**Minerals and Waste Local Plan Publication Stage Representation Form**

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

Q1. Please state if you are responding:

As an agent

Q2. Personal Details:

No Response

Q3. Agent's Details:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Mr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td>Sam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td>Hubbard (received via email)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Title</td>
<td>Principal Planner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation</td>
<td>Waveney District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Line 1</td>
<td>Riverside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Line 2</td>
<td>4 Canning Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Line 3</td>
<td>Lowestoft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address Line 4</td>
<td>Suffolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Code</td>
<td>NR33 0EQ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Number</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paragraph</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>MP10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies Map</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q5. Do you consider the Local Plan is

No Response
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 Council considers that Policy MP10 is not particularly clear. It is the Council’s understanding that the Minerals Safeguarding Area is the same as the Minerals Consultation Area. However, the way that point (a) of the policy is worded suggests that Minerals Safeguarding Areas are there own specific area within a wider Minerals Consultation Area. To add to the confusion the final paragraph states that District Council’s should consult the County Council on proposals falling within the Minerals Safeguarding Area as defined on the Proposals Map. However, the term ‘Minerals Safeguarding Area’ is not specifically acknowledged in the key to the proposals map. It should also be noted the term ‘Proposals Map’ is now changed to ‘Policies Map’ in the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012.

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.

The supporting text should include the following sentence from the existing Minerals Core Strategy: “In Suffolk Mineral Consultation Areas (MCAs) are based entirely on (i.e. contiguous with) Mineral Safeguarding Areas” The supporting text should also state: “Mineral Consultation Areas/Mineral Safeguarding Areas are shown on the Policies Map” The policy should be amended to state: (a) those Minerals Safeguarding Areas located within the / Minerals Consultation Areas identified on the Proposals Policies Map from proposed development in excess of five hectares which is not in accordance with the Development Plan. District and Borough Councils should consult the County Council when a potentially conflicting proposal falls within the Minerals Safeguarding Area/Minerals Consultation Area as defined on the Policies Map. The key to the Policies Map should be revised to state “Minerals Safeguarding Area/Minerals Consultation Area”

Q8. SCC Response

No Response

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

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

Q10. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

No Response

Q11. Your details:

Name S. Hubbard on behalf of Waveney District Council
Date 23 July 2018
Dear Mr. Gunby

**Suffolk County Council Minerals and Waste Local Plan Pre-Submission Consultation**

Waveney District Council welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Suffolk County Council Minerals and Waste Local Plan Pre-Submission Consultation. Overall the Council is supportive of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan but raises specific issues with two policies contained within the plan.

- Policy MP10 Minerals consultation and safeguarding areas
- Policy MS7: Wangford

Representation forms completed by Sam Hubbard, Principal Planner for the above policies are attached to this email.

Yours sincerely,

Cllr David Ritchie (on behalf of Waveney District Council)
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*

*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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hubbard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Job Title (where relevant)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal Planner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation (where relevant)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Waveney District Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address Line 1</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Riverside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address Line 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 Canning Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address Line 3</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lowestoft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address Line 4</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post Code</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NR33 0EQ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

[Redacted]
Name or Organisation:

3. To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate?
   Paragraph
   Policy
   MP10
   Policies Map

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

Please tick as appropriate

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 Council considers that Policy MP10 is not particularly clear.

It is the Council’s understanding that the Minerals Safeguarding Area is the same as the Minerals Consultation Area. However, the way that point (a) of the policy is worded suggests that Minerals Safeguarding Areas are there own specific area within a wider Minerals Consultation Area.

To add to the confusion the final paragraph states that District Council’s should consult the County Council on proposals falling within the Minerals Safeguarding Area as defined on the Proposals Map. However, the term ‘Minerals Safeguarding Area’ is not specifically acknowledged in the key to the proposals map.

It should also be noted the term ‘Proposals Map’ is now changed to ‘Policies Map’ in the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012.
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.

The supporting text should include the following sentence from the existing Minerals Core Strategy:
“In Suffolk Mineral Consultation Areas (MCAs) are based entirely on (i.e. contiguous with) Mineral Safeguarding Areas”

The supporting text should also state: “Mineral Consultation Areas/Mineral Safeguarding Areas are shown on the Policies Map”

The policy should be amended to state:

(a) those Minerals Safeguarding Areas located within the Minerals Consultation Areas identified on the Proposals Policies Map from proposed development in excess of five hectares which is not in accordance with the Development Plan.

District and Borough Councils should consult the County Council when a potentially conflicting proposal falls within the Minerals Safeguarding Area/Minerals Consultation Area as defined on the Policies Map.

The key to the Policies Map should be revised to state “Minerals Safeguarding Area/Minerals Consultation Area”

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?

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

[ ] Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination
8. If you wish to participate as the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

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: [Redacted] Date: 23/07/2018

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.
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

Sam

Last Name

Hubbard

Job Title (where relevant)

Principal Planner

Organisation (where relevant)

Waveney District Council

Address Line 1

Riverside

Address Line 2

4 Canning Road

Address Line 3

Lowestoft

Address Line 4


Post Code

NR33 0EQ

Telephone Number & Email Address (where relevant)

[Redacted]
Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation:

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

Paragraph [ ] Policy [MS7] Policies Map [ ]

4. Do you consider the Local Plan is:

4. (1) Legally Compliant

Yes [ ] No [ ]

4. (2) Sound

Yes [ ] No [X]

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

Yes [ ] No [ ]

Please tick as appropriate

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.

AONB Issues

The Suffolk Coast and Heaths Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty is an important resource to East Suffolk. Not only does it provide valuable natural habitats it also provides a destination for recreation which helps support the local tourism economy which is vital to East Suffolk.

The Council understands and support the sustainable extraction of minerals to support economic growth and development. However, the Council considers that the expansion of quarrying in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty should be an absolute last resort.

Chapter 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) places a high level of protection to land designated as Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Specifically, paragraph 115 states that great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Paragraph 116 goes on to state that planning permission should be refused for major developments in these designated areas unless it can be demonstrated the proposal is in the public interest having regard to:
• The need for the development
• The cost of and scope for developing elsewhere
• The extent to which the detrimental effect on the landscape and recreational opportunities can be moderated.

Paragraph 144 states that local planning authorities should ensure that as far as practical landbanks should be maintained from land outside of Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) on Minerals states that in exceptional circumstances, such as where a local authority area is largely made up of designated areas such as Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, it may be appropriate to rely largely on policies which set out the general conditions against which applications will be assessed rather than specific allocations. Waveney District Council is concerned that Policy MS7 is not in accordance with national planning policy and therefore the plan is currently unsound as result of the inclusion of the site. The Council considers that there is insufficient evidence to justify the allocation with respect to the need for the development and the consideration of alternative more suitable options.

Need for the Development

Given that the Suffolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan allocates 31% more land than is required, it is considered the need for this particular site is not justified and not in accordance with the NPPF or NPPG. The removal of the MS7 allocation would still result in a safety margin of 20%. It should be noted as a comparison the proposed submission draft of the Waveney Local Plan only over allocates housing development by 12%.

The Council understands that the Suffolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan does not prohibit additional quarries on unallocated land. Indeed, the extensive area covered by the Minerals Consultation Area could lead to prior extraction from a number of large strategic housing developments across the County. These developments further will lessen the need for this quarry.

It is understood that this particular quarry proposal contains a high proportion of gravel unlike most quarries in Norfolk and Suffolk. However, it is not clear what evidence supports this statement. For example what analysis has been done on the gravel content of nearby quarries in Norfolk? Linked to the point below has any testing been done of other potential sites within the extensive Minerals Consultation Area?

Alternative Sites

Whilst it is appreciated a number of alternative options have been considered in the Sustainability Appraisal which were based on site submission by quarry operators. It is not clear from the evidence or the plan whether the planning authority pro-actively investigated other options within the Minerals Consultation Area or adjacent to other existing quarries which hadn’t been submitted. It is also not apparent the extent to which the planning authority has engaged with Norfolk to see if there are any more appropriate options over the border to meet needs within the north east area of Suffolk.

Other Issues

Traffic

Traffic modelling undertaken as part of the Waveney Local Plan indicated possible capacity issues at the two main junctions on to the A12 in the vicinity of the quarry. It is questioned whether the Suffolk model has been used to consider the cumulative effects on traffic on these junctions.
Heritage Impact
The site is in close proximity to two grade II listed buildings Reydon Grange, and Reydon Hall. The site could be considered to be in the setting of these listed buildings. No Heritage Impact Assessment has been undertaken to assess the impact on the setting and the significance of the assets. In absence of this evidence it is questioned whether the site is in conformity with the heritage policies of the NPPF.

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.

It is suggested that in order to make the plan sound further evidence is required to demonstrate the need for this allocation. Without this evidence the allocation should be removed from the plan. It is not considered that this change would undermine the supply of minerals given the over-supply identified. Following adoption of the plan and prior to a future review, the County Council should be encouraged to explore alternative options which could yield the same quality material. If on this review there are no alternative options and the level and type of aggregate is still required, the County Council could consider allocating this site in a future version of the plan.

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?

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

Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination

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

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: __________________________ Date: 23/07/2018

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.