock, including:
   a. Local quarries, such as Henham (where greater reserves remain than previously identified) and various nearby quarries in Norfolk, for example at Kirby Cane and Earsham
   b. Greater uptake than at present of available marine dredged aggregate landed at Ipswich, Lowestoft and/or Great Yarmouth, especially as proposed by Brett Aggregates at the Western Dock in Ipswich and another operator at Great Yarmouth.
   c. General increased output from other land quarries, and possibly from increased quantities of imported crushed rock.

5. The Landscape Character Assessment (LCA) prepared as part of the submission by the Irvings shows that the area of the proposed development is a significant landscape. This makes it an important part of the AONB which should be given the full protection. Protection of the countryside surrounding the settlement of Reydon was identified as a high priority in the Reydon Village Plan in 2014) and is a consistently strong feature of the current consultation for the emerging Reydon Neighbourhood Plan.

6. The proposed development would result in unacceptable and irreparable harm to the Suffolk Coast and Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), both during excavation and afterwards. The proposed mitigation measures are completely inadequate. These conclusions, extremely well-evidenced in the submission by the Irvings, demonstrate that the Landscape and Visual Appraisal prepared by Crestwood Environmental for Cemex is deeply flawed.

7. The proposed development will bring limited benefit to the local economy and its overall impact is very likely to be negative since much of the prosperity of the area is derived from tourism, particularly wildlife and countryside tourism.

8. In the consultation on SCC’s First Draft Plan, there was widespread opposition to the extension of Wangford Quarry into Reydon from some 150 individuals, Reydon and Wangford Parish Councils, District and County Councillors, Therese Coffey MP and Suffolk Coast and Heaths AONB. The proposal has not materially changed since then, so the opposition continues.
6. 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 working of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

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

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

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

Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination

---

Commented [PO1]:

1. This proposal and the related Policy MS7 should be deleted from the SCC’s Mineral and Waste Plan. There can be no doubt that the demand could be supplied from other sources if Wangford Quarry. For this principal reason and those related points made above, we consider that there is no case made for the exception to the rules protecting the AONB to allow this development.

2. Deleting this proposal and Policy MS7 would make the Local Plan legally compliant and sound.
8. If you wish to participate as the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

We wish to ensure that the strength of feeling among our 360 members against this proposal is expressed and to challenge the case made by SCC and Cemex that the tests have been met for excepting this proposal from the rules protecting the AONB.

**Please note** that the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

9. Signature: [signature] Date: 22 July 2018

Please return to: Graham Gunby, Development Manager, Suffolk County Council, 8 Russell Road, Ipswich, Suffolk, IP1 2BX. All correspondence must be received by Monday 23rd July 2018 at 17:00, or the views expressed will not be able to be taken into account.

---

**Notes to Accompany Representation Form**

1. **Introduction**

   1.1. The plan is published in order for representations to be made prior to submission. The representations will be considered alongside the published plan when submitted, which will be examined by a Planning Inspector. The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) (PCPA) states that the purpose of the examination is to consider whether the plan complies with the legal requirement, the duty to co-operate and is sound.

2. **Legal Compliance and Duty to Co-operate**

   2.1. The Inspector will first check that the plan meets legal requirements under s20(5)(a) and the duty to co-operate under s20(5)(c) of the PCPA before moving on to test soundness.

   2.2. You should consider the following before making a representation on legal compliance:
• The plan in question should be included in the current Local Development Scheme (LDS) and the key stages should have been followed. The LDS is effectively a programme of work prepared by the LPA, setting out the Local Development Documents (LDDs) it proposes to produce. It will set out the key stages in production of any plans which the LPA proposes to bring forward for independent examination. If the plan is not in current LDS it should not have been published for representations. The LDS should be on the PLA’s website and available at its main offices.

• The process of community involvement for the plan in question should be in general accordance with the LPA’s Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) (where one exists). The SCI sets out the LPA’s strategy for involving the community in the preparation and revision of LDDs (including plans) and the consideration of planning applications.

• The Plan should comply with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (the regulations). On publication, the LPA must publish the documents prescribed in the Regulations, and make them available at its principle offices and on its website. The LPA must also notify the various persons and organisations set out in the Regulations and any persons who have requested to be notified.

• The LPA is required to provide a Sustainability Appraisal Report when it publishes a plan. This should identify the process by which the Sustainability Appraisal has been carried out, and the baseline information used to inform the process and the outcomes of that process. Sustainability Appraisal is a tool for appraising policies to ensure they reflect social, environmental, and economical factors.

• In London, the plan should be in general conformity with the London Plan (the Spatial Development Strategy).

2.3. You should consider the following before making a representation on compliance with the duty to co-operate.

• The duty to co-operate came into force on 15 November 2001 and any plan submitted for examination on or after this date will be examined for compliance. LPAs will be expected to provide evidence of how they have complied with any requirements arising from the duty.

• The PCPA establishes that non-compliance with the duty to co-operation cannot be rectified after the submission of the plan. Therefore, the Inspector has no power to recommend modifications in the regard. Where duty has not been complied with, the Inspector has no choice but to recommended non-adoption of the plan.

3. Soundness

3.1. Soundness is explained in paragraph 182 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The Inspector has to be satisfied that the plan is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy:
• **Positively prepared:** This means that the plan should be prepared based on strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development.

• **Justified:** The plan should be the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence.

• **Effective:** The plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities.

• **Consistent with national policy:** The plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the NPPF.

3.2. If you think the content of the plan is not sound because it does not include a policy where it should do, you should go through the following steps before making representations:

• Is the issue with which you are concerned already covered specifically by national planning policy (or the London Plan)? If so it does not need to be included?
• Is what you are concerned with covered by any other policies in the plan on which you are seeking to make representations or in any other plan?
• If the policy is not covered elsewhere, in what way is the plan unsound without the policy?
• If the plan is unsound without the policy, what should the policy say?

4. General Advice

4.1. If you wish to make a representation seeking a modification to a plan or part of a plan you should make clear in what way the plan or part of the plan is inadequate having regard to legal compliance, the duty to cooperate and the four requirements of soundness set out above. You should try to support your representation by evidence showing why the plan should be modified. It will be helpful if you also say precisely how you think the plan should be modified. Representations should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested modification, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further submissions based on the original representation made at publication. 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.

4.2. Where there are groups who share a common view on how they wish to see a plan modified, it would be very helpful for that group to send a single representation which represents the view, rather than for a large number of individuals to send in separate representations which repeat the same points. In such cases the group should indicate how many people it is representing and how the representation has been authorised.