

**Planning (Regulatory) Committee
Minutes of the Meeting Held on 26 January 2024
at 11am in the Council Chamber, County Hall**

Present:

Cllr Brian Long (Chair)

Cllr Steven Askew

Cllr Rob Colwell

Cllr Chris Dawson

Cllr Mark Kiddle-Morris

Cllr Paul Neale

Cllr Mike Sands

Cllr Martin Storey

Cllr Tony White

Substitute Members Present:

Cllr David Bills for Cllr Graham Carpenter

Also Present

Hollie Adams

James Beasley

Cllr Roly Beazley

Cllr John Billing

Chris Burgess

Charles Colling

Jenna Conway

Ralph Cox

Andrew Harriss

Nick Johnson

Karl Robinson

Andrew Sierakowski

Marcia Solloway-Brown

Phil Taylor

Kieran Yates

Committee Officer

Public Speaker

Public Speaker

Public Speaker

Subject Lead (Planning Team), npLaw

Planning Officer

Public Speaker

Principal Planner

Planning Officer

Head of Planning

Public Speaker

Planning Officer

Public Speaker

Public Speaker

Highway Development Management Officer

1 Apologies and Substitutions

- 1.1 Apologies were received from Vice-Chair Cllr Graham Carpenter (Cllr David Bills substituting), Cllr William Richmond and Cllr Alexandra Kemp.

1.2 Election of Vice-Chair for meeting

Cllr Storey was nominated by Cllr Tony White and seconded by Cllr Brian Long. Cllr Martin Storey was duly elected to sit as Vice-Chair for the meeting.

2 Minutes

- 2.1 The minutes from the Planning (Regulatory) Committee meeting held on 24 November 2023 were agreed as an accurate record and signed by the Chair.

3 Declarations of Interest

- 3.1 Cllr Kiddle-Morris declared a declaration of interest related to item FUL 2022 0021 as he was speaking as Local Member. He would abstain from speaking and voting on this item as a Committee Member.

4 Urgent Business

- 4.1 There was no urgent business.

Applications referred to the Committee for determination.

5 Point of Order

- 5.1 The Committee agreed to take agenda items 6, "FUL/2022/0021: Land south of Rawhall Lane, Beetley, Dereham, Norfolk, NR20 4HJ" and 7, "FUL/2023/0019: Land adjacent to the Barn, Heron Farm, Bunwell Road, Besthorpe, Attleborough, Norfolk, NR17 2LN" first, followed by item 5, "FUL/2023/0033: Carter Concrete Ltd, Britons Lane, Beeston Regis, NR26 8TP".

6 FUL/2022/0021: Land south of Rawhall Lane, Beetley, Dereham, Norfolk, NR20 4HJ

- 6.1.1 The Committee received the report setting out a planning application for the development of a new sand and gravel quarry on agricultural land south of Rawhall Lane, approximately 1.1 km to the north-west of Beetley, near Dereham.
- 6.1.2 In line with his declaration of interest, Cllr Kiddle-Morris did not take part in discussion, debate or voting on this application as a Member of the Committee, as he was speaking to the Committee about the application as Local Member.
- 6.1.3 The Planning officer gave a presentation; maps, photographs and diagrams shown in the presentation are available to view as part of the Committee report or planning application documents:
- Photographs and maps from the planning application documents and the local plan were shown. There was an area of land which was included in the local plan but excluded from the application as the mineral here was not good.
 - There was proposed to be 6 phases of extraction, with restoration after each phase. Maps detailing the phases were shown. The final works phase would return to the access of the site.
 - There was a proposal to restore the site back to agricultural land.

- The level of extraction was proposed to be kept above the water table.
- A map was shown of site access and photographs of the site access and aspects of the site.

6.2 The Committee asked questions about the presentation:

- Removal of the two substantial trees on the site was queried. The Planning Officer confirmed that these would be retained.

6.3.1 Cllr John Billings spoke as local Parish Councillor for Beetley Parish Council

- Cllr Billings felt that this application threatened to disrupt the peace and safety of the community. Cllr Billings had given his concerns in writing which he felt were not fully represented in the report.
- Cllr Billings felt that the report failed to show accurate highways conditions as the traffic survey was conducted during the Covid-19 pandemic, therefore misrepresenting the impact on the B1146 due to the lower traffic levels during this time.
- Cllr Billings stated that the proximity of the site to Rawhall Lane raised a threat of noise to residents living in East Bilney. The start time of operations raised concerns due to the early opening hours.
- Cllr Billings raise concerns that there would be a doubling of aggregate trucks passing by the local school which would impact on the safety of children. Cllr Billings asked the Committee to consider the implications on the school and preschool of the heavy traffic.
- Cllr Billings queried the disparity between site specific allocation policies Min12 and Min51. Min12 stated that sites must be phased with adjacent permitted sites to ensure only one is worked at any one time.
- Cllr Billings asked the Committee to think about the impact of traffic, noise levels and on school children and delay the approval of this application until existing sites had completed extraction.

6.3.2 Cllr Roly Beazley spoke as Chairman of Gressenhall Parish Council

- Cllr Beazley supported Cllr Billings' comments. He accepted the principal of gravel production but thought this would be better achieved over the long scale.
- There were two other pits in the vicinity of this site which fully met needs.
- Cllr Beazley objected to the doubling of lorry movements on the local road network, which he described as less than adequate.
- Cllr Beazley felt that the application did not comply with CS13, as it did not mention the production of renewable energy on the site, which he felt should be considered in today's environment.

6.3.3 Committee Members asked questions to the speakers:

- The Planning Officer clarified that CS13 required sites to have provision and consideration of renewable energy on site but recognised that this was not always possible. Planning officers had asked the applicant to look into this. They had considered it but found constraints of the site would not allow it.
- The Highways Officer had assessed safety during a site visit. The B1146 was a designated lorry route and there was a quarry opposite; he concluded that

the route was adequate and that highways objections could not be justified. There could be up to 28 trips to the site which was around 2 HGVs per hour which did not constitute severe highways impact. He recommended the HGV routing plan to ensure that HGVs used the lorry route. If so minded, Members could make a recommendation to amend the routing plan to avoid school hours drop off and pick up times.

- A Committee Member asked about lorry movements taking into account other quarries in the area. The Highways Officer was unsure of the number of vehicles from other sites however had carried out a traffic survey on the road.
- A Committee Member suggested that the meeting be adjourned so the full extent of highway impacts could be assessed, noting the possible impact on the wider highway network. Officers clarified that the traffic from the site did not constitute a severe highways impact as this was a designated lorry route and the results of the HGV survey included HGVs from any source. The threshold for a more detailed assessment was an increase in traffic of 10% which was not reached.
- A Committee Member asked how mitigation measures would handle the timetable of HGV arrival. The Planning Officer replied that it was difficult to control HGVs arriving before opening of the quarry other than through opening times and the routing agreement. Proposed operating hours were set out on page 55 of the report.
- The Planning Officer confirmed that there should be a wheel wash on the site.
- It was pointed out that as traffic surveys were said to have been taken during Covid, when figures were measured at a point of low traffic movement then percentage increases would be much higher, but it had been pointed out that they were acceptable.

6.3.4 Jenna Conway from Heaton Planning spoke on behalf of the applicant:

- Longwater Gravel was a family run company based in Norfolk with three quarries producing sand and gravel for use within the County.
- The company was well established in the market and was a local employer, engaging with smaller companies to supply materials.
- The central area of the proposed quarry was in Min51, along with land to the north and south proposed for allocation in the emerging minerals and waste local plan. Norfolk County Council had identified a need to secure additional reserves to meet demand for the county of 12m tonnes of reserve. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) advised that local authorities could give weight to emerging plans according to the stage of allocation; this plan had been submitted and was in its final stage.
- Work had been undertaken to minimise the impact of work where possible, such as the site being at low level behind vegetation and bunds and phased working to minimise the number of working areas at any one time.
- Restoration would be completed at the earliest opportunity with peripheral trees and hedges retained with stand-off areas to ensure they were not impacted by operations. Internal hedges were proposed to be reinstated as part of the restoration plan, with stand-off from the western boundary.

- The new quarry proposed at Beetley would supply reserves when Longwater operations Wymondham and Coxford quarries ceased in the next 5-10 years and was at lower tonnage to increase when these ceased.
- The restoration concept was based on land for agricultural use and the scheme showed an increase of over 100% in-area habitat units and a 13% increase in linear habitat units.
- Liaising with statutory consultees had resulted in amendments to the scheme and additional information provided. Proposals had been provided with no objections from the statutory consultees, subject to conditions and subject to submitting further schemes to measure additional impacts.
- The operation would be carried out in tandem with the works at Middleton Aggregates. The benefits of Middleton's Aggregates already operating was that cumulative impacts could be measured.
- HGV movements were a maximum of three additional movements per hour with no peak hours, progressive across the day, and should not cause problems at school drop off or pick up time.

6.3.5 Cllr Mark Kiddle-Morris spoke to the Committee as local Member for Necton and Launditch:

- Cllr Kiddle-Morris circulated a photograph showing the location of the site; see appendix A of these minutes.
- The site was proposed to extract around 70,000 to 100,000 tonnes of aggregate per annum.
- There were three other active quarries in the division, and two of these also extracted around this amount per annum. Middleton Aggregates was adjacent to this site, and this site had applied to extend its operations to 2037. Longham quarry produced 110,000 tonnes per annum.
- If this application was approved there would be 300,000 tonnes coming out of this division.
- There had been concerns raised that the processing plant was 400m away from the processing plant of Middleton Aggregates, and the cumulative impact of noise, dust and vibrations from the two plants had not been taken into account in the assessment. Cllr Kiddle-Morris felt that more work needed to be done to look at the cumulative impact.
- The transport assessment proposed 18-29 HGV movements per day depending on the extraction rate. Middleton Aggregates produced around the same amount of traffic meaning that this would result in around 36-58 more HGVs per day if this application was approved. Cllr Kiddle-Morris felt that the assessment of highway safety was inadequate and a reduction of the speed limit on Rawhall Junction should be investigated.
- It had been stated that it was not possible to install a renewable energy source on site however Cllr Kiddle-Morris noted that solar panels had been installed at a local quarry which provided 20% of the site's energy.
- Cllr Kiddle-Morris felt that MW1, MW3 and MW6 or the emerging local plan were not met in this case. He felt that the application should be deferred to start at the end of the Middleton quarry extraction, and more work carried out to assess the cumulative impact with Middleton Aggregates.

- 6.3.6 Committee Members asked questions to the speakers:
- Cllr Kiddle-Morris confirmed that the school was 1.5 miles south of Rawhall Lane.
 - A Committee Member asked why renewable energy was not possible on site; the Planning Officer replied that the assessment included in the application concluded there was not enough space on site to accommodate it.
 - A Committee Member asked about the mitigations in place to take care of wildlife. The Planning Officer replied that a licence was needed to undertake work due to the protected species in the area, and mitigations for these species were built into the application.
 - The Vice-Chair felt that a 20mph speed limit past the school would be beneficial. Cllr Kiddle-Morris confirmed that there was a wigwag 20mph advisory speed limit. The Head of Planning advised that since highways impacts were negligible any recommendations to put in place a highways condition would not pass the test needed to put a condition in place.
- 6.4 The Vice Chair **proposed** that the plant operating times be amended so that they were in line with the nearby Middleton Aggregates' operating times to protect local amenity. He understood that the Middleton site closed at 5pm. This proposal was seconded by the Chair. With 6 votes in favour this proposal was **agreed**. **after the meeting it was determined that Middleton Aggregates closed at 6pm, not 5pm. The Chair, in consultation with the Head of Planning and Legal Officer, agreed that this condition be changed so that the site close at 6pm, as the intention of this proposal was to keep operating times in line with those at Middleton Aggregates.*
- 6.5 Cllr Colwell **proposed** that the application be deferred to a later date so that the concerns about highways could be looked into in more detail, particularly the cumulative effect on local villages. This was seconded by Cllr Mike Sands with the addition of further investigation into mitigation measures for wildlife. With 3 votes for and 6 against, the proposal was **lost**.
- 6.6 The planning officer reported that the applicant had requested changes to the conditions. These were read out by the planning officer and are attached at appendix B of these minutes. The Chair requested that at future meetings late amendments to conditions were circulated to the Committee as a hard copy, and that an item was added to future agendas for the Committee's consideration of changes made to applications between publication of reports and the meeting and late correspondence received.
- 6.7 Cllr Paul Neale left the meeting at 14:20 and would not vote on this item.
- 6.8 A Committee Member asked about the HGV rerouting. The Planning Officer replied that the HGV rerouting plan would ensure that vehicles would not turn right and go towards the B1146. The Chair noted the importance of businesses acting as good neighbours.
- 6.9 With 7 votes for and 1 vote against, the Committee **agreed** that the Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services be authorised to:

1. Grant planning permission subject to the conditions outlined in Section 11 the amended conditions, set out in appendix B to these minutes, and the proposal agreed by the Committee for the site to close at 6pm to align with the closing time of Middleton Aggregates (agreed at paragraph 6.4 of these minutes)
2. Discharge conditions where those detailed above require the submission and implementation of a scheme, or further details, either before development commences, or within a specified date of planning permission being granted;
3. Delegate powers to officers to deal with any non-material amendments to the application that may be submitted.

6.10 The Committee took a break from 12:40 until 12:45.

7. FUL/2023/0019: Land adjacent to the Barn, Heron Farm, Bunwell Road, Besthorpe, Attleborough, Norfolk, NR17 2LN

7.1.1 The Committee received the report setting out a planning application for a change to the use of an area of land from open air storage (plant, materials and aggregates) to an aggregate and soil recovery facility (part retrospective). The application sought to recycle / recover up to 60,000 tonnes per annum of aggregates and soils from imported construction, demolition and excavation waste linked to the adjacent Newall civil engineering business.

7.1.2 The Planning Officer gave a presentation to the Committee; maps, photographs and diagrams shown in the presentation are available to view as part of the Committee report or planning application documents:

- A presentation was given showing maps of the site location, an aerial photo, maps of the proposed site plan including landscaping and a cross section, available in the planning application documents.
- Photographs were shown of the crusher, local highways, the application site, and views of the site from nearby, available in the planning application documents.
- Health and Safety Executive (HSE) best practice guidance advised that crushers should be in a raised position so the operator could be always seen in the hopper. A condition requiring all plant to operate at ground level would go against this and was therefore unreasonable.

7.2 A Committee Member asked how much development had taken place on the site since the planning application submitted in 2021 was refused by the Committee. The Planning Officer replied that there had been waste stored on the site.

7.3.1 Karl Robinson spoke to the Committee as an objector:

- This was the eighth retrospective application for this site related to waste. As the nearest unconnected neighbour to the site, due to the site moving 150m closer Mr Robinson believed the site became worse.
- Planning Applications had been refused for this site in the past due to noise and landscaping issues which had not been resolved. There were no controlled hours of operation at the site which had tipping at all hours.

- There was no planning consent to planning to store waste and Mr Robinson believed that Breckland District Council had allowed them to store it as “material”.
- Mr Robinson stated that the applicant ran lorries at all hours with no control, from 4:30am until midnight through country lanes, which was noisy. There had been objection received from the Parish Council about this, waking local residents. The lorries were reported to travel through Bunwell and New Buckenham, affecting residents here as well.
- There was noise heard locally from excavators, reversing sounds and tipping of waste. There had been no objection from Environmental Health or the Environment Agency however there was an open case with Breckland District Council over noise and over 30 incidents had been reported to the Environment Agency.
- Mr Robinson showed photographs of the view of the site from his back garden, which showed a view of the excavator working in an elevated position and other machinery above the top of the bund and a photograph of the highways; please see appendix C of these minutes. There was a condition on the site from Breckland District Council to have no aggregate crushers on the site and no waste storage, but Mr Robinson believed this indicated this showed waste processing was taking place.
- Mr Robinson asked for a condition to regulate lorry hours as he noted that the noise peaked by 30 decibels over background noise.
- He felt that there was an issue with lorry movements on the nearby roads, as shown in his photographs, at appendix C to these minutes.
- If refused, Mr Robinson felt that Norfolk County Council should work on resolving enforcement issues with waste with Breckland District Council and was concerned about the storage of waste on the site, which Breckland District Council had a condition in place against.

7.3.2 Marcia Solloway-Brown spoke in support of the application:

- Ms Solloway-Brown lived at the closest residential home to the site. She did not have any problems with the site and thought the bund had been put up sensitively.
- She had put trees around her own boundary, and the application site ran alongside her boundary which she said was hard to see from the road. Ms Solloway-Brown liked the location of the house and liked living there and wanted it to be her “forever home”.
- Ms Solloway-Brown felt recycling was important to be carried out by everyone and places were needed for it to take place; it would always have an impact but the negative impact could be reduced. She felt Newall’s had addressed this.
- Ms Solloway-Brown stated that she was not disturbed by the noise and dust from lorries on the site. She was retired, and before this had worked from home; work on the site had not stopped her conducting business at home. Newall’s had worked to limit dust by dampening the road regularly.
- Ms Solloway-Brown reported that before Newall’s began work in the area, it was an agricultural area, with tractors and agricultural work taking place. The work here affected her no more so than the agricultural work had done.

- Ms Solloway-Brown stated that neighbours had encouraged her to disprove of the application however she was happy to live next to the application site.

7.3.3 Phil Taylor spoke to the Committee as applicant:

- Newall's took pride in their reputation and relationship with the community. They welcomed parish councils and residents to visit the site to understand what the site did and its benefits but noted that recycling could be seen as negative. However, recycling was better than sending waste to landfill.
- Mr Taylor was confused by the recommendation to refuse, since all statutory consultees had no objections. Three facts had changed since this application was last submitted: the site previously considered was on a smaller piece of land which was more difficult to work, there was a 5m bund around the land granted by the District Council, and trees which had been planted around the site; see appendix D of the minutes.
- The equipment could be located at ground level. The Council recommended the application for refusal because they could not impose a condition requiring it to be located at ground level due to Health and Safety Executive legislation.
- Mr Taylor felt that the report was confusing on the reasons for refusal. He had not heard of other sites which had been granted permission with controls in place for the height of machinery.

7.3.4 James Beasley spoke to the Committee as applicant:

- Mr Beasley was a qualified health and safety manager and environmental manager. He stated that in their recommendation, the council referenced the best practice guidance by the Health and Safety Executive. This was not a code of practice.
- The Provision and Use of Work Equipment Regulations 1998 stated that clear written instructions must be given when using this equipment. The manufacturer's specifications for the equipment were approved by EU and UK regulations. Neither of these stated that a ramp or platform must be used for loading or operating the equipment.
- Statutory guidance of mobile crushing and screening process guidance also did not state that a ramp or platform must be constructed. Plants recognised Health and Safety Executive guidance, but as stated in this guidance, this was not comprehensive, and Newall's had turned to statutory documentation and advice from Morgan Sindell's Health and Safety advisor which stated that techniques using modern technologies in the form of CCTV to allow operators to view operations and allowing operators to carry out task in a safe manner was key.
- Risks arising from the tasks could be controlled in a safe and manageable level.

7.4 The Committee moved onto debate:

- The Planning officer confirmed that working at ground level had been raised with the applicant, who had looked into other measures such as attaching CCTV cameras to the plant or working using a banksman.
- The highway routing was queried. The Highways Officer had recommended the HGV routing to ensure that HGVs would avoid travelling through Bunwell.

- Cllr Tony White **proposed** to approve the application, seconded by Cllr Chris Dawson, who noted that this was a finely balanced application, due to there not being a clear adverse impact on local amenity and landscape. The Chair clarified that if approved, conditions would need to be put in place. In usual circumstances when this occurred, conditions were delegated to officers in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chair. In the absence of the Vice-Chair the Chair suggested that instead this was in consultation with the Chair and Cllr Tony White, as the proposer of the motion.
- A Committee Member was concerned having read Health and Safety Executive guidance, which stated that the machinery used at the site could be fatal. The Chair noted it was the responsibility of the site operator to ensure the machinery used on site was used safely.
- A Committee Member asked if anything could be done to manage the antisocial operating hours. The Chair suggested that, if this application was approved, opening times would be taken into account as part of drawing up of conditions. If there were any concerns with the conditions drawn up then they would be brought back to the Committee.
- Cllr White and the Chair **confirmed** that the Committee did not intend to condition the requirement for the site operator to work at ground level.
- A Committee Member noted that it was the company's responsibility to carry out a Health and Safety assessment and ensure they were operating machinery safely on site.

7.5 With 7 votes for, and 2 votes against the Committee **AGREED** to **approve** the planning application, with conditions to be agreed by officers in consultation with the Chair of the Committee and Cllr Tony White.

8. **FUL/2023/0033: Carter Concrete Ltd, Britons Lane, Beeston Regis, NR26 8TP**

8.1.1 The Committee received the report setting out a planning application under Section 73 of the Planning Act 1990 for variation of conditions of permission reference FUL/2019/0002 to regularise changes to the approved restoration scheme for the original quarry.

8.1.2 The Committee Officer gave a presentation to the Committee; maps, photographs and diagrams shown in the presentation are available to view as part of the Committee report or planning application documents:

- The location map, site plan and approved restoration scheme and photographs of the site were shown.
- The site was located in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. On balance it was considered that there was demonstration of public benefits of this development continuing within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
- Photographs of highways access from the site were shown.
- The Planning Officer updated Members on an additional condition recommended since the report was published; see Appendix E to these minutes.

8.2 The Committee moved to debate:

- A Committee Member asked about the safety of the steep sides of the quarry after restoration. The Planning Officer confirmed there would be provision for public access, however people would not be encouraged to venture onto the slopes, which were not proposed to be reduced in steepness. Over time, gorse and shrubs would colonise the slopes and reduce the opportunity for people to climb them.
- Cllr Chris Dawson recommended that the application be approved. The Chair agreed with this proposal to move to the vote on approval.

8.3 The Committee unanimously agreed that the Interim Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services be authorised to:

1. Grant planning permission subject to the conditions outlined in section 11, and subject to continued obligations of the existing legal agreement; and
2. Discharge conditions where those detailed above require the submission and implementation of a scheme, or further details, either before development commences, or within a specified date of planning permission being granted;
3. Delegate powers to officers to deal with any non-material amendments to the application that may be submitted.

The meeting ended at 13:39

Chair



If you need this report in large print, audio, Braille, alternative format or in a different language please contact 0344 800 8020 or Textphone 0344 8008011 and we will do our best to help.

Proposed Quarry South of Rawhall Lane

Legend

- 📍 Feature 1
- 📍 Feature 2
- 📍 plant



Planning (Regulatory) Committee

Item No: 6

Report Title: FUL/2022/0021: Land south of Rawhall Lane, Beetley, Dereham, Norfolk, NR20 4HJ

Date of Meeting: 26 January 2024

Responsible Cabinet Member: N/A

Responsible Director: Grahame Bygrave, Interim Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services

Is this a Key Decision? No

Proposal & Applicant: Planning Application for a new sand and gravel quarry on agricultural land south of Rawhall Lane (Longwater Gravel Company Limited)

There are 7 updates since the planning application committee report was published:

Organization	Comment	Officer Response
Applicant	<p>Requests amendment to draft Condition No. 1 so that the condition states:</p> <p><i>The development to which this permission relates shall cease and the site shall be restored by 31 December 2036 2046 in accordance with Drawing No. LON-002-M.D.015E, Concept Restoration Plan, dated September 2023.</i></p>	<p>This is a typographical correction. The end date is intended to be 2046.</p> <p>Recommended that the requested amendment is accepted.</p>

Applicant	<p>Requests removal of draft Condition No. 7 which states:</p> <p><i>Prior to the first use of the development hereby permitted the vehicular access/crossing over the verge shall be constructed in accordance with a detailed scheme to be agreed in writing with the Mineral Planning Authority in accordance with the highways specification (Industrial) and thereafter retained at the position shown on the approved plan. The scheme shall include details of any hedgerow removal and a specification for any replanted hedgerow to be replanted outside the approved visibility splay in accordance with the requirement of Condition No. 10.</i></p>	<p>The applicant has requested removal of the condition on the basis that details of the access have been submitted. NCC Highways however are not satisfied that the level of detail of the construction of the access required has been supplied and accordingly have requested inclusion of the condition.</p> <p>It is therefore recommended that the condition be retained as worded.</p>
Applicant	<p>Requests an amendment to draft Condition No. 13 to include reference to a caveat for essential maintenance and emergencies outside the normal operational hours to state (additional wording underlined):</p> <p><i>No operation authorised or required under this permission shall take place on Sundays or public holidays, or other than during the following periods:</i></p> <p><i>07.00 - 18.00 Mondays to Fridays</i> <i>07.00 - 13.00 Saturdays.</i></p> <p><u><i>except for the purposes of essential maintenance and in the event of an emergency.</i></u></p>	<p>This is an acceptable amendment.</p> <p>Recommended that the requested amendment is accepted.</p>
Applicant	<p>Requests an amendment to draft Condition No. 17 to remove reference to heavy goods vehicles, on the basis that HGV's may be delivering to sites that require audible reversing alarm systems, so that the condition states:</p>	<p>This is standard requirement to minimise noise from HGVs and mobile plant and white noise</p>

	<p>All heavy goods vehicles and all mobile plant operating on the site will be fitted with broadband ('white-noise') reverse warning systems and maintained in accordance with the manufacturers recommendations for the lifetime of the development.</p>	<p>alarms are audible.</p> <p>Accordingly, it is recommended that the condition is retained as worded.</p>
Applicant	<p>Requests that Condition Nos. 24 & 27 are combined to state:</p> <p><i>Prior to any operations commencing on the site a Soil Resource and Management Plan, which shall be prepared in accordance with the Institute for Quarry's Good Practice Guide for Handling Soils in Mineral Workings (2021). Shall be submitted to the MPA for their consideration. The Plan shall identify clearly the origin, intermediate and final locations of soils for use in the restoration, as defined by soil units, together with details balancing the quantities, depths, and areas involved.</i></p> <p><i>All soil handling and storage operations shall be carried out in accordance with the details to be set out in the approved Soil Resource and Management Plan.</i></p>	<p>This is an acceptable amendment.</p> <p>Recommended that the requested amendment is accepted.</p> <p>Subsequent conditions would be renumbered.</p>
Applicant	<p>Requests an amendment to draft Condition No. 28 be amended to remove period of time stated in the condition as this is unnecessary so that condition states:</p> <p><i>Soil shall only be moved when in a dry and friable condition. For all soil types no soil handling shall proceed during and shortly after significant rainfall, and/or when there are any puddles on the soil surface.</i></p> <p><i>Soil handling and movement shall not be carried out between the months of October to March inclusive.</i></p> <p><i>Plant or vehicle movement shall be confined to clearly defined haul routes, or the overburden surface and shall not cross areas of topsoil and subsoil.</i></p>	<p>This is an acceptable amendment.</p> <p>Recommended that the requested amendment is accepted.</p>

	<p>Requests an amendment to draft Condition No. 35 on the basis that the requirement of the condition is to onerous, so that the condition states:</p> <p><i>Prior to the installation of any fixed external lighting, a Lighting Design Strategy scheme for areas to be lit shall be prepared by a suitably qualified lighting consultant and submitted to the Mineral Planning Authority for written approval. The strategy shall:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>(a) Identify those areas/features on site that are particularly sensitive for bats, and those areas where lights are likely to cause disturbance in or around their breeding sites and resting places or along important routes used to access key areas of their territory, for example, for foraging;</i> <i>(b) Show how and where external lighting will be installed (through technical specifications and the provision of appropriate lighting contour plans which shall include lux levels of the lighting to be provided) so that it can be clearly demonstrated that areas to be lit will not cause light pollution and disturb or prevent bats using their territory or having access to their breeding sites and resting places; and</i> <i>(c) Include the hours of operation for the approved lighting.</i> <p><i>The lighting shall be installed in accordance with the specifications and locations set out in the approved strategy and shall be maintained thereafter in accordance with the strategy for the lifetime of the development.</i></p>	<p>Full details of the lighting scheme have not been submitted with the application and any scheme should be designed to take into account the potential presence of bats and designed by suitably qualified lighting consultant.</p> <p>It is therefore advised that the condition be retained as worded.</p>
Applicant	<p>Requests that the monitoring requirement set out in draft Condition No. 37 be deleted (as follows) or amended so that a monitoring report be submitted post each phase of mineral extraction and restoration:</p> <p><i>The development shall be undertaken strictly in accordance with the Proposed Quarry Development, Beetley, Norfolk, Ecology Addendum (BNG Calculations), Wild Frontier</i></p>	<p>Monitoring is required to ensure the delivery of BNG a proposed.</p> <p>Currently guidance allows for up to five years of</p>

	<p><i>Ecology Ltd, dated December 2022, including the implementation of the Proposed Habitats set out in Section 2.3 and the Appropriate Management of Proposed Habitats set out in Section 2.4 to deliver the Change in Biodiversity Unit calculations for the site - Area Based Habitats set out in Table 5 Proposed Hedgerow Unit calculations for the site – Linear Based Habitats set out in Table 6.</i></p> <p><i>An annual Monitoring Report to be prepared a competent ecologist shall be submitted to the Mineral Planning Authority by 31st December each year confirming implementation of the Proposed Habitats and the Appropriate Management of Proposed Habitats, following the commencement of soil stripping and extraction works in Phase 2.</i></p> <p>It is recommended that this second paragraph is retained with the following amended wording (underlined):</p> <p><i>An annual Monitoring Report to be prepared a competent ecologist shall be submitted to the Mineral Planning Authority by 31st December each year confirming implementation of the Proposed Habitats and the Appropriate Management of Proposed Habitats, following the commencement of soil stripping and extraction works in Phase 2 <u>and until five years after the end date of the final restoration works notified in accordance with Condition No. 2.</u></i></p> <p>As a consequential amendment it is also recommended that Condition No. 2 be amended to state:</p> <p><i>Within seven days of the commencement of operations, the operator shall notify the Mineral Planning Authority in writing of the start date <u>and within seven days of the completion of the final restoration works in Phases 1 and 2 (shown on Drawing Refs LON-002-M.D.014E and Drawing Ref. LON-002-M.D.015E), the operator shall notify the Mineral Planning Authority in writing of the end date of the works.</u></i></p>	<p>aftercare, so it is recommended that the condition is retained as worded but with the additional wording to require submission of a monitoring report for a period up to five years after the completion of the final restorations works in phases 1 and 2. This would provide greater certainty to the developer.</p> <p>As a consequential amendment, Condition No. 2 should also be amended to require completion of the works on site.</p>
--	--	---

--	--	--

Photographs from Karl Robinson

FUL/2023/0019













Photographs from Phil Taylor

FUL/2023/0019











Approximate location of plant

Planning (Regulatory) Committee

Item No: 5

Report Title: FUL/2023/0033: Carter Concrete Ltd, Britons Lane, Beeston Regis, NR26 8TP

Date of Meeting: 26 January 2024

Responsible Cabinet Member: N/A

Responsible Director: Grahame Bygrave, Executive Director of Community and Environmental Services

Is this a Key Decision? No

Proposal & Applicant: Non-compliance with conditions 2 (approved plans) and 7 (restoration scheme) of permission reference FUL/2019/0002 to regularise proposed changes to approved restoration scheme (retrospective): Norfolk Gravel Limited

There are ** updates since the planning application committee report was published:

Organization	Comment	Officer Response

There is one amendment to the report since the planning application committee report was published:

Paragraph	Issue	Amendment
11.2 Additional condition and reason for condition	Additional condition required in order to clarify locations of proposed two no. culverts underneath proposed trackway, to facilitate surface water drainage into northeast corner of quarry void, and secure management and maintenance of surface water drainage features	Additional condition and reason: Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 3.3.5 of submitted document titled Environmental Statement; unreferenced; prepared by David L Walker Limited; dated August 2023, and the email reference B92/2 from David L Walker Limited to Norfolk County Council dated 08 January 2024

	(please refer to paragraph 3.98 of Committee Report)	<p>16:23 hours, within three months of the date of this permission details of a scheme for the management of surface water shall be submitted to the County Planning Authority for its approval in writing. The scheme shall also include details of the maintenance and management of all the surface water drainage features.</p> <p>The scheme shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details and retained in perpetuity, and be managed and maintained in accordance with the approved details in perpetuity.</p> <p>Reason: To ensure the effective management of surface water and to ensure clear arrangements are in place for ongoing operation and maintenance of the surface water drainage system, in accordance with Policy DM4 of the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Core Strategy 2010-2026, and paragraph 175 of the National Planning Policy Framework (2023).</p>