

BRECKLAND COUNCIL

At a Meeting of the

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND REVIEW PANEL 1

**Held on Tuesday, 11 March 2008 at 10.00 am in
The Gallery Bar, Watton Sports Centre, Dereham Road, Watton**

PRESENT

Mr J.D. Rogers (Chairman)	Mr I.A.C. Monson
Mrs M.P. Chapman-Allen	Mrs P. Quadling
Mr P.J. Duigan	Mrs P.A. Spencer
Mr A.P. Joel (Vice-Chairman)	Mrs L.S. Turner

Also Present

Councillor Claire Bowes	Mr B. Rose
Mr M.A. Kiddle-Morris	

In Attendance

Mark Broughton	- Scrutiny Officer
Paul Harris	- Planning Policy Officer
Sam Hubbard	- Planning Policy Assistant
Andrea Long	- Environmental Planning Manager
David Spencer	- Principal Planning Policy Officer
Elaine Wilkes	- Senior Committee Officer

10/08 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 5 February 2008 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

11/08 APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Mr. R.P. Childerhouse, Mr. K. Martin and Mrs. A. Steward.

12/08 DECLARATION OF INTEREST

The following declarations were made in regard to Agenda Item 7:

- Mr. J.D. Rogers – Personal interest a Member of the Norfolk County Council's Minerals and Waste Committee and as Ward Member for Carbrooke.
- Mr. I.A.C. Monson – Personal interest as a Member of Norfolk County Council of Wards/Parishes within the County Council Division in Breckland area
- Mr. M. Kiddle-Morris – Personal interest relating to applications affecting two parishes within his Ward.

13/08 NON-MEMBERS WISHING TO ADDRESS THE MEETING

- Councillor C. Bowes
- Mr. M. Kiddle-Morris
- Mr. B. Rose

Action By

Action By

14/08 STRATEGIC HOUSING LAND AVAILABILITY ASSESSMENT (AGENDA ITEM 6)

The Senior Planning Policy Officer gave a presentation and explained that the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) was an essential piece of the evidence base for the Local Development Framework (LDF) required by national guidance as set out in Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing.

The purpose of the assessment was to identify sites with potential for housing, assess that potential and predict when those sites were likely to be developed. Consultation was undertaken on a draft methodology for the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment in August 2007, the results of which indicated the need to make revisions to the method. The key element of the revisions was the establishment of a project steering group comprising Council officers and development industry stakeholders whose expertise could help to ensure that the conclusions reached were credible and could be relied upon. The expedient production of the assessment was essential if existing milestones for the submission of the Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD were to be met and that the soundness of the document was not put at risk.

The assessment would aim to identify as many sites with housing potential in and around as many settlements as possible in Breckland. As a minimum, it should identify specific sites for at least the first 10 years of a plan from the anticipated date of adoption and ideally long than the whole 15 year plan period.

In answer to various questions, the following points were noted:

- The assessment would look at overall housing figures and would not be specific to affordable housing or by location. While exception sites would be screened these were considered unlikely to form strategic sites in the Core Strategy but would be borne out as the process moved forward to identify sites as part of the site specifics work.
- The Project Steering Group would include representatives from local developers, major and local planning consultants, regional housing providers and surveyors. While membership of the Steering Group was on a voluntary, unpaid basis, it was acknowledged that there would be concerns about conflicts of interest. However, given the need to work and consult with stakeholders, it would be very difficult to find representatives from the relevant fields without any interests. The role of this Panel would therefore be important to ensure concerns were managed through the public scrutiny process.
- The assessment would look at issues of scale of sites and their sources, for example brownfield or garden sites, and what, if any, exception or other criteria should be applied to them.
- Density multipliers under PPS3 offered more flexibility to look at lower densities of development on sites. In this regard, using existing density multipliers, densities were close to or slightly below the figures from actual planning applications, so that assessments

Action By

appeared to be well related in terms of actual planning applications. Densities could also be reduced by other factors, such as site constraints. The Steering Group would be considering this issue and reporting its views to the Panel for further comment as part of the consultation process.

RESOLVED that the Panel notes the importance of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment and the proposals for its production.

15/08 CONSULTATION ON NORFOLK MINERALS AND WASTE LDF (AGENDA ITEM 7)

The Planning Policy Assistant presented the report and gave details of the current consultation on the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Development Framework being undertaken by Norfolk County Council.

It was explained that the County Council was currently consulting on drafts of its Core Strategy and Development Control Development Plan Document and its Minerals and Waste Site Allocations document. As the Local Planning Authority, Breckland Council was a statutory consultee in the formation of the Minerals and Waste Development Framework. It was also important that Breckland was aware of the County's plans for minerals and waste development and how this affected the strategy, policies and sites in the Breckland Local Development Framework. The report summarised the content of both documents and provided officers' recommendation of Breckland's response to the consultation. The consultation documents together comprised around 500 pages and were not reproduced with the report. However, a series of appendices were attached to the report outlining proposed policies which could affect Breckland and proposed sites for minerals and waste development in and around Breckland. All the consultation documents and supporting evidence could be viewed on-line at www.norfolk.gov.uk

Members' views were requested and, subject to any amendments, it was proposed that the comments and recommendations listed in Appendices B, C and D of the report should form Breckland Council's response to the consultation.

During the ensuing discussion, the following points and responses to questions were made:

(a) General

- The District Council was a statutory consultee as well as being a statutory planning authority in its own right. When the County Council considered the District Council's recommendations, it would have to justify its proposals on sound planning reasons and therefore the District Council's views should carry weight.
- The County Council's Plan period ran parallel to that of Breckland's. Although planning applications for development could come forward before some waste sites, it was thought that the County Council would want to try to achieve parallel working with Districts. Hence there was a recommendation under the site specifics that the proposals should not stifle development in Breckland.

Action By

- A member queried the fact that there was no mention of nuclear waste and it was explained that this was something that did not fall within the scope of this strategy but was a national issue.
 - The consultation documents included all potential sites and no sieving of sites had been made by the County Council at this stage to take account of protected sites, for example those sites in the Thetford area which were sited within a European protected area. The officers' recommendations ensured such sites were highlighted by raising strong objections. It was likely other environmental agencies as statutory consultees would also raise similar objections.
- (b) Appendix B: Evaluation of Policies contained in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy and Development Control Development Plan Document Preferred Options
- *Preferred Option CS4* – The intention of the recommendation was that it should not inhibit housing growth in Breckland.
 - *Preferred Approach 8.1.1 and Preferred Option DC2* – The recommendation raised concerns about the impact on development viability.
 - *Preferred Option DC3 and DC4* – A member reiterated the concerns raised about the impact on air quality from thermal incineration facilities.
 - *Preferred Approach 10.14.1* – It was proposed that the recommendation on this item should be amended by adding a proviso that the Norfolk County Council may have to undertake a more detailed Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the future and to take account of issues not covered in the Breckland Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.
 - *Preferred Option CS10* – This option related to Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA) and it was confirmed that an AQMA monitoring post existed covering the Fibrothetford and surrounding area.
- (c) Appendix C: Minerals Site Allocations Issues and Options. Sites in and adjacent to Breckland
- *MIN 100: Mileham: Point Farm, Litcham Road, Beeston*: A member advised that Beeston Parish Council was strongly opposed to this proposal on the grounds that the roads were inadequate for lorry traffic, the likely impact of any excavations on nearby bore holes and the cumulative effect from the extension to the Bittering quarry contrary to policy under Preferred Option DC1. It was proposed that the District Council should amend its recommendation of no objection to one of objection for the above reasons.

Subject to the proposed amendments in regard to Preferred Approach 10.14.1 in Appendix B and MIN100 in Appendix C, the Panel supported the officers' recommendations.

Action By
Andrea
Long

RESOLVED that, subject to the following amendments, the comments and recommendations set out in Appendices B, C and D of the report be supported to form the basis of this Council's response to Norfolk County Council's Minerals and Waste Local Development Framework current consultation documents:

- (1) In Appendix B: Preferred Approach 10.14.1 (Flood Risk Assessments): Amend recommendation to read: Support the use of Breckland's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) but raise the issue that Norfolk County Council may have to undertake a more detailed Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the future and to take account of issues not covered in Breckland's SFRA.
- (2) In Appendix C: Min 100: Mileham: Point Farm, Litcham Road, Beeston: Amend recommendation from "do not object" to objection on the grounds that the roads are inadequate for lorry traffic, the likely impact of any excavations on nearby bore holes and the cumulative effect from the extension to the Bittering quarry contrary to policy under Preferred Option DC1.

A schedule of the recommendations from Appendices B, C and D to the report, as amended, is attached to these minutes.

Members were reminded that a presentation and display of the options would be given by Norfolk County Council at Elizabeth House, Dereham on Monday, 17 March 2008 between 12 noon and 4.00 p.m. when members and the public would have the opportunity to submit comments.

16/08 UPDATE ON A47/A1067 LINK ROAD (AGENDA ITEM 8)

The Principal Planning Policy Officer presented the report giving an update on the latest position regarding the proposed link road from the A47 to the A1067 in the north-east area of Breckland.

Five potential routes had been consulted on by Norfolk County Council in late summer 2007. Breckland had objected to two of the proposed routes.

The results of the County Council's consultations were considered by the Norfolk County Council's Cabinet on 28th January 2008 and the County Council was now working on a scheme based on route options 1, 2 and 3, which were the options favoured by Breckland.

It was noted that the cost of providing a route was in the region of £6.7m and a phased approach was to be adopted. Phase 1 would involve the route from the Wood Lane junction to the airfield site, with design costs drawn from the existing budget.

However, there was no budget set aside for the scheme and it would have to compete with other schemes for funding and the scheme did not form part of the proposed Northern Distributor Route.

The position was noted.

17/08 WORK PROGRAMME (AGENDA ITEM 9)

It was noted that the item regarding the review of the Street Naming and Numbering policy provisionally scheduled for the next meeting on 1st April was unlikely to be ready in time for that meeting, as consultations were still being undertaken. In the circumstances, the Panel agreed that, if necessary, the meeting should be cancelled.

So far as the meeting scheduled for May was concerned, the following items were noted for the agenda for that meeting:

- LDF Core Strategy – Consultation Responses
- Thetford Area Action Plan Timetable
- LDF Site Specifics – Process
- Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment – Update

18/08 NEXT MEETING

RESOLVED that the meeting scheduled for 1st April 2008 be cancelled in the event that the report on Street Naming and Numbering is not ready in time.

Action By

**Mark
Broughton**

The meeting closed at 11.55 am

CHAIRMAN

POLICY DEVELOPMENT AND REVIEW PANEL 1 – 11 MARCH 2008

APPENDIX TO MINUTE NO. 15/08

CONSULTATION ON NORFOLK MINERALS AND WASTE LDF

SCHEDULE OF RECOMMENDATIONS

Appendix B – Evaluation of Policies contained in the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy and Development Control Development Plan Document Preferred Options.

OPTION	RECOMMENDATION
<p>Preferred Option CS2 - This policy option sets out the spatial distribution of minerals and waste development in Norfolk. The policy proposes that strategic minerals and waste development will be focused within or with in reasonable distance from Key Centres for Development and Change. The policy option would mean larger, more multi-functional facilities, especially for waste. The policy also allows for medium sized facilities to be located around larger and growing service centres. Norfolk County Council has defined Key Centres as settlements with existing populations over 20,000 or settlements which will accommodate a housing growth of at least 3,000 new homes between 2001 and 2021.</p> <p>In the case of Breckland, only Thetford is classed as a Key Centre for Development and Change. Attleborough and Dereham have been defined as larger and growing service centres.</p>	<p>Support approach but recommend that Attleborough is elevated to a Key Centre due to its planned growth of 4,000 homes over the period between 2001 and 2021, which will increase demands on mineral provision locally and increase levels of waste generated locally.</p>
<p>Preferred Option CS4 - This policy option outlines the County's proposals to safeguard Minerals and Waste sites from other forms of development. Through this policy, the County plan to develop Mineral Safeguarded Areas which are complimented by Mineral Consultation Areas. These areas will be identified in the submission version of the document.</p>	<p>The vernacular in Breckland is sustained by many local minerals including flint, chalk and carstone, some of which are still extracted in Breckland (e.g. Newton quarry near Castle Acre). It is important that future supplies of these materials are recognised and protected. The approach should therefore be supported with particular reference to the protection of reserves of the above mentioned traditional Breckland construction materials. However, in defining protection areas, care must be taken that these do not conflict with potential broad areas of growth in Thetford and Attleborough</p>
<p>Preferred Approach 8.1.1 and Preferred Option DC2 - This policy and approach aim to reduce waste generation. Norfolk County Council proposes that District Councils will be encouraged to apply financial contributions to new residential, commercial and industrial development for waste minimisation initiatives. The policy also requires new waste management facilities to incorporate waste minimisation initiatives.</p>	<p>Raise concerns about the impact on development viability when financial contributions for waste minimisation initiatives are added to contributions for open space, affordable housing, education and renewable energy requirements. It is requested that Norfolk County Council assists Local Planning Authorities in assessing the viability of contributions for waste minimisation.</p>

OPTION	RECOMMENDATION
<p>Preferred Option DC3 and DC4 - These policies outline the County's approach to energy recovery from waste. Preferred policy option DC3 requires development proposals for energy recovery from waste to give adequate consideration to treatment technology that minimises greenhouse gas emissions. Preferred policy option DC4 requires development proposals for waste management facilities maximise possibilities for renewable energy generation.</p> <p>Renewable energy can be generated from waste by thermal treatment (incineration), combustion of landfill gas, combustion of gas from anaerobic digestion, and through pyrolysis and gasification.</p>	<p>Approach should be supported to ensure that more waste is diverted from landfill. However, concerns should be raised about the impact of thermal treatment facilities which can be a controversial issue. The draft sustainability appraisal on the Core Strategy and Development Control document does not assess the possible detrimental affect on local air quality or health and does not provide any evidence to suggest otherwise. The draft sustainability appraisal also does not reference or review the Health Protection Agency position statement on incineration, which could be an important document in assessing air quality and health impacts of incineration through sustainability appraisal. As Breckland has some health deprived areas and an Air Quality Management Area it is important that thermal treatment methods are appropriately tested through the sustainability appraisal.</p>
<p>Preferred Option CS6 & DC6 - These preferred policies aim to give priority to sites that have good access to higher designated routes on the route hierarchy as well as the A11 and A47 trunk roads. The policies also aim to minimise lorry traffic through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas with environmental designations or core areas of the ecological network • Air Quality Management Areas • Quiet lanes or cycle routes • Residential areas 	<p>Support the preferred policies to ensure that lorry traffic is diverted away from rural settlements and to ensure prioritisation in the selection of sites with good access to the District's trunk roads, the A11 and A47.</p>
<p>Preferred Option DC7 - The preferred policy option restricts development in Core River Valleys. The policy states that development in Core River Valleys will only be permitted if it provides flood storage areas in order to mitigate flood risk to existing or planned development or where restoration schemes offer opportunities for habitat creation or enhancement to landscape character.</p>	<p>Support approach, which will protect the river valleys of the Nar, Wissey, Wensum, Yare, Thet and Little Ouse.</p>
<p>Preferred Option CS8 - This preferred policy option seeks to give protection to Historic Parks and Gardens from minerals and waste developments. The policy would mean that the County Council would avoid allocating sites near or in historic parks and gardens.</p>	<p>Breckland has some significant historic parks and gardens; therefore it is recommended that the policy option is supported.</p>
<p>Preferred Approach 10.14.1 - This policy approach relies on existing national policy for flood risk protection. The approach suggests that District Council Strategic Flood Risk Assessments will be used to further inform planning decisions for minerals and waste development.</p>	<p>Support the use of Breckland's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment but raise the issue that the Norfolk County Council may have to undertake a more detailed SFRA for the future and to take account of issues not covered in Breckland SFRA.</p>

OPTION	RECOMMENDATION
<p>Preferred Option CS10 - This policy sets out the County's preferred approach to air pollution. The policy aims to prohibit minerals and waste development in Air Quality Management Areas (AQMA). The policy outlines that minerals and waste development will only be permitted in AQMAs where it can be demonstrated that there are no alternatives and any harmful air pollution emissions will be mitigated.</p>	<p>Support approach to ensure no new waste and minerals development occur in the Breckland AQMA.</p>

Appendix C: Minerals Site Allocations Issues and Options – Sites in and adjacent to Breckland

Site Ref. No. & Location	Comments & Recommendation
<p>MIN 111: Attleborough: Land at Swangey Fen, near Shropham</p>	<p>The site is in close proximity to Attleborough and the A11 corridor of development and could therefore be an important source of material for the large amounts of development occurring in the area. The site is close to the A11 which is accessible by Swangey Lane and onto the A11 at Breckland Lodge. However, there are some constraints with this particular site. The site exists in a Core River Valley and development could be of detriment to this. The site is also adjacent to Swangey Fen which is a Special Area for Conservation (SAC). Development of the site may affect drainage of the SAC and therefore have a negative impact on protected species. The Tree and Countryside Officer has also raised issues with this site. He believes that the development could result in the destruction of BAP habitats and result in incidental destruction of an ancient green lane.</p> <p>Recommendation: Object unless Appropriate Assessment proves that there will be no detrimental impact on the protected species on the adjacent SAC and that the scheme is excavated in a way that does not have a negative impact on the amenity of the Core River Valley.</p>
<p>MIN 68: Beeston with Bittering: Land at Watery Lane, Beeston</p>	<p>The southern half of the site is very close to the village of Beeston and development of the site could be visually intrusive and there could be issues with noise and light pollution. The site lies within the Beeston Plateau as defined in the Breckland Landscape Character Assessment (LCA). The LCA advises that one of the key visual sensitivities in this landscape is the elevated, domed plateau landform which could be damaged by this allocation. There is also an issue of access to main distributor roads and the allocation of the site could increase HGV traffic through the villages of Litcham and Beeston.</p> <p>Recommendation: Object because of the proximity to the built up area of Beeston and the subsequent impact on amenity, views and landscape.</p>
<p>MIN 23: Beeston with Bittering: Land to the north of Beeston</p>	<p>This site directly abuts the village of Beeston and development of the site could be visually intrusive and there could be issues with noise and light pollution. The site lies within the Beeston Plateau as defined in the Breckland Landscape Character Assessment (LCA). The LCA advises that one of the key visual sensitivities in this landscape is the elevated, domed plateau landform which could be damaged by this allocation. There is also an issue of access to main distributor roads, and the allocation of the site could increase HGV traffic through the villages of Litcham and Beeston.</p> <p>Recommendation: Object, because of proximity to the built up area of Beeston and the subsequent impact on amenity, views and landscape.</p>

Site Ref. No. & Location	Comments & Recommendation
MIN 61 Beeston with Bittering: Punch Farm	<p>Excavation of the site would form an extension to existing workings. The site is distant from Beeston and Litcham in comparison to the other proposed sites in this area. The seclusion of the site, within a more contained part of the Plateau should not have a significant impact on landscape or views. The site is reasonably close to the towns of Dereham and Swaffham, and therefore could be a source of materials for the planned development of these towns. There remain concerns about the HGV network access to the site and extraction at this site should not result in HGV movements through Litcham.</p> <p>Recommendation: Do not object <i>provided HGV traffic is routed via existing HGV route from Longham to Wendling.</i></p>
MIN 8: Beetley: Land off Stoney Lane	<p>This proposed allocation together with MIN13 and MIN51 would form an extension to East Bilney quarry. The development of this site is unlikely to take place without the development of MIN13 and MIN51 as the proposed method of transport for the mineral will be by ground conveyors to the East Bilney quarry. The expansion of East Bilney quarry could have an impact on traffic movements through the town of Dereham. However, the extension proposed in MIN8, MIN13 and MIN51 could provide an important source of material for planned development in Dereham. There could be cumulative landscape and highways impacts if all proposed allocations in this area were to be excavated.</p> <p>Recommendation: Do not object</p>
MIN 9: Beetley: Land off Fakenham Road	<p>The same issues identified for MIN8 are applicable to this site. This site is also in close proximity to homes and the Travellers site around Hungry Hill and therefore there could be issues with noise, dust and light pollution. Workings on this site are likely to easily visible from these properties.</p> <p>Recommendation: Do not object – provided that effective screening measures are introduced to minimise the impact of the proposed workings on adjacent residential units.</p>
MIN 10: Beetley: Land off Fakenham Road	<p>The same issues apply to this site as apply to MIN9.</p> <p>Recommendation: Do not object – provided that effective screening measures are introduced to minimise the impact of the proposed workings on adjacent residential units.</p>
MIN 11: Beetley: Land between School Road and Chapel Lane	<p>The same issues apply as outlined for the previous proposals. It is likely that the development of this site would mean development of adjacent sites MIN 9, MIN10 and MIN 13. Together these proposals could cause a cumulative impact on the landscape of the area and a cumulative impact on highways, as it may mean increased HGV traffic through Dereham and local areas. For the site to be allocated, effective phasing and restoration would be needed to minimise these cumulative impacts. However, from evidence presented this does not seem to be the developer's intentions, due to the planned use of a conveyor between sites. The site also could have an impact on the views of properties along Fakenham Road.</p> <p>Recommendation: Object unless appropriate phasing and restoration is linked to the allocation</p>

Site Ref. No. & Location	Comments & Recommendation
MIN 12: Beetley: Land between Field Lane and Chapel Lane	<p>The same issues apply as outlined for the previous proposals. It is likely development of this site would mean development of adjacent sites MIN11, MIN 9, MIN10 and MIN 13. Together these proposals could cause a significant cumulative impact on the landscape of the area and a cumulative impact on highways, as it may mean increased HGV traffic through Dereham and local areas. The site is also very close to the built up area of Beetley. Additionally the site is within a Ground Water Protection Zone and pollution from the extraction of minerals at the site could have adverse effects on drinking water.</p> <p>Recommendation: Object</p>
MIN 13: Beetley: Land south of Rawhall Lane	<p>The excavation of this site would form an extension to existing workings. The site does not have any major landscape constraints; however, increased HGV traffic could impact on traffic flows through Dereham. The development of adjacent sites could lead to a cumulative impact on highways and landscape. The site could provide minerals for development in Dereham.</p> <p>Recommendation: Do not Object.</p>
MIN 14: Beetley: Land to north of Stoney Lane	<p>The same issues apply as outlined for the previous proposals. It is likely development of this site would mean development of adjacent sites, MIN 9 and MIN 13. Together these proposals could cause a significant cumulative impact on the landscape of the area and a cumulative impact on highways, as it may mean increased HGV traffic through Dereham and local areas. Additionally the site is within a Ground Water Protection Zone and pollution from the extraction of minerals at the site could have adverse effects on drinking water.</p> <p>Recommendation: Object</p>
MIN 51: Beetley: Land west of Bilney Road	<p>This proposed allocation together with MIN13 would form an extension to East Bilney quarry. The development of this site is unlikely to take place without the development of MIN13 as the proposed method of transport for the mineral will be by ground conveyors to the East Bilney quarry. The expansion of East Bilney quarry could have an impact on traffic movements through the town of Dereham. However, the extension proposed in MIN13 and MIN51 could provide an important source of material for planned development in Dereham. There could be cumulative landscape and highways impacts if all proposed allocations in this area were to be excavated.</p> <p>Recommendation: Do not object</p>
MIN 89: Beetley: Beck Farm, East Bilney	<p>There is a lack of appropriate access to this site. Access would mean loosing a tree-lined track which runs down the eastern boundary of the site. The site is in close proximity to the River Black Water and development of site could affect the water quality of this river. The site adjoins a County Wildlife Site (CWS) and excavation of this site could negatively impact the quality of the CWS. Therefore development of this site could conflict with Preferred Option CP8 in the emerging Breckland Core Strategy.</p> <p>Recommendation: Object due to more appropriately located possible sites in the area.</p>
MIN 63: Beetley: Beck Farm, East Bilney	<p>There are considerable landscape issues with this site. The site is very visible from East Bilney village and evidence presented by Norfolk County Council suggests it would be difficult to design an adequate scheme to reduce the landscape impacts due to sloping nature of the site. The site adjoins a County Wildlife Site (CWS) and excavation of this site could negatively impact the quality of the CWS.</p> <p>Recommendation: Object due to impacts on landscape and potential impacts on CWS</p>

Site Ref. No. & Location	Comments & Recommendation
MIN 97: Billingford & Bintree: Bintree Woods, Bintree	<p>The site which is predominantly covered in plantation woodland crosses two landscape characters, "River Wensum and Tud Tributary Farmland" and "River Wensum and Blackwater". The Breckland Landscape Character Assessment highlights the importance of wooded areas to these landscapes. Excavation of this site would involve the loss of this woodland. The western boundary of this site lies within a Core River Valley, and development would likely detract from the landscape quality of this area. Evidence from Norfolk County Council suggests that the established woodland has an ecological value. In addition to this, the western side of the site falls within the River Wensum SAC. There are also highway constraints as the site is relatively remote from major roads. Development of adjacent sites could cause a significant cumulative impact on landscape, ecology and transport. In addition to this the site is relatively remote from the major growth areas in Breckland. The Tree and Countryside Officer has raised objections to this site as development would mean; the loss of a prime site for heathland recreation, damage to the landscape of the conservation area, and threatening to the Wensum SAC and BAP habitats.</p> <p>Recommendation: Strongly Object for the above reasons.</p>
MIN 103: Billingford & Bintree: Land to south of Yarrow Road, near Bintree	<p>The main issues with this site are its remoteness from major roads and its distance from major growth areas within Breckland. There are more appropriate sites identified which are closer to Dereham. Parts of the site are in close proximity to the village of Bintree and any development could raise issues with noise, dust and light pollution in the locality. The western boundary of the proposed site is very close to the North Elmham Conservation Area and a Core River Valley and development of this site could impact on the natural beauty of the area. The site is also within the Wensum Valley project area.</p> <p>Recommendation: Object</p>
MIN 106: Billingford: Land to north of Short Lane	<p>The same issues apply to this site as apply to the previous site. The main issues are around remoteness to the highways network. Any development on site would possibly mean HGV traffic follows through the village of Billingford. There is potential for a large amount of mineral extraction from this site. However, its distance from Dereham, which is the nearest centre in Breckland which will see further development, is quite far, and the direct route to Dereham is through smaller roads and villages.</p> <p>Recommendation: Object for the reasons outlined above.</p>
MIN 49: Bridgham: Manor Farm, Bridgham	<p>The site is borders onto the B1111 which has good access to the A11. Mineral's extraction in this area would provide a source of material for development in the A11 corridor including the centres of Attleborough and Thetford. However, the site has many constraints. The site lies within the river valley of the River Thet and any excavation would be visible from higher ground and involve the loss of pasture adjoining the river. Minerals development in this area would have a detrimental impact on the landscape character of the area, which is defined as a Core River Valley. The site is in close proximity to the Breckland SPA and a number of County Wildlife Sites. Evidence presented by Norfolk County Council suggests that excavation could affect the drainage of these protected areas and could therefore affect the protected species. The site also falls within a groundwater protection zone and therefore development could have an adverse effect on water supplies. The site is very close to the settlements of Bridgham and East Harling and minerals excavation at the site could cause noise, light and dust pollution issues for local residents. The Tree and Countryside Officer objects to this site.</p> <p>Recommendation: Object for the reasons outlined above</p>

Site Ref. No. & Location	Comments & Recommendation
<p>MIN 3: Carbrooke: Land between Cuckoo Lane and Mill Lane, off B1108 Norwich Road</p>	<p>The site is on the B1108 road and is close to Watton and Carbrooke. The site could provide an important source of material for future development in the Watton and Carbrooke area (being the only site promoted in the locality). Evidence presented by Norfolk County Council suggests that excavation at this site would not be visible from nearby settlements and would have minimal effect on landscape. The Breckland Landscape Character Assessment Settlement Fringe Study suggests that the landscape in which the site sits has a low sensitivity to change. The site is within a ground water protection zone and excavation may have an impact on water supplies.</p> <p>Recommendation: Do not Object</p>
<p>MIN 72: Gressenhall: High House Farm</p>	<p>It appears from the proposal that this site would be a separate working from surrounding sites MIN 8, MIN13 and MIN51. The site is close to Gressenhall and there could be light, dust and noise pollution issues which could affect the local population. Evidence presented by Norfolk County Council suggests that the impact of excavation on this site on the landscape of the surroundings would be minimal. The main issues surrounding this development would be the cumulative impact if other sites surrounding it were developed too.</p> <p>Recommendation: Do not Object</p>
<p>MIN 15: Great Ellingham, Little Ellingham & Rocklands: Land at Rookery Farm, Watton Road, Great Ellingham</p>	<p>The site is close to Great Ellingham and Attleborough and could provide materials for the development that these settlements will see over the Local Development Framework period to 2026. However, there are some severe highways issues. The site sits on Mill Lane, an unclassified track and the only access to a major road (B1077) is through either Great Ellingham or Rocklands. Access through these villages would be unsuitable for HGV traffic. The site also sits on Grade2 agricultural land, and development would therefore be against Breckland sustainability objectives to minimise the loss of productive agricultural land. The site is also in a groundwater protection zone.</p> <p>Recommendation: Object, principally on highways issues</p>
<p>MIN 99: Harling: West Harling Woods, East Harling</p>	<p>This is a large site with the potential to produce a large volume of material for development along the A11 corridor. However, the site is heavily constrained. The site sits within the Breckland SPA, and development is likely to have a significant detrimental impact on the protected Nightjar and Woodlark species. The development of this site would result in the loss of the woodland which is deemed an important feature of the landscape in the Breckland Landscape Character Assessment. The site is also within a groundwater protection zone. The Tree and Countryside Officer objects to this site.</p> <p>Recommendation: Strongly Object</p>
<p>MIN 98: Hockham & Wretham: Hockham Woods</p>	<p>The site fronts onto the main road between Watton and Thetford the A1075 and has good access to both Settlements. Development of this site could provide materials for development in Watton, Thetford and the A11 corridor. However, the site is heavily constrained. The site sits within the Breckland SPA, and development is likely to have a significant detrimental impact on the protected Nightjar and Woodlark species. The development of this site could result in the loss of the majority of the woodland which is deemed an important visual feature of the landscape in the Breckland Landscape Character Assessment. The site is very close to the Breckland Air Quality Management Area and any proposal at the site would have to ensure that the excavation of minerals did not exacerbate the situation. The Tree and Countryside Officer objects to this site, and has raised the issue that pingo sites run alongside the nearby stream.</p> <p>Recommendation: Strongly Object</p>

Site Ref. No. & Location	Comments & Recommendation
MIN 28: Hoe: Land at Manor Farm	<p>The site lies on the B1110 road to Dereham. The site is approximately 1.5km from the edge of Dereham. Future minerals development at this location could provide an important source of material for development in Dereham over the plan period. There are no significant landscape issues apart from that the site is close to a Core River Valley and evidence supplied by Norfolk County Council suggests that views of the site could easily be screened. The site however, is in a ground water protection zone and is on Grade 2 agricultural land. Development of this land would be contrary to Breckland's sustainability objective of minimising the loss of productive agricultural land.</p> <p>Recommendation: Do not object</p>
MIN 22: Hoe: OS Field No. 2700, Land to east of former railway line, Beetley Quarry, Hoe	<p>The site would form an extension to the existing works to the north and west of the site. The site is within an area with a long history of mineral workings and is not visible from any public viewpoints. The site does border a County Wildlife Site, and therefore development of the site could have a negative impact on the biodiversity of the area. Further work will be needed to assess the impact on the CWS. The site is also within a groundwater protection zone. The site is also within a Core River Valley and extraction could damage the character of the landscape despite the fact it cannot be seen from public viewpoints. The Tree and Countryside Officer objects to this site, as it is too close to the valley edge and could affect wet BAPS and could compromise the use of the railway as possible green infrastructure.</p> <p>Recommendation: Do not object, subject to there being no adverse effects on the CWS, plus the scheme could offer restoration opportunities which could later enhance landscape and biodiversity</p>
MIN 66: Longham: Land adjacent to Longham Hall	<p>The site is proposed for an 'area of search'. Evidence presented from Norfolk County Council suggests the impacts of this activity on land would be unacceptable in terms of landscape. The site is also in a groundwater protection zone. To the north of the site lies another potential allocation which is also subject to a current planning application for minerals development. If the development to the north is permitted any development on this site would likely result in a significant cumulative impact on the landscape, the setting of the Church and possibly highways.</p> <p>Recommendation: Object</p>
MIN 67: Longham: Land known as Spreadoak, adjacent to Bittering Quarry, Reed Lane	<p>The site currently subject to a planning application. We have previously submitted comments on this application and these comments are still applicable. In summary we were not opposed to the principle of minerals development, but we advised a number of amendments including requesting that workings were further back from existing dwellings and improved landscaping and screening were introduced to limit visual impact.</p> <p>Recommendation: Do not Object</p>
MIN 50: Mileham, Tittleshall & Litcham: Land surrounding Grenstein Farm, Mileham	<p>The south of the site fronts on to the B1145. The River Nar SSSI runs through the site and any exploration on the site would have to avoid this area. The site is also within a Core River Valley. The site's landscape character is classified as Settled Tributary Farmland and some of the important features of this landscape could be lost if exploration leads to excavation. Additionally, whilst the site can be accessed from the B1145 it would result in HGV movements having to go directly through either Litcham or Mileham to reach higher order routes (A1065 or A1067).</p> <p>Recommendation: Object</p>

Site Ref. No. & Location	Comments & Recommendation
MIN 100: Mileham: Point Farm, Litcham Road, Beeston	<p>The site is close to existing workings north of Longham. The site is fairly remote from nearby settlements, and there are no significant landscape constraints. However, evidence presented by Norfolk County Council states that it could be difficult to screen any workings from views from surrounding roads. Two properties also overlook the site. Development of site, together with nearby workings could provide a potential source of minerals for development in Swaffham and Dereham.</p> <p>Recommendation: Object on grounds that the roads are inadequate for lorry traffic, the likely impact of any excavations on nearby bore holes and the cumulative effect from the extension to the Bittering quarry contrary to policy under Preferred Option DC1.</p>
MIN 21: North Elmham: Land at Foxburrow Farm, Beetley Quarry, North Elmham	<p>The site lies just south of North Elmham. Access to the site would have to be by a small track onto the B1145, and there could be a highway safety issue on this junction. The site is adjacent to a County Wildlife Site. This site is within the Core River Valley and development could further harm the character and appearance of the landscape. The site is also in a groundwater protection area, and activities on the site could adversely affect water supplies. The Tree and Countryside Officer objects to this site, due to possible impacts on archaeology.</p> <p>Recommendation: Object</p>
MIN 35: Quidenham: Sawmill Field, Heath Road, Quidenham / Snetterton	<p>The site is adjacent the Snetterton Employment allocation and excavation of the site could provide minerals for future development at Snetterton and Attleborough. The site is also close to the train line which could be potential method of transport of materials along the A11 corridor. There are no significant landscape issues surrounding the location. However, across the Heath Road is a County Wildlife Site, despite this, evidence provided by Norfolk County Council suggests that the development of the site would probably not have effect on the biodiversity of these sites. The loss of this site for minerals will mean that it does not form an option as part of employment land releases at Snetterton.</p> <p>Recommendation: Do not object</p>
MIN 107: Shropham: Land to south of Spong Lane	<p>The site lies immediately west of existing workings. The proposal is for an 'Area of Search' and could lead to an extension of the existing workings which could supply material to future developments in Attleborough and the A11 corridor. The site is within a Core River Valley but is unlikely to be visible from the main viewpoints due to the sloping nature of the site. The site is next to a County Wildlife Site and any future extraction at the site would have to ensure there is no adverse effect on the site. The site is poor agricultural land but is in a groundwater protection zone. The Tree and Countryside Officer objects to this site because it is too close to the County Wildlife Site (CWS)</p> <p>Recommendation: Do not Object, subject to the development not causing any adverse effects on CWS.</p>
MIN 108: Shropham: Land to north of Hargham Road	<p>The site lies west of existing workings. The proposal is for an 'Area of Search' and could lead to an extension of the existing workings which could supply material to future developments in Attleborough and the A11 corridor. The site is quite close to the village of Shropham and activities associated with the search for minerals could lead to noise problems for local residents. Possible future extraction could lead to further noise problems for local residents. However, evidence presented by Norfolk County Council suggest that an adequate buffer zone complete with vegetation to the south of the site could limit any visual impacts of the site. The site also borders a County Wildlife Site. Any future extraction would have to ensure that it does not have a detrimental impact on the biodiversity of the CWS. The site is also within a Groundwater Protection Zone. Potential development of surrounding sites could lead to a cumulative detrimental impact. The Tree and Countryside Officer objects to this site because it is too close to the County Wildlife Site (CWS).</p> <p>Recommendation: Do not Object at this Stage</p>

Site Ref. No. & Location	Comments & Recommendation
MIN 110: Shropham: Land to north of Spong Lane	<p>The site lies west of existing workings. The proposal is for an 'Area of Search' and could lead to an extension of the existing workings which could supply material to future developments in Attleborough and the A11 corridor. The site is very close to the village of Shropham and activities associated with the search for minerals and the potential future extraction of minerals at the site could have a detrimental impact for the village. The development of the site could have a cumulative impact if the surrounding sites were developed as well. The Tree and Countryside Officer objects to this site because it is too close to the County Wildlife Site (CWS)</p> <p>Recommendation: Object. Other sites promoted in the area are more favourable as they will have less of an effect on the village of Shropham.</p>
MIN 102: Snetterton: Land at North Farm, south of the River Thet, Shropham	<p>The site is in close proximity to Attleborough and the A11 corridor of development and could therefore be an important source of material for the large amounts of development occurring in the area. The site is close to the A11 which is accessible by Swangey Lane and through West Car. However there are some constraints with this particular site. The site exists in a Core River Valley and development could be of detriment to this. The site is adjacent to Swangey Fen which is a Special Area for Conservation (SAC). Development of the site may affect drainage of the SAC and therefore have a negative impact on protected species. The development of the site would also involve the loss of woodland which could have a further direct impact on local biodiversity. The Breckland Landscape Character Assessment recommends maintaining views of wooded character on valley crests which could be lost if the site is excavated. The Tree and Countryside Officer objects to this site because it is too close to the County Wildlife Site (CWS)</p> <p>Recommendation: Object unless Appropriate Assessment proves that there will no detrimental impact on the protected species on the adjacent SAC and that the scheme is excavated in way that it does not have a negative impact on the amenity of the Core River Valley and the wooded character of the Valley crests.</p>
MIN 60: Tittleshall, Wellingham & Litcham: Grid ref. 5878, 3202	<p>The site is remote from major settlements where development will occur. Activities related to the search for minerals and future possible extraction should not have much of detrimental impact to the landscape. Evidence supplied by Norfolk County Council suggests that screening from local roads is possible. However, they raise issues about the possibilities of implementing a satisfactory restoration scheme which would fit well into the surrounding landscape. Mature oak trees lining the roadsides would have to be maintained to reduce the impact on the amenity of the landscape. There are some issues with transport as the site is remote from any HGV access routes. Evidence from Norfolk County Council indicates that the C235 road which intersects the site is not suitable for an increase in traffic and the use of the other local routes would mean an increase in HGV traffic going through the village of Litcham or Wellingham to reach the main distributor routes.</p> <p>Recommendation: Object due to transport issues.</p>
MIN 2: Deopham: Hill Farm, Hackford, Wymondham	<p>The site is 2.5km from the nearest settlement in Breckland (2.5km from Hardingham, 5km from Attleborough). The scheme is small but could still provide a source of minerals for development in Attleborough.</p> <p>Recommendation: Do not object</p>
MIN 34: Methwold: Land at Methwold Warren	<p>The site is 6km from Mundford and 6km from Weeting. The site would form an extension to the current minerals and waste activities in the area. The site is within the Breckland SPA and development of this site could have a significant detrimental impact to the habitat of the protected species.</p> <p>Recommendation: Strongly object</p>

Site Ref. No. & Location	Comments & Recommendation
MIN 57: Stoke Ferry: Browns Fen, Oxborough Road, Stoke Ferry	<p>The nearest Breckland settlement to this site is Oxborough, which is 2km away. The site does not raise any issues relevant to Breckland.</p> <p>Recommendation: Do not object</p>
MIN 93: Pentney & East Winch: Church Farm, Pentney, King's Lynn	<p>The site is fairly close to Narborough and Swaffham, both of which will see growth in Breckland's Preferred Options on its Core Strategy. The site therefore could be an important source of material for this development. However, there are concerns around the impacts on amenity to the population of Pentney.</p> <p>Recommendation: Do not Object.</p>

Appendix D: Waste Site Allocations, Issues and Options – Sites in and adjacent to Breckland

Site Ref. No. & Location	Comments & Recommendation
WAS 14: Ashill: Ashill Recycling Centre, Swaffham Road	<p>The site would form an extension to current household recycling centre and construction would be on brownfield land. Effective screening could minimise any impact on views and landscape. The site is on the main road between Swaffham and Watton and could deal with waste generated from both of these towns. The road bypasses the village of Ashill but does go through the villages of Saham Toney and South Pickenham, and an increase of HGV traffic on this un-designated road could have a detrimental impact on these settlements.</p> <p>Additional Comments from Street Scene: The site's allocation would provide a useful landbank for any waste/resource management infrastructure for Ashill, but is 5.5km sustainable?</p> <p>Recommendation: Do not object</p>
WAS 47: Attleborough: West Carr Road	<p>The site is very close to A11 and therefore has good access to the town of Attleborough and other settlements along the trunk road. The site has the potential to deal with locally generated waste from Attleborough and surrounding settlements. With Attleborough's planned growth over the next 20 years, waste facility provision close to the town is essential. The site is unlikely to have any impacts on the landscape due to current screening. The site is on brownfield land.</p> <p>Additional Comments from Street Scene: Agree with above, an excellent 'proximity principle' example with sufficient separation from major residential areas.</p> <p>Recommendation: Do not Object</p>
WAS 21: Beeston with Bittering: Paynes Business Park, Dereham Road, Beeston	<p>The site is just south of Beeston behind a collection of industrial buildings on Brownfield land. The land adjoins a HGV access route which leads south to the A47 trunk road. There would be no adverse effects on landscape character from this development. However, the uses proposed for the site may be better located closer to major sources of waste such as the market towns to reduce journey times.</p> <p>Recommendation: Do not Object at this stage</p>

Site Ref. No. & Location	Comments & Recommendation
WAS 01: Beetley: Beck Farm, East Blinney	<p>The site is currently a minerals working. Development of waste facilities of this site would further delay restoration of the site. The site is proposed for a number of different uses. Some of the uses for the site which have larger footprints such as thermal treatment facilities may cause detriment to the surrounding rural landscape character. The proposed use for a household recycling centre would be better located closer to the town of Dereham to reduce car journeys.</p> <p>Additional Comments from Street Scene: Agree, Dereham proposal is currently preferred option (Crane Fruehauf site application)</p> <p>Recommendation: Object</p>
WAS 59: Billingford & Bintree: Bintree Woods	<p>The development of this site for waste recycling and landfill uses would be dependent on the site first being allocated for mineral excavation. The site is predominantly covered in plantation woodland and crosses two landscape characters, "River Wensum and Tud Tributary Farmland" and "River Wensum and Blackwater". The Breckland Landscape Character Assessment highlights the importance of wooded areas to these landscapes. Excavation of this site would involve the loss of this woodland. The western boundary of this site lies within a Core River Valley, and development would likely detract from the landscape quality of this area. Evidence from Norfolk County Council suggests that the established woodland has an ecological value. In addition to this, the western side of the site falls within the River Wensum SAC. There are also highway constraints as the site is relatively remote from major roads. In addition to this the site is relatively remote from the major growth areas in Breckland.</p> <p>Recommendation: Strongly Object</p>
WAS 06: Carbrooke: OS Field No. 2780, former pit, Land off B1108 Norwich Road	<p>The site is in close proximity of Watton and Carbrooke and could deal with the increased level of waste from construction projects delivering the new development planned in Breckland's Preferred Options on its Core Strategy. The end product from recycling could be used in construction projects locally. The site is on brownfield land and can be directly accessed from the B1108.</p> <p>Recommendation: Do not Object</p>
WAS 34: Cranworth: Shipdham Transfer Station, Shipdham Industrial Estate	<p>The site is located on Shipdham Airfield which is allocated for employment uses in the Breckland 1999 Local Plan and is proposed as a General Employment Area in the emerging Breckland Core Strategy and Development Control Policies DPD. The site is relatively close to Shipdham and Dereham, both of which will see development over the plan period. Dereham does not currently have a household recycling centre and therefore one located in Shipdham Airfield could be beneficial for the town. The site is also on brownfield land and is on a designated HGV access route.</p> <p>Recommendation: Do not Object</p>
WAS 61: Harling: West Harling Woods, East Harling	<p>Waste development on this site would be dependant on it first being allocated for minerals extraction. We do not believe this site is an acceptable site for minerals development for the reasons as follows. The site sits within the Breckland SPA, and development is likely to have a significant detrimental impact on the protected Nightjar and Woodlark species. The development of this site would result in the loss of the woodland which is deemed an important feature of the landscape in the Breckland Landscape Character Assessment. The site is also within a groundwater protection zone.</p> <p>Recommendation: Strongly Object</p>

Site Ref. No. & Location	Comments & Recommendation
WAS 60: Hockham & Wretham: Hockham Woods	<p>Waste development on this site would be dependant on it first being allocated for minerals extraction. We do not believe this site is an acceptable site for minerals development for the reasons as follows. The site sits within the Breckland SPA, and development is likely to have a significant detrimental impact on the protected Nightjar and Woodlark species. The development of this site could result in the loss of the majority of the woodland which is deemed an important visual feature of the landscape in the Breckland Landscape Character Assessment. The site is very close to the Breckland Air Quality Management Area and any proposal at the site would have to ensure that the excavation of minerals did not exacerbate the situation.</p> <p>Recommendation: Strongly Object</p>
WAS 04: Kilverstone: Land off Brettenham Road	<p>The site is very remote and cannot easily be viewed, so any impact on the visual amenity of the landscape would be minimal if the site were to be developed. Despite the site being located on greenfield land, the planned growth of Theford will mean a large increase in the waste that the town produces, therefore there is a need for a local facility to treat and manage this waste and this site is only 3.5km from the outskirts of the town. The proposed uses for the site could be considered as 'bad neighbour' uses and would be best located away from residential areas. However, the site is very close to the Breckland SPA and any development would have to ensure that it does not have any detrimental impact on the SPA. Development of the site would have to ensure that the tree belts are retained as these are an important feature of the surrounding landscape character and work as effective screening from surrounding view points. There are some issues with access on to highways. Evidence from Norfolk County Council suggests that the main access road to the site, the C148, is unsuitable for additional commercial traffic, due to visibility issues.</p> <p>Recommendation: Do not object at this stage and await results from appropriate assessment on the impact on the Breckland SPA and when further information is provided on highways issues.</p>
WAS 63: Kilverstone: Land to north-west of Watton Road	<p>The site is immediately adjacent to the Breckland SPA and is immediately south of a County Wildlife Site. Development at this site could have a detrimental impact to these protected habitats. The site is 4km from the outskirts of Theford, but the access on to the main road between Theford and Watton (A1075) is adjacent a level crossing and Norfolk County Council consider this point of access not suitable for the increased level of traffic likely to be generate by this development. The site can be seen from the A1075 and development of this site could spoil views across to the woodland. The site's surrounding landscape character is classified as 'The Brecks of Theford Forest' in the Breckland Landscape Character Assessment (LCA). The LCA highlights the importance of wooded skylines and the remote unsettled/undeveloped character of the area. Development of this site could result in the loss of these qualities.</p> <p>Recommendation: Object unless appropriate access to the site can be achieved alongside with necessary screening to conserve the character of the landscape. Appropriate Assessment and Environmental Impact Assessment would have to ensure that there is no detrimental impact to the surrounding SPA and other wildlife designations.</p>
WAS 09: Longham: Longham Hall	<p>The site is currently operated as a mineral extraction site. Development of the site would prevent the implementation of the proposed restoration scheme and result in further development in remote countryside.</p> <p>Recommendation: Object.</p>
WAS 10: Longham: Longham Hall	<p>The site is on greenfield land in open countryside. The development is remote from major settlements and access to the site would mean increased traffic through nearby villages. Development on the site is likely to be intrusive on the surrounding open arable countryside.</p> <p>Recommendation: Object, uses proposed would be better located nearer to a town.</p>

Site Ref. No. & Location	Comments & Recommendation
WAS 11: Longham: Longham Hall	<p>The site is located at the back of Longham Hall and is currently used for trailer storage. The existing buildings on the site along with the trailers detract from the rural appearance of the site and any new development is not likely to further affect the character of the surrounding landscape. The site is fairly remote from larger settlements which will see further growth during the plan period. There is an issue with access to the site, Norfolk County Council make it clear in their evidence that access would need to be achieved via the C229 road, and it is unsure whether the applicant has the landholding to make this possible.</p> <p>Recommendation: Do not object providing access can be achieved on to the HGV route C229</p>
WAS 20: North Tuddenham: Norwich Road	<p>The site is located in open countryside on greenfield land. The site is close to Dereham and there will be a need for waste management facilities close to the town. The site would be easily visible from the A47 and surrounding views and evidence presented by Norfolk County Council suggests it would be difficult to screen the development. The development of the site in this location could result in the loss of woodland, which is an important characteristic of the surrounding landscape character type and could be of local biodiversity importance. Industrial type development in this area would detract from the rural nature of the landscape.</p> <p>Recommendation: Object. A facility like this would be better located on surrounding industrial areas such as Shipdham Airfield.</p>
WAS 53: Quidenhams: Sawmill Field, Heath Road	<p>Development of this site would be dependant on it first being allocated for mineral extraction. Inert recycling of material could provide materials for development in Snetterton and the surrounding areas on the A11 corridor. Inert recycling and inert landfill could provide disposal methods for construction material waste from development in the locality. Landfill in this location would only occur to restore the site which could eventually promote biodiversity.</p> <p>Recommendation: Do not object</p>
WAS 19: Snetterton: Harling Road	<p>The site is within the Snetterton Heath Employment Allocation as designated in the 1999 Breckland Local Plan and is within a proposed General Employment Area in the emerging Breckland Core Strategy. The site is currently used for various waste and minerals related uses. The site, if developed, could manage waste from settlements along the A11 corridor, some of which will grow over the plan period. There are minimal landscape issues as the site is surrounded by other industrial uses. Evidence from the Norfolk County Council's Preferred Options on its Minerals and Waste Core Strategy suggest there is not a need for more landfill sites over the plan period.</p> <p>Recommendation: Do not object, but raise questions around the need for landfill to be included as a proposed use.</p>
WAS 52: Swaffham: Former railway cutting, Broom Covert, Swaffham Heath	<p>The site is located on a dismantled railway adjacent an existing temporary landfill operation. Although the site is on greenfield land and is fairly remote from major settlements the proposed use of the site could be considered sustainable if the waste is generated locally from the commercially worked forests. The site has access to the A1122 and is not far from the A47 trunk road. The site is adjacent to the Breckland SPA and proposal for development would have to ensure that there is no detrimental impact on the quality of the habitat.</p> <p>Recommendation: Do not object providing that the waste managed is generated locally</p>

Site Ref. No. & Location	Comments & Recommendation
WAS 32: Theftford Transfer Station, Burrell Way	<p>The planned growth of Theftford will mean a large increase in the waste that the town generates, therefore there is a need for a local facility to treat and manage this waste. The site is on brownfield land within the London Road industrial site. There are a number of uses proposed for the site including anaerobic digestion, composting, thermal treatment and a household waste recycling centre (incineration); however, it appears that Norfolk County Council has only tested the household recycling centre through sustainability appraisal. The uses proposed could all help manage the extra waste that will be generated by the town.</p> <p>Recommendation: Do not object, but ensure all proposed uses are tested through sustainability appraisal.</p>
WAS 03: Wretham: Adjoining Larkshall Mill, East Wretham	<p>The site adjoins the existing waste management facility in Wretham along the A1075 from Watton to Theftford. The site consists of a tree belt that screens the existing facility from views from the North. Therefore the development of this site would mean the loss of the tree belt and therefore create exposed views of the proposed development and existing development. The surrounding landscape is classed as 'Stanta Heath' in the Breckland Landscape Character Assessment (LCA). The LCA highlights the importance of woodland blocks like the tree belt where this allocation is proposed in this landscape character type. The site is within the Breckland Air Quality Management Area and some of the proposed uses for the site could exacerbate the existing air quality issues in this area.</p> <p>Recommendation: Strongly object for above reasons</p>
WAS 02: Kimberley: Warren Hill, Wymondham Road	<p>The site is 3km from Hardingham, 6km from Attleborough. No issues that affect Breckland.</p> <p>Recommendation: Do not object</p>
WAS 37: Feltwell landfill site, The Oakery, Lodge Road	<p>The site is 6km from Mundford and 6km from Weeting. The site would form an extension to the current minerals and waste activities in the area. The site is adjacent to the Breckland SPA and development of this site could have a significant detrimental impact to the habitat of the protected species.</p> <p>Recommendation: Object to all proposed uses except composting which could fit into the rural nature of the site and is likely to have less of an impact on the SPA</p>