

HILL FARM HOUSE
GREAT DUNHAM
KING'S LYNN PE32 2LP
01760 755315
litcam@netcom.co.uk

12 March 2008

To the Chairmen of Parish Councils

Beeston with Bittering
Beetley
Gressenhall
Litcham
Longham
Mileham
Tittleshall
Wellingham

Dear All

Norfolk Minerals and Waste Development Framework

You will have received documentation from County Hall about the above, read about it in the papers, and I thought it might be helpful if I wrote to explain the position as I understand it, because it is a complex issue.

The government has altered the way in which the process is going to happen, so that there are three stages:

1. Issues & Options stage. This is where we are now, and to which the documents you have received refer. ***The consultation period ends on the 28th March.***
2. Preferred options stage, which should be around October 2008. More consultation.
3. The submissions draft, which the County Council will work up after stages one and two, and which will be submitted to the Secretary of State. Sometime in early 2009.

While the whole process is to some extent new, it is stage one (Issues and Options) that is completely new, and seemingly an extra procedure.

For years and years County Council have given guidelines through the Minerals Plan (approved by the Secretary of State) as to where applications for extraction can take place. In the new procedure the Council must a) develop its core strategy (the orange book you have received) and b) allow/invite applications from landowners, companies in the sector and other promoters for mineral and waste sites (the blue books).

Therefore the sites in the book are not suggested by the council, but by landowners. They cannot be refused by the Council at this stage, and no pre-screening has happened. They should be suitable and available for appraisal against the core strategy, but their inclusion in the list is the result of the promoter's application at this stage, and **not** because the Council considers them necessarily appropriate or necessary. All the council can do is the initial assessment – and that is what the short extract on each site in the blue book is. Neither does their inclusion mean they will be brought forward or any future application successful. It is clear in one or two cases in the County that some promoters have made submissions in a speculative and blanket approach, for there is a relatively small cost at this stage.

The consultation ends on 28 March. It is crucial that your parish makes some response, especially in relation to the orange document, and the core strategies which are highlighted in pink. Any comments on individual sites will carry more weight if put in relation to these core elements, and the Council department is obviously keen to hear especially any **local** knowledge that you might have and which has been missed out.

The county has a need for roads and a government imposed requirement for houses, and also has a statutory duty to maintain a minerals landbank and to deal with waste. Obviously we all need quarries and recycling centres etc, but they are always emotive issues when they are on top of us. A balance has to be struck, and there will be plenty of opportunity later to make your views known on individual applications.

I hope this helps, and I repeat that this is a complex procedure: this letter is my interpretation of it, and I may not have got it right in every detail, so please forgive me if this proves the case. **Please** respond to the County Council and do contact me – preferably by email – if you want any advice or help with your response.

Yours sincerely

Christopher Lloyd Owen

Christopher Lloyd Owen
Member for Necton & Launditch

Find out how to prevent slips, trips
and falls in your workplacewww.hse.gov.uk/shatteredlivesDon't chance it
CHANGE ITWindows Live™ Home Hotmail Spaces OneCare MSN chris kennell@hotmail.com
Sign out

New Reply Reply all Forward Delete Junk Move to Options

Fw: Minerals sites, public consultationFrom: **Griselda Hubbard** (grizandy@tiscali.co.uk)
Sent: 21 March 2008 13:42:59
To: chris kennell (chriskenell@hotmail.com)

thought you might want to read this

G

----- Original Message -----

From: Trevor Wood

To: Wendling ; Mrs T. Reynolds ; Mrs C. Hubbard ; Mrs C. Hudson ; Mr C. Brown ; Mr B. Leigh

Sent: Friday, March 21, 2008 12:57 PM

Subject: Minerals sites, public consultation

Dear Sir or Madam

In Hoe we have recently submitted our responses to the minerals sites public consultation and a further response to the policies underpinning the strategy. As you know the opportunity for people to submit responses will ends next Friday and we thought we would communicate before then with surrounding parishes to ensure that an issue of common interest is not overlooked.

This area has for many years been the county's 'gravel pit', with the largest cluster of quarries, despite having one of the smallest building programmes. It has suited the gravel producers to dig and process here, then criss cross our area with inordinately lengthy lorry journeys to supply distant construction sites. Once again, in the latest round of submissions to establish new pits, our area has received the largest number of applications and this continued proliferation has the potential to widen the scars that already disfigure the local lanscape.

For the first time however the county's minerals provision strategy includes consideration of carbon emissions and a 'proximity principal' underpins the policy that will carry us into the 21st century. The intention is that sand and gravel sites will be established close to where the material is to be used, reducing haulage journeys to less than ten miles from main centres and five miles from the larger towns. The towns within five miles (indeed even ten miles) of the sites in our local cluster are scheduled to have some 4% of the total development projected for the whole of the county (to 2021), thus if the proximity principal is applied, this area should be called on to provide 4% of the total requirement for sand and gravel. In the circumstances there is clearly no justification for permitting any further gravel workings in our area.

I know that local parishes and residents have worked hard in preparing their opposition to individual sites but if supporting the proposed policy removes the arguments put forward for any growth then it seems important to show support for it. Our response will not have the organisation and financial backing that the aggregates industry enjoys and it is certain that there will be concerted opposition to the proximity principal from those connected with the applications. The most effective counter to this is to register support for it.

We have no common forum for passing information so I hope you find this method of communication acceptable. The local press have indicated that they will be giving this matter further coverage before the deadline and I have passed on information regarding the issue covered here, in the hope that the debate will remain active to the end of the consultation period.

It would be helpful if you could acknowledge receipt of the message. We hope that you and your residents find this useful but please forgive the structure of the message if it merely duplicates conclusions you have already reached. Finally please get in touch if you wish to discuss anything further (tel.01362 860326).

Trevor Wood

N.B.

NCC require a landbank of 3 million tonnes of sand and gravel per year. As the register of sites will run from 2010 (the expected publications date) to 2021 this represents a total of 33 million tonnes. 70% of applicants declared surveyed reserves of aggregate and this amounted to 81 million tonnes. Reserves at the other 30% are not known but current workings have 20million tonnes. The total available reserve of aggregate therefore is more than three times the requirement.

The reserves are distributed throughout the county and every area has a considerable surplus available beyond its projected requirement. There is nothing to support any contention that gravel must be transported from this area to others because it is not available within the parameters of the proximity principal.

The county as a whole will have 68,000 dwellings constructed between 2001 and 2021. 1200 will be built in Dereham and the villages that surround it, 600 will be in Swaffham and its environs, 800 will be in the Fakenham area.....a total of 2,600. This accounts for the whole of the area within 5 miles of the local sites and is how the 4% figure was arrived at.

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG.

Version: 7.5.519 / Virus Database: 269.21.8/1337 - Release Date: 3/20/2008 20:10

Want to race through your inbox even faster? Try the full version of Windows Live Hotmail. (It's free, too.)

© 2008 Microsoft | Privacy | Legal

Help Central | Account | Feedback

Ms Nightingale
The Wae House
Chapel Road
Longham
DEREHAM
NR19 2RN



15.3.2008.

Dear Mrs Hubbard,

Regarding the letter circulated in the village setting out the proposed sites around Longham for Waste Disposal and Mineral Extraction, I wonder if you have considered approaching the campaign group - Campaign to Protect Rural England 128 Southwark Street, London SE1 OSW. Freephone 0800 163680 Website WWW.cpre.org.UK. - for help in this matter.

I feel that we are going to need some strong support to stop this going ahead.

Sincerely,

J Nightingale

Mrs. G.R. Hubbard
21 South Green Gardens
Dereham
Norfolk NR19 1FY