

To Planning Services,
Norfolk County Council
Planning and Transportation Department
FREEPOST NC22093/8
County Hall
Martineau Lane
Norwich,
Norfolk
NR21 2BR

Date

Dear Sirs,

Response to the Consultation on the Waste and Mineral Site Allocations
Development Plan Documents.

Please find enclosed my response **objecting** to each of the following proposals
covered by the above mentioned consultation:

WAS 09
WAS 10
WAS 11
WAS 21
MIN 23
MIN 66
MIN 63
MIN 68
MIN 100

I am responding as an individual.

The questions below are optional.

We want to make sure that we are reaching as many people as possible so we have a few key questions to ask about you. This will identify where we are failing to involve people and help us develop better ways of encouraging greater participation in future consultations.

This information will be held on a county council database in accordance with the data protection Act 1998. It will be treated confidentially and will not be divulged to other parties. You only need to complete this form once, however many responses you make on the Minerals Site Allocations and Waste Site Allocations documents.

THIS PAGE WILL BE SEPARATED FROM YOUR REPRESENTATION FORM BEFORE IT IS USED FOR MONITORING PURPOSES.

Ethnic Origin

I would describe my ethnic origin as (please tick):

White

- British
- Irish
- Any other white background

Black or Black British

- Caribbean
- African
- Any other black background

Asian or Asian British

- Indian
- Pakistani
- Bangladeshi
- Any other Asian background

Mixed

- White & Black Caribbean
- White & Black African
- White & Asian
- Any other mixed background

Chinese

- Chinese

Other

- Any other ethnic group

Gender

(Please tick the appropriate box)

- Male Female

Age (Please tick the appropriate box)

- | | | | |
|----------|--------------------------|---------|--------------------------|
| Under 16 | <input type="checkbox"/> | 16 – 24 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 25 – 34 | <input type="checkbox"/> | 35 – 44 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 45 - 54 | <input type="checkbox"/> | 55 – 64 | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 65+ | <input type="checkbox"/> | | |

Disability

Do you have any long standing illness, disability or infirmity?

- Yes No

Occupation

- Employed Self-employed
- Unemployed Student
- Retired

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Rep No.:

Comment No.:

Ack'd:

Name: _____

Address:

Postcode: _____

Telephone: _____

Email: _____

This representation relates to:
THE WASTE SITE ALLOCATIONS DPD

Please tick your preferred method of contact:
Letter Email

Location: **LONGHAM**. Reference No.: **WAS 09**

I am responding as an **INDIVIDUAL**

This representation is an **Objection**

Landscape (e.g. visual impact)

This site has a temporary planning permission for mineral extraction under ref C/3/95/3013 that is due to expire 31 December 2010 and the site restored in accordance with phased landscaping conditions by 31 December 2012. The proposal would therefore conflict with the current planning requirements for restoration and after use. The proposed area is not a derelict 'brownfield' site; inclusion could result in a permanent waste facility being created in the open countryside, within the heath, wood and grass zone of the ecological network, preventing approved restoration back to agricultural land-use. The proposal would therefore offer no landscape restoration opportunities in either the short or medium term.

Highways/transport

The site is not close to the strategic highway network and would present an unacceptable impact on the public highway placing undue strain upon the local amenity and inadequate road system in terms of environmental harm and structural damage. The C229, from which it would be accessed, already carries inappropriate levels of HGV traffic. NCC previously turned down a very controversial planning application for a smaller proposal on the proposed site. One of the grounds for refusal was "the proposal would result in an increase in HGV movements to the detriment of the amenity of the area and will have an adverse impact on the highway safety contrary to policy WAS 16 and WAS 13 of the Waste Local Plan". These same roads are still not suitable for additional HGV traffic. Local roads and lanes and the C229 are inadequate for the significant increase in HGV's and associated traffic which would haul through to the site affecting all road users especially vulnerable cyclists/horse riders and walkers in terms of highway safety and damage to road surfaces and verges. The junction at Station Road Wendling is already dangerous and too narrow for existing HGV's and cars to simultaneously use safely, the increase in traffic would require substantial change to the junction, which would unacceptably harm the local environment and be against the Council's stated policy.

Ecology (e.g. flora and fauna)

The proposal is likely to affect the badger and deer population in the vicinity of the site. Records note long established badger setts in the area of the proposal. Great crested newts and water voles are also known to be in the area. Noise from HGV traffic and composting/recycling operations are likely to disturb local bird and wildlife habitats, as will seagull scavengers. Bioaerosols and fungal spores may affect the health of birds and wildlife.

Archaeology**Amenity (e.g. odour, dust, noise, litter, etc.)**

Composting and recycling inert waste is likely to cause local air pollution resulting in both a detrimental impact to the local amenity and a risk to the health of the local population, particularly those suffering from asthma, dust allergies and other respiratory problems. Composting creates bioaerosols and fungal spores that may adversely impact on the health of local people. This caused significant concern in the previous planning application on this site 6 years ago. NCC Head of Law at the time advised the planning Committee that "perception of risk to health" is a land-use issue material to planning and one of the grounds for refusal was stated to be "that there is significant public perception of risk to health arising from the proposed process". Health concerns over this roadside site are as relevant today as they were 6 years ago, in fact more so given the increased scale of the proposal. It is well documented that obnoxious smells/odours are likely to arise from the composting operations and will affect the local amenity. There is likely to be a significant increase in noise from the composting and recycling processes and noise from HGV and associated traffic. The proposal is likely to generate significant litter and attract scavenging seagulls, which will affect the local amenity and wildlife.

Other site specific issues (please specify) (e.g. pollution, flooding, public right of way, etc.)

There is a significant increase in risk of contamination to ground water from the composting and recycling processes affecting local water supplies and the water course.

And other comments (including about the Sustainability Appraisal, Evidence Base for the Minerals Site Allocations or Evidence Base for the Waste Site Allocations)?

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Rep No.:

Comment No.:

Ack'd:

Name: _____

Address: _____

Postcode: _____

Telephone: _____

Email: _____

This representation relates to:
THE WASTE SITE ALLOCATIONS DPD

Please tick your preferred method of contact:
Letter Email

Location: **LONGHAM**. Reference No.: **WAS 10**

I am responding as an **INDIVIDUAL**

This representation is an **Objection**

Landscape (e.g. visual impact)

The location is a greenfield site in open countryside, and the proposed development would be in direct contradiction to NCC policy WAS 4. As there should be sufficient sites within established or allocated industrial land there is no proven need for the Council to ignore its own policies in respect of this site.

The site is within the heath, wood and grass zone of the ecological network and the proposal is unlikely to offer restoration opportunities in the short or medium term.

The site sits on a high spot in the local area and will have a highly visible adverse impact on the local surroundings.

Highways/transport

The site is not close to the strategic highway network and would present an unacceptable impact on the public highway placing undue strain upon the local amenity and inadequate road system in terms of environmental harm and structural damage. The C229, from which it would be accessed, already carries inappropriate levels of HGV traffic. NCC has previously turned down applications because these same roads are not suitable for additional traffic, this proposal would substantially increase the volume of HGV and non-HGV traffic.

The junction of the A47 to Wendling would require substantial work to ensure adequate safety and such works would adversely impact the local environment, which is counter to WAS 16. Similarly the junction in Wendling of the old A47 with Station Road is already dangerous and too narrow for existing HGV's and cars to simultaneously use safely; and the increase in traffic would require substantial change to the junction, which again would unacceptably harm the local environment and be against the Council's stated policy.

Local roads and lanes and the C229 near the proposal are also inadequate for the significant increase in cars (and light commercial vehicles) which would undoubtedly impact on Longham and nearby villages as they route through to/from the site. Any changes to those roads would have an unacceptable detrimental impact to the local environment and would, therefore, again be counter to the Councils' stated policy.

The site has no current suitable access from the C229 and it is understood that the general position of the Council/Highways department is that no new access points can be created because of the danger caused through the existing levels of HGV and other traffic using this very narrow road. This proposal would, therefore, require the Council to change its policy on a safety related issue.

Ecology (e.g. flora and fauna)

The site is within a Groundwater Protection Zone 3. The water resource is already under strain from the waste and effluent from the turkey farm adjacent to the site. Household waste in particular will cause additional risk to the water course.

Household waste, soil spoil and inert waste such as concrete can all be sinks for the H5N1 bird flu virus and other notifiable diseases such as fowl pest; either because they are transported from contaminated sites, or vehicles come from contaminated sites to the proposed site (per the Surrey foot and mouth outbreak), or infected household waste is brought to the site. Additionally building materials such as brick and concrete dust carry the fungi *Aspergillus fumigatus* which is a significant cause of illness and death in farmed poultry. Given the site's adjacency to a turkey farm all of these risks would constitute an unacceptable biohazard for both the turkey farm and local residents. Additionally if there is an outbreak of a notifiable disease at the turkey farm or the farm is otherwise subject to DEFRA imposed quarantine restrictions the site would have to close, rendering it ineffective for a significant period. Any increase in the risk of bird flu or other similar viruses would have a detrimental impact on the local bird population.

Such a site will inevitably produce an increase in windborne litter, which has a known detrimental impact on local fauna, (deer, badgers, foxes etc). The site is located on a particularly windy plateau/high spot, with the prevailing winds likely to take airborne pollutants to the village and across the surrounding area, which is within the heath, wood and grass zone of the ecological network. The site is also in close proximity to Honeypot Wood a designated SSSI. Increased traffic is likely to cause more road deaths of deer, badgers and hedgehogs.

The whole area is well known for badgers and any development of this site would have a detrimental impact on the population.

The site is at least 5 miles away from the majority of the households it is designated to service. Travelling by car on 10 mile plus round trips is environmentally unacceptable and not necessary at a time when car users are being penalised financially for using their cars and the cost of fuel is in any case rising significantly.

Archaeology

The site is adjacent to the original pre-Tudor manor house of Longham village and there could be significant archaeology which would need to be investigated. It is also adjacent to an old airfield of WW2 at which many young servicemen lost their lives; it may be considered to be an inappropriate

development at a site of historical sensitivity.

Amenity (e.g. odour, dust, noise, litter, etc.)

Locating this site would significantly and adversely impact the amenity of the area. Part of the C229 as well as other roads from Dereham are designated parts of the National Bicycle Route 13 and tourists are encouraged to visit the area for its scenery and ability to walk, ride and bicycle. All of this would be adversely impacted if this proposal was to be approved and any reduction in tourism would have a significant adverse impact on the local economy in a time of increasing economic difficulty.

There is a significant increase in risk of contaminated water to a number of houses in the area who have no mains water connection and rely on bores and to local wildlife using the water course.

The village of Longham is directly downwind of the proposed site and would suffer disproportionately with litter, smells and windborne pollutants with the consequential risk to health. This caused significant concern in a previous planning application on another site 6 years ago. NCC Head of Law at the time advised the planning Committee that "perception of risk to health" is a land-use issue material to planning and one of the grounds for refusal was stated to be "that there is significant public perception of risk to health arising from the proposed process".

The proposal is likely to generate significant litter and attract scavenging seagulls, which will affect the local amenity and wildlife.

This proposal would result in a significant increase in noise and car pollution 7 day a week 363 days a year.

Other site specific issues (please specify) (e.g. pollution, flooding, public right of way, etc.)

There will be a significant increase in noise pollution, not only from the traffic but also from the machinery and associated plant required for household and inert waste recycling. As the site is on a high plateau and the windward side of the village this noise will adversely impact the whole community and the local amenity generally. Additionally inert waste recycling is extremely dusty and this dust will be taken by the wind to the village resulting in both a detrimental impact to the local amenity and a risk to the health of the local population, particularly those suffering from asthma, dust allergies and other respiratory problems.

Walkers (with or without dogs) and elderly people would be at a significant increase of risk of accidents with the increase in traffic on roads with no footpaths. Horse/pony riders would also be at greater risk of accidents with the increased traffic on the narrow (and often single track with blind bends) lanes from Dereham.

There is a permissive right of way bounding the site which is likely to be adversely impacted by developing this site. This site was specifically developed as the council recognised the lack of off-road tracks and bridleways in the area, and developing this proposal will negate the recently provided benefit.

There will be significant additional light pollution in an area where there are limited street lights and

other similar light pollutants.

If there is a bird flu outbreak at the turkey farm or the farm is otherwise subject to quarantine restrictions the site would have to close, rendering it ineffective for a significant period.

And other comments (including about the Sustainability Appraisal, Evidence Base for the Minerals Site Allocations or Evidence Base for the Waste Site Allocations)?

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Rep No.:

Comment No.:

Ack'd:

Name: _____

Address: _____

Postcode: _____

Telephone: _____

Email: _____

This representation relates to:
THE WASTE SITE ALLOCATIONS DPD

Please tick your preferred method of contact:
Letter Email

Location: **LONGHAM**. Reference No.: **WAS 11**

I am responding as an **INDIVIDUAL**

This representation is an **Objection**

Landscape (e.g. visual impact)

The site is directly behind Longham Village Church, an historic building and local landmark. Locating an inert waste recycling site close to this village landmark will adversely impact the local visual amenity.

Highways/transport

The site is not close to the strategic highway network and would present an unacceptable impact on the public highway placing undue strain upon the local amenity and inadequate road system in terms of environmental harm and structural damage. In recognition that the C229 cannot cope with the increase in HGV traffic NCC has previously turned down a planning application on the grounds that "an increase in HGV traffic would have an adverse impact on the highway safety contrary to policy WAS 16 and WAS 13 of the Waste Local Plan". The C229, from which this proposal would be accessed, already carries inappropriate levels of HGV traffic. Local roads and lanes and the C229 are inadequate for the significant increase in HGV's and associated traffic which would haul through to the site affecting all road users, especially vulnerable cyclists/horse riders and walkers, in terms of highway safety and damage to road surfaces and verges. The junction at Station Road Wendling is already, dangerous and too narrow for existing HGV's and cars to simultaneously use safely, the increase in traffic would require substantial change to the junction, which would unacceptably harm the local environment and be against the Council's stated policy. The site has no current access to the C229, and it is difficult to see how such access could be provided.

Ecology (e.g. flora and fauna)

Soil spoils and inert waste such as concrete can all be sinks for the bird flu virus; either because they are transported from contaminated sites, or vehicles come from contaminated sites to the proposed site (per the Surrey foot and mouth outbreak). Additionally building materials such as brick and concrete dust carry the fungi *Aspergillus fumigatus* which can be a significant cause of illness and death in

farmed poultry. Given the site's proximity to a turkey farm these would constitute an unacceptable biohazard for both the turkey farm and local residents. Any increase in the risk of bird flu or other similar viruses would have a detrimental impact on the local bird and wildlife population.

Archaeology

Amenity (e.g. odour, dust, noise, litter, etc.)

Locating this site would significantly and adversely impact the local amenity of the area from significant noise generated by the recycling Plant and HGV traffic. Local roads are used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders and tourists are also encouraged to visit the area. All of this would be adversely impacted if this proposal was to be approved.

As previously mentioned the site is adjacent to the village church and the use of industrial machinery required for inert waste recycling will, because of the noise, adversely impact the ability of the community to use the Church and could undermine its structure.

Additionally inert waste recycling is extremely dusty and this dust will be taken by the wind to the village resulting in both a detrimental impact to the local amenity and a risk to the health of the local population, particularly those suffering from asthma, dust allergies and other respiratory problems.

Walkers (with or without dogs) and elderly people would be at a significant increase of risk of accidents with the increase in traffic on roads with no footpaths. Horse/pony riders would also be at greater risk of accidents with the increased traffic on the narrow (and often single track with blind bends) lanes from Dereham.

There will be a significant increase in risk of contamination to ground water from the recycling processes affecting local water supplies and the water course.

Other site specific issues (please specify) (e.g. pollution, flooding, public right of way, etc.)

And other comments (including about the Sustainability Appraisal, Evidence Base for the Minerals Site Allocations or Evidence Base for the Waste Site Allocations)?

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Rep No.:

Comment No.:

Ack'd:

Name: _____

Address: _____

Postcode: _____

Telephone: _____

Email: _____

This representation relates to:
THE MINERAL SITE ALLOCATIONS DPD

Please tick your preferred method of contact:
Letter Email

Location: **LONGHAM**. Reference No.: **MIN 66**

I am responding as an **INDIVIDUAL**

This representation is an **Objection**

Landscape (e.g. visual impact)

The site is in an open landscape on level but gently sloping ground, visible from a significant number of homes and local lanes in the village of Longham. Developing it as a mineral site will have a significant adverse impact on the local visual amenity and environment, particularly as 'bundings' would be necessary to work the site. The bund would be a visual eyesore for a significant number of village residents, adversely affecting the visual amenity. Additionally, if it is the intention to process the minerals at the Bittering Quarry it would prolong the life of an existing quarry and the associated environmental disturbance beyond reasonable expectation and result in existing timetables for restoration not to be met, in contradiction of NCC policy MIN 24. It would also result in sand and stone deposits on the public highway. This latter problem being one the current operators and the local authority have been singularly ineffective in preventing/enforcing to date.

Highways/transport

The site is not close to the strategic highway network and would present an unacceptable impact on the public highway placing undue strain upon the local amenity/landscape and inadequate road system in terms of environmental harm and structural damage.

The area of the site is served by undesignated roads such as the C222, C242 or the C229. Whichever route is finally put forward will inevitably result in additional HGV and associated traffic using a local road network which is completely unsuitable for the size and volume which would result.

The C229, from which it likely to be accessed, already carries inappropriate levels of HGV traffic. In recognition of the unacceptable increase in HGV traffic accessing the C229 NCC has previously turned down applications because these same roads are not suitable for additional traffic, this proposal would substantially increase the volume of HGV and non-HGV traffic.

The junction of the A47 to Wendling would require substantial work to ensure adequate safety and such works would adversely impact the local environment, which is counter to NCC policy WAS 16. Similarly the junction in Wendling of the old A47 with Station Road is already dangerous and too narrow for existing HGV's and cars to simultaneously use safely; and the increase in traffic would require

substantial change to the junction, which again would unacceptably harm the local environment and be against the Council's stated policy.

The cumulative effect of this development alongside existing mineral extraction sites will put inappropriate and unnecessary strain on the local roads, adversely affecting the environment and causing additional structural damage to the surrounding area.

Ecology (e.g. flora and fauna)

Planning has just been given for the adjacent 46.7 ha Spreadoak site (WAS 67 in the Site Allocations document). Given the scale and cumulative effect of existing and approved extraction sites in this very small locale it is inevitable that the habitats of the local wildlife, protected or otherwise, will be adversely affected.

Archaeology

Amenity (e.g. odour, dust, noise, litter, etc.)

Locating this site would significantly and adversely impact the amenity of the area. The site is bounded to the south and west by designated sections are designated parts of the National Bicycle Route 13 and tourists are encouraged to visit the area for its scenery and ability to walk, ride and bicycle. All of this would be adversely impacted if this proposal was to be approved and any reduction in tourism would have a significant adverse impact on the local economy in a time of increasing economic difficulty.

Walkers (with or without dogs) and elderly people would be at a significant increase of risk of accidents with the increase in traffic on roads with no footpaths. Horse/pony riders would also be at greater risk of accidents with the increased traffic on the narrow (and often single track with blind bends) lanes around the village.

The village is immediately adjacent to the site and downwind from the prevailing winds. Dust from the operation is likely to have an adverse impact on the health of the local community, particularly the elderly and those with respiratory diseases and/or allergies.

The processing of minerals on the proposed site is likely to create significant noise disturbance to local residents from the processing plant/machinery including crushing/screening operations. There is likely to be considerable noise disturbance from reversing alarms and dump truck/ excavations on the site as well as HGV and associated traffic accessing/leaving the site.

Other site specific issues (please specify) (e.g. pollution, flooding, public right of way, etc.)

This site is only 7 metres from the boundary of the nearest dwelling (The Old Rectory).

There will additional light pollution from the operators working after dark, and for security for the plant and equipment stored on site, in an area where there are no street lights and other similar light pollutants.

The proposal may have adverse effects on public drinking water resources in terms of quality and continuity of supply given that excavations may affect the water table.

Taking into account the cumulative effects of the existing extensive quarry works to the north and the recently granted permission on 46.7 acres immediately to the north, this site would seem to be in direct conflict with NCC policy MIN 12.

And other comments (including about the Sustainability Appraisal, Evidence Base for the Minerals Site Allocations or Evidence Base for the Waste Site Allocations)?

There has been no evaluation on the level of mineral extraction likely to be available from this site, the cost of extraction or the timeframe over which it is likely to be extracted. With no information or basis on which to assess its viability NCC would not be able to include it in the requirements for minerals, so it would seem inappropriate to include in the plan for the future.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Rep No.:

Comment No.:

Ack'd:

Name: _____

Address: _____

Postcode: _____

Telephone: _____

Email: _____

This representation relates to:
THE WASTE SITE ALLOCATIONS DPD

Please tick your preferred method of contact:
Letter Email

Location: **BEESTON** Reference No.: **WAS 21**

I am responding as an **INDIVIDUAL**

This representation is an **Objection**

Landscape (e.g. visual impact)

Highways/transport

The site is not close to the strategic highway network and would present an unacceptable impact on the public highway placing undue strain upon the local amenity and inadequate road system in terms of environmental harm and structural damage. The C221, from which it would be accessed, already carries inappropriate levels of HGV traffic. This proposal would increase the already substantial volumes of HGV and commercial traffic.

Ecology (e.g. flora and fauna)

Archaeology

Amenity (e.g. odour, dust, noise, litter, etc.)

Locating this site would significantly and adversely impact the local amenity of the area. A previous proposal for composting on this site was previously turned down and caused significant concerns over health.

Other site specific issues (please specify) (e.g. pollution, flooding, public right of way, etc.)

And other comments (including about the Sustainability Appraisal, Evidence Base for the Minerals Site Allocations or Evidence Base for the Waste Site Allocations)?

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Rep No.:

Comment No.:

Ack'd:

Name: _____

Address: _____

Postcode: _____

Telephone: _____

Email: _____

This representation relates to:
THE MINERAL SITE ALLOCATIONS DPD

Please tick your preferred method of contact:
Letter Email

Location: **BEESTON** Reference No.: **MIN 23**

I am responding as an **INDIVIDUAL**

This representation is an **Objection**

Landscape (e.g. visual impact)

The site is in an open landscape and developing it as a mineral site will have adverse impact on the local visual amenity. Additionally, the suggestion in the site allocations document that the minerals extracted could be processed at a site in Bittering some 6 kilometres away is inappropriate as this would prolong the life of an existing quarry and the associated environmental disturbance beyond reasonable expectation and result in existing timetables for restoration not to be met, against the Council's policies (MIN 24).

Highways/transport

The site is not close to the strategic highway network and would present an unacceptable impact on the public highway placing undue strain upon the local amenity/landscape and inadequate road system in terms of environmental harm and structural damage.

The cumulative effect of this development alongside existing mineral extraction sites will put inappropriate and unnecessary strain on the local roads, adversely affecting the environment and causing additional structural damage to the surrounding area in contradiction to NCC policy MIN 12.

The area of the site is served by undesignated roads such as the U35182, C222 and C221. Whichever route is finally put forward will inevitably result in additional HGV and associated traffic using a local road network which is completely unsuitable for the size and volume which would result. Any improvements to accommodate HGV traffic would have a detrimental impact on the landscape and local environment, which is counter to NCC policy, WAS 16.

The suggestion in the site allocations document that the minerals extracted could be processed at a site in Bittering some 6 kilometres away would have additional adverse impact on the local road system, create additional unnecessary road miles with the associated additional pollution and result in even greater deposits of sand and stone on the public highway and the grass verges. This latter problem being one the current operators and the local authority have been singularly ineffective in preventing/enforcing to date.

Ecology (e.g. flora and fauna)

Given the scale and cumulative effect of the proposed extraction sites in the Beeston area it is inevitable that the habitats of the local wildlife, protected or otherwise will be adversely affected. The proposal already indicates that this site would affect the Biodiversity Action Plan Species or their habitats.

Archaeology**Amenity (e.g. odour, dust, noise, litter, etc.)**

Locating this site would significantly and adversely impact the amenity of the area. Part of the C229 (Reed Lane), C222 (Litcham Road) as well as other surrounding roads are designated parts of the National Bicycle Route 13 and tourists are encouraged to visit the area for its scenery and ability to walk, ride and bicycle. All of this would be adversely impacted if this proposal was to be approved and any reduction in tourism would have a significant adverse impact on the local economy in a time of increasing economic difficulty.

Walkers (with or without dogs) and elderly people would be at a significant increase of risk of accidents with the increase in traffic on roads with no footpaths. Horse/pony riders would also be at greater risk of accidents with the increased traffic on the narrow (and often single track with blind bends) lanes around the village.

Other site specific issues (please specify) (e.g. pollution, flooding, public right of way, etc.)

There will be a significant increase in noise pollution, not only from the traffic but also from the machinery required for running the operation.

There will additional light pollution from the operators working after dark, and for security for the plant and equipment stored on site, in an area where there are limited street lights and other similar light pollutants.

And other comments (including about the Sustainability Appraisal, Evidence Base for the Minerals Site Allocations or Evidence Base for the Waste Site Allocations)?

The estimated level of reserves for a site of this size (26.7 ha) compared to the size and level of reserves of other proposals suggests either it is not as economically sound as other proposals or the proposers have not provided accurate information.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Rep No.:

Comment No.:

Ack'd:

Name: _____

Address: _____

Postcode: _____

Telephone: _____

Email: _____

This representation relates to:
THE MINERAL SITE ALLOCATIONS DPD

Please tick your preferred method of contact:
Letter Email

Location: **BEESTON** Reference No.: **MIN 61**

I am responding as an **INDIVIDUAL**

This representation is an **Objection**

Landscape (e.g. visual impact)

The site is in an open landscape and developing it as a mineral site will have adverse impact on the local visual amenity.

Highways/transport

The site is not close to the strategic highway network and would present an unacceptable impact on the public highway placing undue strain upon the local amenity/landscape and inadequate road system in terms of environmental harm and structural damage.

There is no current HGV access route to the site and allowing additional HGV and associated traffic to use the C222 and or the C221 whilst the adjacent existing mineral extraction and restoration is still happening would create further environmental and structural damage.

The area of the site is served by undesignated roads such as the C221 and C222 to access the B1145 or bound for the C229 to access the A47. Whichever route is finally put forward will inevitably result in additional HGV and associated traffic using a local road network which is completely unsuitable for the size and volume which would result. Any improvements to accommodate HGV traffic would have a detrimental impact on the landscape and local environment, which is counter to NCC policy, WAS 16.

The cumulative effect of this development alongside existing mineral extraction sites will put inappropriate and unnecessary strain on the local roads, adversely affecting the environment and causing additional structural damage to the surrounding area.

Ecology (e.g. flora and fauna)

Given the scale and cumulative effect of the existing and proposed extraction sites in the Beeston area it is inevitable that the habitats of the local wildlife, protected or otherwise, will be adversely affected. The proposal already indicates that this site would affect the Biodiversity Action Plan Species or their habitats.

Archaeology**Amenity (e.g. odour, dust, noise, litter, etc.)**

Locating this site would significantly and adversely impact the amenity of the area. Parts of some of the roads suggested as the route for HGV's as well as other surrounding roads are designated parts of the National Bicycle Route 13 and tourists are encouraged to visit the area for its scenery and ability to walk, ride and bicycle. All of this would be adversely impacted if this proposal was to be approved and any reduction in tourism would have a significant adverse impact on the local economy in a time of increasing economic difficulty.

Any increase in HGV and associated traffic along the undesignated roads suggested as a route would adversely impact the ability of the local community and tourists to enjoy the landscape and visual amenity of the area, adversely impacting tourism and the local economy.

Walkers (with or without dogs) and elderly people would be at a significant increase of risk of accidents with the increase in traffic on roads with no footpaths. Horse/pony riders would also be at greater risk of accidents with the increased traffic on the narrow (and often single track with blind bends) lanes around the village.

Other site specific issues (please specify) (e.g. pollution, flooding, public right of way, etc.)

There will be a significant increase in noise pollution, not only from the traffic but also from the machinery required for running the operation.

There will additional light pollution from the operators working after dark, and for security for the plant and equipment stored on site, in an area where there are limited street lights and other similar light pollutants.

And other comments (including about the Sustainability Appraisal, Evidence Base for the Minerals Site Allocations or Evidence Base for the Waste Site Allocations)?

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Rep No.:

Comment No.:

Ack'd:

Name: _____

Address:

Postcode: _____

Telephone: _____

Email: _____

This representation relates to:
THE MINERAL SITE ALLOCATIONS DPD

Please tick your preferred method of contact:
Letter Email

Location: **BEESTON** Reference No.: **MIN 68**

I am responding as an **INDIVIDUAL**

This representation is an **Objection**

Landscape (e.g. visual impact)

The site is in an open landscape and developing it as a mineral site will have adverse impact on the local visual amenity. Additionally, the suggestion in the site allocations document that the minerals extracted could be processed at a site in Bittering some 6 kilometres away would prolong the life of an existing quarry and the associated environmental disturbance beyond reasonable expectation and result in existing timetables for restoration not to be met.

Highways/transport

The site is not close to the strategic highway network and would present an unacceptable impact on the public highway placing undue strain upon the local amenity/landscape and inadequate road system in terms of environmental harm and structural damage.

The cumulative effect of this development alongside existing mineral extraction sites will put inappropriate and unnecessary strain on the local roads, adversely affecting the environment and causing additional structural damage to the surrounding area.

Whichever route is finally put forward will inevitably result in additional HGV and associated traffic using a local road network which is completely unsuitable for the size and volume which would result. Further improvements to junctions with the B1145 and/or the C229/A47 would be required to ensure adequate safety and such works would adversely impact the local environment, which is counter to WAS 16.

The suggestion in the site allocations document that the minerals extracted could be processed at a site in Bittering some 6 kilometres away would have additional adverse impact on the local road system, create additional unnecessary road miles with the associated additional pollution and result in even greater deposits of sand and stone on the public highway and the grass verges. This latter problem being one the current operators and the local authority have been singularly ineffective in preventing/enforcing to date.

Ecology (e.g. flora and fauna)

Given the scale and cumulative effect of existing and proposed extraction sites in the Beeston area it is inevitable that the habitats of the local wildlife, protected or otherwise, will be adversely affected, as the submission itself indicates.

Archaeology**Amenity (e.g. odour, dust, noise, litter, etc.)**

Locating this site would significantly and adversely impact the amenity of the area. Part of the C229 (Reed Lane) as well as other surrounding roads are designated parts of the National Bicycle Route 13 and tourists are encouraged to visit the area for its scenery and ability to walk, ride and bicycle. All of this would be adversely impacted if this proposal was to be approved.

Walkers (with or without dogs) and elderly people would be at a significant increase of risk of accidents with the increase in traffic on roads with no footpaths. Horse/pony riders would also be at greater risk of accidents with the increased traffic on the narrow (and often single track with blind bends) lanes around the village.

Other site specific issues (please specify) (e.g. pollution, flooding, public right of way, etc.)

There will be a significant increase in noise pollution, not only from the traffic but also from the machinery required for running the operation.

There will additional light pollution from the operators working after dark, and for security for the plant and equipment stored on site, in an area where there are limited street lights and other similar light pollutants.

And other comments (including about the Sustainability Appraisal, Evidence Base for the Minerals Site Allocations or Evidence Base for the Waste Site Allocations)?

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

Rep No.:

Comment No.:

Ack'd:

Name: _____

Address:

Postcode: _____

Telephone: _____

Email: _____

This representation relates to:
THE MINERAL SITE ALLOCATIONS DPD

Please tick your preferred method of contact:
Letter Email

Location: **MILEHAM** Reference No.: **MIN 100**

I am responding as an **INDIVIDUAL**

This representation is an **Objection**

Landscape (e.g. visual impact)

The site is in an open landscape and developing it as a mineral site will have adverse impact on the local visual amenity. Additionally, the suggestion in the site allocations document that the minerals extracted could be processed at a site in Bittering some 6 kilometres away is inappropriate as this would prolong the life of an existing quarry and the associated environmental disturbance beyond reasonable expectation and result in existing timetables for restoration not to be met, against NCC policy MIN24.

Highways/transport

The site is not close to the strategic highway network and would present an unacceptable impact on the public highway placing undue strain upon the local amenity/landscape and inadequate road system in terms of environmental harm and structural damage.

Neither of the immediate access roads are current HGV access routes and both are unsuitable to become so designated. Any work to upgrade the roads to fulfil the suitability requirements of an HGV access route would adversely impact the local environment, which is counter to WAS 16.

The cumulative effect of this development alongside existing mineral extraction sites will put inappropriate and unnecessary strain on the local roads, adversely affecting the environment and causing additional structural damage to the surrounding area, in contradiction to MIN 12.

The suggestion in the site allocations document that the minerals extracted could be processed at a site in Bittering some 6 kilometres away as well as being in contradiction to the Council's own policy (MIN 24) would have additional adverse impact on the local road system, create additional unnecessary road miles with the associated additional pollution and result in even greater deposits of sand and stone on the public highway and the grass verges. This latter problem being one the current operators and the local authority have been singularly ineffective in preventing/enforcing to date.

Ecology (e.g. flora and fauna)

Given the scale and cumulative effect of existing and proposed extraction sites in the Beeston area it is inevitable that the habitats of the local wildlife, protected or otherwise, will be adversely affected; as the submission itself indicates.

Archaeology**Amenity (e.g. odour, dust, noise, litter, etc.)**

Locating this site would significantly and adversely impact the amenity of the area. The surrounding roads are designated parts of the National Bicycle Route 13 and tourists are encouraged to visit the area for its scenery and ability to walk, ride and bicycle. All of this would be adversely impacted if this proposal was to be approved and any reduction in tourism would have a significant adverse impact on the local economy in a time of increasing economic difficulty.

Walkers (with or without dogs) and elderly people would be at a significant increase of risk of accidents with the increase in traffic on roads with no footpaths. Horse/pony riders would also be at greater risk of accidents with the increased traffic on the narrow (and often single track with blind bends) lanes around the village.

Other site specific issues (please specify) (e.g. pollution, flooding, public right of way, etc.)

There will be a significant increase in noise pollution, not only from the traffic but also from the machinery required for running the operation.

There will additional light pollution from the operators working after dark, and for security for the plant and equipment stored on site, in an area where there are limited street lights and other similar light pollutants.

And other comments (including about the Sustainability Appraisal, Evidence Base for the Minerals Site Allocations or Evidence Base for the Waste Site Allocations)?

The estimated level of reserves for a site of this size (23 ha) compared to the size and level of reserves of other proposals suggests either it is not as economically sound as other proposals or the proposers have not provided accurate information.