

Appendix A - Comments on the Norfolk Mineral's Issues and Options consultation document

*Denotes new site not previously consulted upon in 2008

Parish	Site Ref	Summary of previous comments made	NCC assessment outcome	Recommended response to current consultation
Attleborough	MIN 111	Objected, unless excavation can avoid harm to Core River Valley	Not acceptable	Maintain objection and endorse NCC assessment of the site
Beeston with Bittering	MIN 23	Objected due to proximity of site and impact on Beeston in terms of light, landscape, and noise.	Potentially acceptable	Unclear whether revised site area is acceptable in landscape and amenity terms. Maintain objection to the site.
Beeston with Bittering	MIN 61	No objection and would not have a significant impact on landscape	Potentially acceptable	All previous comments apply.
Beeston with Bittering	MIN 68	Objected due to proximity of site and impact on Beeston in terms of light, landscape, and noise.	Potentially acceptable	Unclear whether revised site area is acceptable in landscape and amenity terms. Maintain objection to the site.
Beeston with Bittering	MIN 100	Possible concerns that site cannot be adequately screened	Not acceptable	Reiterate previous comments and endorse NCC assessment of the site
Beetley	MIN 8	No objection	Acceptable	All previous comments apply.
Beetley	MIN 9	No objection, but providing effective screening measures are provided	Not acceptable	Endorse NCC assessment of the site
Beetley	MIN 10	No objection, but providing effective screening measures are provided	Not acceptable	Endorse NCC assessment of the site
Beetley	Min 11	Object, unless phasing and restoration could minimise the impacts.	Not acceptable	Maintain objection and endorse NCC assessment of the site
Beetley	MIN 12	Concerns raised as to impact on Groundwater Source Protection Zone, and proximity of settlement of Beetley	Not acceptable	Reiterate previous comments and endorse NCC assessment of the site
Beetley	MIN 13	Extension to an existing site, but should be mindful of impact of HGVs on settlement of Dereham and landscape impact.	Acceptable	Reiterate previous comments and endorse NCC assessment of the site

Beetley	MIN 14	Concerns as to cumulative effect on landscape if developed with adjacent sites MIN 9 and MIN 13	Not acceptable	Reiterate previous comments and endorse NCC assessment of the site
Beetley	MIN 51	Would form an extension to existing quarry	Potentially acceptable	Cumulative impact on landscape if developed with MIN 8 and MIN 13. Unclear if this is in addition to two adjacent sites or in place of one or other.
Beetley	MIN 63*		Not acceptable	Object to the site as would have an adverse impact on landscape character. Site forms a key buffer between existing extraction site and proximate residential development.
Beetley	MIN 72	Concerns that the site was in close proximity to Gressenhall and could result in noise, dust and light pollution harming amenity	Not acceptable	Reiterate previous comments and endorse NCC assessment of the site
Beetley	MIN 89	Site unlikely to take place without MIN 13 and 51 as proposed transport is ground conveyors. Concerns as to the cumulative effect on landscape and highways.	Not acceptable	Reiterate previous comments and endorse NCC assessment of the site
Billingford and Bintree	MIN 97	Significant concern due to cumulative impact on landscape, ecology and transport	Not acceptable	Maintain objection on the grounds of landscape, transport and ecological impacts. Agree with NCC assessment that site is unacceptable.
Bridgham	MIN 49	Site would harm amenity of residents of Bridgham and Harling as a result of noise, dust and light. Development would harm persons enjoyment of their property.	Not acceptable	Reiterate previous comments and endorse NCC assessment of the site
Cranworth	MIN 116*	N/A	Not acceptable	Object to this site due to adverse impact on landscape character (site is in River valley and given significant policy protection in BDC Core Strategy), and harm to the amenity of surrounding properties. This is a new site and

				would require significant highway improvements with limited prospect of these being implemented.
Great Ellingham	MIN 15	Could help supply aggregates to support development at Attleborough	Not acceptable	Endorse NCC assessment of the site as not acceptable on highway grounds.
Hoe	MIN 28	Could help supply aggregates to support development at Dereham	Potentially acceptable	Site is proximate to Upper Wensum and Blackwater river valley. Breckland Core Strategy affords significant protection to sensitive River Valleys in terms of impact of development on the landscape. Agree with NCC that site should not be allocated.
Litcham, Mileham and Tittleshall	MIN 50	Concerns raised on landscape grounds	Potentially acceptable	Although site area has been significantly revised, it is considered that the site remains unsuitable in landscape terms due to harm to the Nar Valley. Therefore, disagree with NCC assessment and object to the site.
Litcham, Tittleshall and Wellingham	MIN 60*		Not acceptable	<p>Firstly, site location inaccurate on assessment sheet – should say Weasenham.</p> <p>A strategic gas pipe runs directly through the site. Therefore, the deliverability of this site questioned in any event.</p> <p>The Council is concerned that Landscape character will be adversely affected as well as the amenity of residents at nearby Tittleshall from noise, dust, lighting etc.</p> <p>Therefore, the Council objects to this site.</p>
Longham	MIN 66`	Site is unacceptable in landscape terms	Not acceptable	Endorse NCC assessment of the site as not acceptable due to landscape impact.
Longham	MIN 67	Comments raised that working area should be amended to move this further away from residential dwellings at Longham	Acceptable	Resolution by NCC to grant Planning Permission limits opportunity to make further comment.

North Elmham	MIN 21	Site is too close to the village resulting in potential harm due to noise and dust	Not acceptable	Support NCC assessment that the site is unacceptable due to landscape, highways and ecology concerns.
Quidenham	MIN 35*		Not acceptable	Support NCC assessment that the site is unacceptable due to landscape impact and harm to residential amenity of residents at Eccles Road.
Shropham	MIN 107	Site could lead to an extension to existing workings and supply material for development in Attleborough and A11 corridor	Acceptable	The site is in very close proximity of the Thetford River Valley landscape character area identified in the Breckland Core Strategy. The proposal is likely to affect the sensitive landscape in this area. It is also unclear whether site can satisfy a HRA in terms of its impact on Swangey Fen. Therefore, it is considered that the site be downgraded to 'Potentially acceptable' until these concerns are satisfied, if at all. Object.
Shropham	MIN 108	Site is close to village of Shropham and as such there are concerns that residential amenity could be harmed from noise pollution.	Potentially acceptable	The site is in very close proximity of the Thetford River Valley landscape character area identified in the Breckland Core Strategy. The proposal is likely to affect the sensitive landscape in this area. It is also unclear whether site can satisfy a HRA in terms of its impact on Swangey Fen.
Shropham	MIN 109*	N/A	Acceptable	The site is in very close proximity of the Thetford River Valley landscape character area identified in the Breckland Core Strategy. The proposal is likely to adversely affect the sensitive landscape in this area. Furthermore it is unclear why this site has not been identified as having a possible impact on Swangey Fen whereas MIN 107 and 108 have which are close by? Object to this site and consider that it should not be classified as acceptable.
Shropham	MIN 110	Did not support the	Potentially	The site is in very close

		site due to proximity to Shropham village. Considered other sites in the area to be preferable	acceptable	proximity of the Thetford River Valley landscape character area identified in the Breckland Core Strategy. The proposal is likely to adversely affect the sensitive landscape in this area.
Snetterton	MIN 102	Site is close to Attleborough and could provide an important source of material to support new growth.	Not acceptable	<p>The site is in very close proximity of the Thetford River Valley landscape character area identified in the Breckland Core Strategy. The proposal is likely to adversely affect the sensitive landscape in this area.</p> <p>Agree with NCC assessment of site but should also have regard to landscape impacts as above.</p>

Appendix B - Comments on the Norfolk Waste Issues and Options consultation document

*Denotes new site not previously consulted upon in 2008

Parish	Site Ref	Summary of previous comments made	NCC assessment outcome	Recommended response to current consultation
Ashill	WAS 14	Site would form an extension to existing HWRC, but concerns raised about impact of additional HGVs on un-designated roads, and highlighted need for additional screening	Potentially acceptable	Agree with NCC assessment
Attleborough	WAS 47	Site is on brownfield land within an acceptable distance of Attleborough. Limited impact in landscape terms.	Acceptable	Agree with NCC assessment that site is suitable for waste recycling centre and waste transfer.
Attleborough*	WAS 81	Objected due to potential harm to Swangey Fen SAC, also concerns in respect of adverse impact on landscape character.	Not acceptable	Agree with NCC assessment that the site is not acceptable due to concerns in respect of highways, landscape and ecology.
Beeston with Bittering	WAS 21	Although there is unlikely to be any impact on landscape, it was considered proposed use could be better located in relation to sources of waste e.g. market town.	Potentially acceptable	Inaccurate assessment as site is not 'allocated' for industrial use in Core Strategy but is in existing use. Previous comments are again relevant as it is considered that alternative locations closer to sources of waste would be more appropriate and sustainable.
Beeston with Bittering*	WAS 86	Unlikely to be any significant impacts on landscape character. Reasonably close to Swaffham and Dereham as possible sources for waste materials.	Potentially acceptable	Previous comments remain relevant and further detail necessary if identified for minerals extraction under MIN 61.
Beetley	WAS 01	N/A	Acceptable	Due to existing uses permitted, the site could be suitable but until findings of a Habitats Regulations Assessment have been carried out, the

				<p>site should not be considered 'acceptable' as may not be deliverable for additional fill.</p> <p>It is unclear why this site is acceptable in highway terms for additional traffic whereas adjacent site WAS 83 has been considered 'not acceptable' due to need for additional access. This should be clarified in the final document.</p>
Beetley*	WAS 83	N/A	Not acceptable	Endorse NCCs assessment of the site and consider it is unsuitable. There is also likely to be significant cumulative impact on landscape character if sites in close proximity are developed for minerals extraction.
Beetley*	WAS 87	Also submitted as MIN 51	Potentially acceptable	There is likely to be significant cumulative impact on landscape character if sites in close proximity are developed for minerals extraction.
Carbrooke	WAS 06	Site is close to Watton and could deal with waste from construction in District. Site is brownfield and has access from B1108.	Acceptable	Site is adjacent a historic landfill site, well screened as has good access to the B1108. It is considered that the NCC assessment should be endorsed and that the site is appropriate.
Cranworth	WAS 34	Site is located at Shipdham Airfield industrial area. Site could form useful waste recycling centre in the absence of such a facility in Dereham.	Potentially acceptable	Endorse NCC assessment that the site has potential as a Household Waste Recycling Centre.
Croxton	WAS 63	Development could adversely affect European Habitats and Species and has unsuitable access arrangements.	Not acceptable	Endorse NCC assessment that the site is not acceptable due to unsuitable highways access and likely significant effects on European Habitats

				and Species.
Hockering*	WAS 75	N/A	Not acceptable	Overall uses on site have already resulted in harm to landscape and as such, unlikely to result in further harm. It is recognised that the limited site size does not lend itself to allocation and NCC assessment is endorsed. Limited use could be considered through a Planning Application.
Kilverstone	WAS 04	Site is unlikely to have significant landscape impact and as a 'bad neighbour' use is best located away from residential areas.	Not acceptable	Endorse NCC assessment that site is not acceptable on the grounds of likely significant effects on Breckland SPA and SAC. Site is within 1,500m of SPA supporting Stone Curlew and as such likely to result in harm to qualifying features.
Longham	WAS 09	Concerns that development would prevent implementation of restoration and resulting further development in countryside.	Acceptable	Do not agree with NCC assessment. It is considered that previous comments regarding form of development in the countryside remain valid and alternative sites are more appropriate for composting and recycling .e.g. WAS 21
Longham	WAS 10	Development would be intrusive in landscape terms	Not acceptable	Endorse NCC assessment that the site is not acceptable due to landscape and amenity concerns.
Longham	WAS 11	No objection provided suitable access on to the HGV route (C229) can be secured.	Not acceptable	Endorse NCC assessment that the site is unsuitable on amenity grounds.
North Pickenham*	WAS 84	N/A	Potentially acceptable	Firstly, the assessment is inaccurate as the site no longer allocated for employment in the Core Strategy. It is questioned whether the site has suitable highway access as this may not

				<p>be suitable for increased traffic generated by the use.</p> <p>It is considered that the extension of the existing site at Ashill (a relatively short distance away) is preferable.</p>
North Tuddenham	WAS 20	Object as site would result in loss of woodland which is important landscape and biodiversity feature.	Not acceptable	Endorse NCC assessment that the site is not acceptable on grounds of adverse impact on landscape character.
Quidenham	WAS 53 (MIN 35)	Dependant on being identified for mineral extraction first. Recycling of inert material could dispose of local construction waste.	Not acceptable	Endorse NCC assessment that the site is not acceptable as it may harm landscape character, but also may harm the amenity of residents at Eccles Road.
Shropham*	WAS 80 (MIN 107)	N/A	Potentially acceptable	The site is in very close proximity of the Thetford River Valley landscape character area identified in the Breckland Core Strategy. The proposal is likely to affect the sensitive landscape in this area. It is also unclear whether site can satisfy a HRA in terms of its impact on Swangey Fen. Object.
Snetterton	WAS 19	Site is located at Snetterton Heath Employment Area. Unclear whether this site is required for waste.	Acceptable	Snetterton Heath employment area is a key location for advanced engineering and motorsport related activities as set out in Breckland Core Strategy. It is noted that some of the proposed uses are in line with existing uses on the site; however it is considered that this should be limited so that no harm is caused to residential amenity of residents at Eccles Road, and that the proposals do not compromise the Council's strategic economic vision for

				<p>this area. Therefore, the site is not supported for further waste activities and it is considered that further detail is required in order that the emerging Attleborough and Snetterton Heath Area Action Plan is not prejudiced.</p>
Snetterton*	WAS 79 (MIN 102)	N/A	Not acceptable	<p>The site is in the Thetford River Valley landscape character area identified in the Breckland Core Strategy. The proposal is likely to adversely affect the sensitive landscape in this area.</p> <p>Endorse NCC assessment of the site and object to the site on grounds of adverse impact of landscape character.</p>
Thetford	WAS 32	Site is on brownfield land at London Road industrial estate. Do not object but all proposed uses should be tested through sustainability appraisal	Potentially acceptable	<p>Site could be acceptable for revised uses (excluding pyrolysis/ gasification) and could be compatible with existing uses on site.</p>
Wretham	WAS 03	Object, as site would result in loss of tree belt and harm to landscape of 'Stanta heath'. Site is in an AQMA and could result in further harm to air quality.	Not acceptable	<p>Agree that site is not acceptable and consider previous objections still relevant.</p> <p>In addition, the site is also with 1,500m of land with >5 stone curlew nesting attempts. Therefore, may result in significant effect on qualifying features of Breckland SPA/SAC.</p>

Appendix C - Adjacent sites to Breckland

Parish	Site Ref	Summary of previous comments made	NCC assessment outcome	Recommended response to current consultation
Methwold	WAS 34	<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>	Acceptable	<p>Object to the site and disagree with NCC assessment. It is considered that the site is not acceptable for minerals development due to potential harm being caused to Breckland SPA.</p> <p>As it is unclear whether the site can satisfy a Habitats Regulations Assessment, the site should, at best, be reclassified as being 'potentially acceptable'.</p>