

# Waste Site Allocations Development Plan Document

## WAS01, WAS83 & WAS87 Beetley

Name: .....  
Address: .....  
Tel No: .....  
email: .....

### The following should all be logged as objections to the WAS01 & WAS83 sites:

**Landscape:** Endorse NCC assessment that development of this site is likely to have a negative effect on the area. The proposed sites are on the top and side of a hill. The proposed processes are industrial and involve large buildings, some with tall chimney stacks. This location is recognised by the Council for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE) as being 'tranquil'. The proposed processes are completely inappropriate and would have a hugely detrimental effect on the landscape.

**Highways/Transport:** Endorse NCC assessment that development of this site is likely to have a negative effect on the area. All the proposed processes would involve an increase in large and heavy goods vehicles. Issue 17 'Road Safety and Casualty Reduction' highlights the need to avoid waste development adversely impacting on road safety. This site is immediately adjacent to the Sustrans National Cycle Route 13 with the access road following the same route for a short distance. Increasing HGV traffic must increase the danger to cyclists.

**Ecology:** Endorse NCC assessment that development of this site is likely to have a negative effect on the area. Preferred Option CS7 'Local Nature Conservation Designations and Protection and Endorsement of Habitats and Species in Non-Designated Areas' states that minerals and waste development will not be permitted in or near sites of local importance such as County Wildlife Sites. The proposed sites are on the side of a hill within 250m of County Wildlife Site 2137 which contains the River Blackwater which feeds into the River Wensum which has SAC/SSSI status. Many of the processes have the potential to cause pollution to these important areas.

**Amenity:** Endorse NCC assessment that development of this site is likely to have a negative effect on the area. The immediate area around these proposed sites are recognised by the CPRE as being 'tranquil'. All of the proposed processes are industrial. In particular the processing of recyclables and mixed waste processing are recognised as 'bad neighbour' activities due to the impact of the noise, dust, litter, etc. Increased traffic in the local area would also have a detrimental effect on the ability of local people to enjoy walking in the immediate vicinity, as there are no pavements along the roadsides. Cyclists using the Sustrans Route 13 which runs alongside both proposed sites would also be adversely affected.

**Location:** Endorse NCC assessment that development of this site is likely to have a negative effect on the area. According to Preferred Option CS2 'Spatial Distribution of Development', the processes proposed for these sites are considered to be 'strategic'. Such strategic processes should only be located within 10 miles of the settlements of Norwich, Kings Lynn, Great Yarmouth and Thetford. Planning Policy Statement 10 requires the planning authority to consider 'the cumulative effects of previous waste disposal facilities on the well-being of the local community'. As these sites are well beyond 10 miles from the major settlements they should not be considered for these activities and should be removed from the next round of consultation.

**SA13 - To encourage employment opportunities and promote economic growth:** The parish of Beetley has 7 businesses employing between them in excess of 100 people. The largest employers are East Bilney Coachworks and East Bilney Garage, both of which are likely to be affected by dust and any other particles released into the air by industrial waste processes. The Care Home residents are vulnerable people who are particularly susceptible to any air pollution which could cause breathing difficulties. They would also be negatively affected by any increase in noise and vibration. Any detrimental effect on these businesses could affect their viability and therefore have a direct effect on employment opportunities. It is likely that the overall outcome would be job losses if this site were to be developed for waste processes. The assessment at SA13 should be registered as negative.

**The following should be logged as objections to the WAS83 site:**

**Cumulative Impact:** Endorse NCC assessment that development of this site is likely to have a negative effect on the area. WAS83 has been a landfill site; consequently in accordance with Planning Policy Statement 10 para 21 the cumulative impact of the years of operation of that site should mean that further waste sites should not be considered in this parish.

Endorse NCC assessment that development of this site is likely to have a negative effect on the area. Due to the fact that it has been a landfill site, WAS83 is still emitting methane gas and the structure of the surface is unstable. It should not be considered for any waste activity.

**The following should all be logged as objections to the WAS87 site:**

**Landscape:** Disagree with NCC assessment. This site is unacceptable. The proposed site is on the side of a gently sloping hill. The proposed process is industrial and will involve noise, dust and vibration. This location is recognised by the Council for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE) as being 'tranquil'. The proposed process is completely inappropriate and would have a hugely detrimental effect on the landscape, which the council recognises has some good internal features which are rare in this part of Norfolk.

**Highways/Transport:** Disagree with NCC assessment. This site is unacceptable. The proposed process would involve an increase in large and heavy goods vehicles. Issue 17 'Road Safety and Casualty Reduction' highlights the need to avoid waste development adversely impacting on road safety. This site is immediately adjacent to the Sustrans National Cycle Route 13 with the access road following the same route for approx 400m. Increasing HGV traffic must increase the danger to cyclists. Small businesses and private customers will be purchasing the recycled aggregate. There will be no restrictions on their chosen routes resulting in an increase in traffic on the surrounding roads and through the villages.

**Ecology:** Disagree with NCC assessment. This site is unacceptable. Preferred Option CS7 'Local Nature Conservation Designations and Protection and endorsement of Habitats and Species in Non-Designated Areas' states that minerals and waste development will not be permitted in or near sites of local importance such as County Wildlife Sites. This proposed site is close to County Wildlife Site 2068.

**Amenity:** Disagree with NCC assessment. This site is unacceptable. The immediate area around this proposed site is recognised by the CPRE as being 'tranquil'. The proposed process is industrial. It will create noise, dust and vibration. The increase in traffic will affect users of Sustrans Route 13. The roads in this area are within easy walking distance of Gressenhall and are used by many walkers. Their ability to enjoy the countryside will be diminished.

**Location:** Disagree with NCC assessment. This site is unacceptable. This is a totally inappropriate use of a site which will have been used for mineral extraction and should then have been restored to agricultural use.

**SA13 - To encourage employment opportunities and promote economic growth:** The parish of Beetley has 7 businesses employing between them in excess of 100 people. The largest employers are East Bilney Coachworks and East Bilney Garage, both of which are likely to be affected by dust and any other particles released into the air by industrial waste processes. The Care Home residents are vulnerable people who are particularly susceptible to any air pollution which could cause breathing difficulties. They would also be negatively affected by any increase in noise and vibration. Any detrimental effect on these businesses could affect their viability and therefore have a direct effect on employment opportunities. It is likely that the overall outcome would be job losses if this site were to be developed for waste processes. The assessment at SA13 should be registered as negative.

**Overall Conclusion:** Disagree with NCC assessment. I am concerned that the overall assessment of this site looks too positively towards potential mitigation/enhancement that may not be delivered.

Signed ..... Date .....

## Minerals Site Allocations Development Plan Document

The following sites have been allocated by Norfolk County Council as preferred options: MIN8, MIN13, MIN51

Name: .....  
Address: .....  
Tel No: .....  
email: .....

Whilst these sites have been allocated there are still issues which need to be addressed prior to mineral extraction. **The following should all be logged as objections to the above sites:**

**Landscape:** These sites are immediately adjacent to one another, forming a block of 42 hectares. This area of land is relatively flat and whilst the evidence base for these sites lists this as a 'positive', in that it would be easy to use banks of soil to screen the quarry workings, any such banks would also totally remove any view of the surrounding countryside. It is also proposed to use overland conveyor belts to move minerals to the (currently) existing East Bilney Quarry at Rawhall Lane. The use of conveyor belts represents an industrialisation of the countryside in an area that is recognised by the Council for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE) as being 'tranquil'. The cumulative effect of the proposed extractions could have a detrimental effect on the landscape of this area. Particular attention should be paid to the phasing of the sites.

**Highways/Transport:** All the proposed extraction sites would use overland conveyor belts to move the minerals to East Bilney Quarry from where they would be transported by HGV. This would inevitably mean the planning permission for the existing quarry would have to be extended, thereby resulting in many more years of lorries using Rawhall Lane and sharing use of the C225 with the Sustrans National Cycle Route. Issue 17 'Road Safety and Casualty Reduction' highlights the need to avoid waste development adversely impacting on road safety. Prolonging the use of this road by HGV traffic must increase the danger to cyclists.

**Ecology:** Preferred Option CS7 'Local Nature Conservation Designations and Protection and Endorsement of Habitats and Species in Non-Designated Areas' states that minerals and waste development will not be permitted in or near sites of local importance such as County Wildlife Sites. These proposed sites are all within the parish of Beetley which has 6 County Wildlife Sites. Particular attention should be paid to preserving the bio-diversity and landscape features.

**Amenity:** The immediate area around this proposed site is recognised by the CPRE as being 'tranquil'. The cumulative effect of these proposed sites could spoil this beautiful area. Attention should be paid to not obliterating the views of the countryside.

Signed ..... Date .....

The following sites have not been allocated by Norfolk County Council:  
MIN9, MIN10, MIN11, MIN12, MIN14, MIN63, MIN72, MIN89

Name: .....  
Address: .....  
Tel No: .....  
email: .....

The following should all be logged as objections to the above sites:

**Landscape:** Endorse NCC assessment of this site as not acceptable. With the exception of sites 63 and 89 the remaining proposed sites are immediately adjacent to one another, forming a block of over 70 hectares. If all the proposed extraction were allowed it would stretch from Gressenhall in the south to East Bilney in the north and extend both sides of the main road from Beetley to East Bilney. This area of land is relatively flat and whilst the evidence base for these sites lists this as a 'positive', in that it would be easy to use banks of soil to screen the quarry workings, any such banks would also totally remove any view of the surrounding countryside. It is also proposed to use overland conveyor belts to move minerals to the (currently) existing East Bilney Quarry at Rawhall Lane. The use of conveyor belts represents an industrialisation of the

countryside in an area that is recognised by the Council for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE) as being 'tranquil'. The cumulative effect of the proposed extractions are completely inappropriate and would have a hugely detrimental effect on the landscape of this area.

**Highways/Transport:** Endorse NCC assessment of this site as not acceptable. All the proposed extraction sites would use overland conveyor belts to move the minerals to East Bilney Quarry, from where they would be transported by HGV. This would inevitably mean the planning permission for the existing quarry would have to be extended thereby resulting in many more years of lorries using Rawhall Lane and sharing use of the C225 with the Sustrans National Cycle Route. Issue 17 'Road Safety and Casualty Reduction' highlights the need to avoid waste development adversely impacting on road safety. Prolonging the use of this road by HGV traffic must increase the danger to cyclists.

**Ecology:** Endorse NCC assessment of this site as not acceptable. Preferred Option CS7 'Local Nature Conservation Designations and Protection and Endorsement of Habitats and Species in Non-Designated Areas' states that minerals and waste development will not be permitted in or near sites of local importance such as County Wildlife Sites. These proposed sites are all within the parish of Beetley which has 6 County Wildlife Sites.

**Amenity:** Endorse NCC assessment of this site as not acceptable. The immediate area around these proposed sites is recognised by the CPRE as being 'tranquil'. The cumulative effect of these proposed sites would completely spoil this beautiful area. There would be at best disruption to, and at worst complete obliteration of, the views of the countryside. There would be noise, dust and light pollution. Apart from the B1146 there are no pavements. Many people walk around this area using the minor roads. Their enjoyment in doing this would be seriously diminished.

**Other site specific issues:**

Endorse NCC assessment of this site as not acceptable. Issue 38 of the Core Strategy relates to employment issues. Whilst this specifically looked at employment opportunities created by minerals and waste development, it was recognised that the benefit of very small numbers of jobs created were outweighed by the potential drawbacks. Responses to issues raised in the first round of consultation state that 'the impact on local businesses is not a material planning consideration'. The parish of Beetley has 7 businesses, employing between them in excess of 100 people. East Bilney Coachworks and East Bilney Garage are both affected by dust, and the Care Home residents are obviously particularly susceptible to any air pollution which could cause breathing difficulties. Any detrimental effect on these businesses could affect their viability and therefore have a direct affect on employment opportunities.

**Other comments:**

**Tourism:** Endorse NCC assessment of this site as not acceptable. Although tourism is only related to in terms of 'Historic Parks and Gardens' in the Core Strategy document, it does note that tourism is an important economic sector in Norfolk. Whilst Beetley does not have any historic parks or gardens, the B1146 is a major route for visitors to the Rural Life Museum on the edge of Beetley. Consideration should be given to the likely effect of large scale mineral extraction on both sides of this road for about 1 mile just outside Beetley.

In addition to the concerns listed overleaf, MIN63 and MIN89 cause particular concern as both sites are extremely close to the houses in the southern part of East Bilney.

**MIN63:**

**Amenity:** Endorse NCC assessment of this site as not acceptable. Min63 is within 100yards of East Bilney Garage separated only by the County Wildlife Site 2137. This proposed extraction site is overlooked by all the houses along the B1146 within this part of East Bilney. As it is effectively in a bowl, any noise generated would be heard by all the properties. It would be extremely difficult to protect the CWS from the effects of any pollution emanating from this site. The River Blackwater, which runs through the CWS, feeds in to the River Wensum which has SAC/SSSI status.

**MIN89:**

**Amenity:** Endorse NCC assessment of this site as not acceptable. MIN89 is also adjacent to CWS 2137. It is very close to the back gardens of the properties along the south side of Church Road. It is also immediately downhill of the now closed landfill site at Folly Lane. This landfill site was initially operated without any form of lining to contain pollution. Quarrying of minerals between it and the river would lead to pollution of the River Blackwater and possibly the River Wensum.

Signed ..... Date .....