

**WAS 01 & WAS87 Beetley**

Name .....

Address .....

Phone no ..... e-mail address .....

**The following should all be logged as objections to the WAS01 site**

**Landscape.** Endorse NCC assessment that development of this site is likely to have a negative effect on the area. The proposed site is 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 site is 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 this proposed site is 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 this site is well beyond 10 miles from the major settlements it 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 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 .....