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1. **FORMAT**

1.1 The inspector has raised issues and posed questions relating to matters which will be the basis for discussion at upcoming hearing sessions.

1.2 This document sets out Suffolk County Council’s answer to the issues and questions under the heading of *Matter 2 – Vision, aims and objectives and general policies*.

1.3 Issues and questions falling under matters 1, 3 and 4 are responded to in three other documents, one for each matter.

2. **ISSUES**

2.1 Whether the visions, aims, objectives and general policies provide an appropriate basis for sustainable minerals and waste development.
3. **Vision, Aims and Objectives**

**Question 11:** *Should the key diagram indicate proposed minerals and waste development as stated in Objective 2?*

Agreed. Key Diagram should be amended accordingly.

**Question 12:** *Should this objective be to provide a spatial strategy for the location of minerals and waste development?*

Agreed. Objective 2 should be amended accordingly as follows:

Objective 2: providing a Key Diagram that indicates proposed provides a spatial strategy of the location of minerals and waste development, and shows centres of population (as an indication of sources of waste arisings and aggregates demand), transport links and areas of constraint.

**Question 13:** *How do the objectives achieve the first aim of making adequate provision for minerals and waste development?*

By providing a framework of planning policy by which development proposals may be assessed.

**Question 14:** *Are there any policies which deal specifically with flood alleviation and/or public water supply, as referred to in Objective 6?*

Policy GP4 criteria a) and m).

**Question 15:** *Should the aims and objectives specifically address the need to move waste up the hierarchy?*

Agreed. Amend Objective 1 accordingly as follows:

Objective 1: providing Policies that set out the provision to be made for minerals and waste development within Suffolk, taking into account the need to move waste management up the waste hierarchy and the contribution that can be made from recycled aggregates.

**Question 16:** *Should the aims and objectives specifically address the need to work towards self-sufficiency?*

Agreed. Amend Objective 1 accordingly as follows.

Objective 1: providing Policies that set out the provision to be made for minerals and waste development within Suffolk, taking into account the need to move waste management up the waste hierarchy, waste net self sufficiency, and the contribution that can be made from recycled aggregates.

4. **Policy GP1 – Presumption in favour of sustainable development**

**Question 17:** *Should GP1 (A) state ‘taken as a whole’?*

Agreed. Amend Policy GP1 accordingly as follows:

a) Any adverse impacts of granting planning permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework and National Planning Policy for Waste taken as a whole; or
5. **Policy GP3 – Spatial Strategy**

**Question 18:** In paragraph 4.10 (d) and (e) is the marine-dredged sand and gravel and the aggregates landed at Ipswich used in the County or exported outside of the County? Apologies but this is commercially confidential information.

**Question 19:** In Policy GP3 do all minerals proposals need to be close to major centres of population?
Policy GP3 refers to being “well related to” rather than “close to” major centres of population.

**Question 20:** Should the major centres be defined?
Agreed. Make reference to Ipswich, Lowestoft and Bury St Edmunds by amending GP3 as follows:

Preference will be given to proposals for minerals and waste development in accordance with the Key Diagram where individual sites are well related to the Suffolk Lorry Route Network (or rail network or navigation) major centres of population (namely Ipswich, Lowestoft and Bury St Edmunds) and do not have potentially significant adverse impacts upon features of environmental importance (natural or man-made) or endanger human health.

**Question 21:** Is the policy sufficiently clear in that the Key Diagram only indicates urban areas, lorry routes, railways and environmental designations?
Yes because it refers to the key markets, large scale statutory constraints and designated lorry routes and rail routes within Suffolk.

6. **Policy GP4 – General Environmental Criteria**

**Question 22:** Should Policy GP4 require proposals to accord with national policy on designated landscapes and habitats and heritage assets?
Agree. Redraft accordingly see below:

**Question 23:** Should the policy require net biodiversity gain where possible?
Agree. Redraft accordingly see below:

**Question 24:** Should policy GP4 include a requirement to submit sufficient information to enable the Council to carry out appropriate assessment where there may be an adverse impact on an internationally designated site?
Agree. Redraft accordingly see below:

**Question 25:** Is the wording of the policy clear, in particular some of the criteria may be ‘effects’ rather than ‘significant adverse impacts’. The use of the terms ‘national or local guidelines’ is vague and ‘any hierarchy of importance’ is not explained. Criterion(s) which appears intended to encourage consideration of alternative forms of transport is not worded as such and appears out of place in the list of significant adverse impacts.
Agree. Redraft accordingly see below:

**Question 26:** Should protected or ancient woodland/trees be added to criterion (c)?
Agree. Redraft criteria d) accordingly see below:

**Question 27:** Should archaeological interest be added to criterion (f)?
Agree. Redraft criteria f) accordingly see below:
**QUESTION 28: SHOULD THE POLICY INCLUDE A REQUIREMENT FOR CUMULATIVE IMPACT TO BE ASSESSED?**

Agree. Redraft accordingly see below:

**POLICY GP4: GENERAL ENVIRONMENTAL CRITERIA**

Minerals and waste development will be acceptable so long as the proposals, adequately access assess (and address where applicable any the potentially significant adverse impacts including cumulative impacts) the following upon:

a) pluvial, fluvial, tidal and groundwater flood risk;
b) vehicle movements, access and the wider highways network;
c) landscape character, visual impact, and protected designated landscapes;
d) biodiversity including Natura 2000 sites, ancient woodlands and trees;
e) geodiversity;
f) historic environment, archaeology, heritage assets and their setting;
g) public rights of way;
h) neighbouring land-use;
i) soil resources including the best and most versatile agricultural land;
j) noise and vibration;
k) air quality including dust and odour;
l) light pollution;
m) the local water environment;
n) land instability;
o) airfield safeguarding;
p) the differential settlement of quarry backfilling;
q) mud and aggregates on the road;
r) litter, vermin and birds.
s) (or the use of) alternative forms of transport including the use of rail freight shipping;

Proposals should where applicable meet or exceed the appropriate national or local legislation, planning policy or guidance guidelines for each criterion, including reference to any hierarchy of importance, and also comply with other policies of the development plan. Proposals should aim to achieve a biodiversity net gain where possible.
If you need help to understand this information in another language please call 03456 066 067.

Se precisar de ajuda para ler estas informações em outra língua, por favor telefone para o número abaixo. 03456 066 067

Jeigu jums reikia sios informacijos kita kalba, paskambinkite 03456 066 067

Jeżeli potrzebujesz pomocy w zrozumieniu tych informacji w swoim języku zadzwoń na podany poniżej numer. 03456 066 067

Dačă avei nevoie de ajutor pentru a înțelege această informație într-o altă limbă, vă rugăm să telefonați la numărul 03456 066 067

Εάν επιθυμείτε να υλοποιήσετε αυτήν την πληροφορία, μπορείτε να καλέσετε στο 03456 066 067

Если для того чтобы понять эту информацию Вам нужна помощь на другом языке, позвоните, пожалуйста, по телефону 03456 066 067

If you would like this information in another format, including audio or large print, please call 03456 066 067.