

London Borough of Hillingdon

Local Plan Part 2

Representations made by Matthews and Son LLP

on behalf of

Harleyford Aggregates Limited

Further Written Statement, 27 July 2018

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Background

Various consultation responses to the London Borough of Hillingdon (LBH) Local Plan Part 2 have been submitted by Matthews and Son LLP (MS LLP) on behalf of Henry Streeter (Sand and Ballast) Ltd.

Since the submission of the consultation responses Henry Streeter (Sand and Ballast) Ltd has disposed of a number of its quarrying interests to Harleyford Aggregates Ltd (HAL) which has instructed MS LLP to continue with its representations to the LBH Local Plan Part 2.

## 1.2 Non-LBH Reference Documents

- London Plan (2016), Policy 5.20D, E and F
- NPPF 2012
  - Paragraph 143; Bullets 1 & 3
  - Paragraph 145; Bullet 3
- NPPF 2018
  - Paragraph 204a) & c)
  - Paragraph 207c)
- Planning Practice Guidance
  - Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 27-008-20140306, Revision date: 06 03 2014
  - Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 27-009-20140306, Revision date: 06 03 2014
  - Paragraph: 002 Reference ID: 27-002-20140306, Revision date: 06 03 2014
  - Paragraph: 003 Reference ID: 27-003-20140306, Revision date: 06 03 2014

# 2 Representations

**2.1 Issue: MIN1: Safeguarding Areas for Minerals  
MIN2: Additional Safeguarded Areas for Minerals**

**Document: Development Management Policies**

2.1.2 Analysis of Mineral Resources / Potential Mineral Reserves

2.1.2.1 *LBH Background Technical Report (Minerals), April 2008:*

- *Plan 8.1b 'Site by Site Assessment'*
- *Plan 8.3 'Suggested Preferred Areas' showing a reduction in areas of H9, H12 and H14 as compared with Plan 8.1b.*
- *Paragraph 4.4.6: Assumes an average yield of 60,000t per ha for all sites and calculates a need for a further '37.5 hectares for inclusion in the new local*

*development document'. This equates to 2.25 million tonnes which appears to be at odds with the table in paragraph 4.4.4.*

*60,000t per ha equates to an average reserve depth of c.3.5m (at an average 1.7t per cubic metre)*

- *Paragraph 6.3.5: Bedfont Court, 750,000t on a 24ha site.  
This equates to 31,250t per ha and an average depth of c.1.8m (at an average 1.7t per cubic metre).*

- *Table 8.1 & 8.6 combined (extract):*

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Site</b>	<b>Area (ha)</b>	<b>Yield (mt)</b>	<b>Tonnage in Planning Applications (mt)</b>
H9	N of Harmondsworth	30.0	1.8	0.75
H12	W of Harmondsworth Quarry	40.0	2.4	2.2
H14	Sipson Lane E of M4 Spur (a Henry Streeter site)	30.0	1.8	1.8

- *Paragraph 8.6.10: ‘... form a considered view as to which should be proposed as Preferred Areas in the new LDF. This assessment is set out in Table 8.6. It concludes that the sites best suited to identification as Preferred Areas are the eastern part of Site H9, the whole of Site H12 apart from its northwestern corner, and the whole of Site H14 apart from the SINC in the extreme south-east.’*
- *The LBH LAA 2013 discusses geology but only in very broad terms. No site-specific geological evidence to support the potential allocations has been presented and therefore it is unclear how these sites can be considered to have known or viable resources and consequently whether planning permission would be sought (and therefore whether these sites can be considered to be any more than Areas of Search).*

#### 2.1.2.2 Comments:

*Site H14 (see extract of Tables 8.1 & 8.6 above).*

- *Planning Permission 45408/APP/2009/340 dated 21 May 2009.*
- *Planning Application (received by LBH on 19 February 2009) Supporting Statement*
  - *Paragraph 2.1: 16ha (not 30ha as suggested by LBH)*
  - *Paragraph 2.16: Average depth of deposit = 2.7m (not 3.5m as suggested by LBH)*
  - *Paragraph 2.17: 600,000t (not 1,800,000t as suggested by LBH)*
- *The extant planning consent reference is 45408/APP/2017/2075 dated 7 September 2017.*
- *No allowance for the difference between the tonnage stated in the planning application (0.6mt) and subsequently in any document published by LBH (stating 1.8mt) has been made.*
- *Current position: Mineral extraction nearing completion.*
- *Paragraph 3.4 of the LBH LAA 2017 perpetuates the concept of there being 4.75 million tonnes of aggregate ‘identified and safeguarded within LBH’, this including 1.8 million tonnes at Sipson. Paragraph 3.3 states, however, that only 100,000 tonnes remain at this site. This site cannot therefore be considered an allocation as consent has already been granted.*

- Furthermore, Table 9 incorrectly states a yield of 4.75 million tonnes when it should be 4.75 million tonnes (includes Sipson) minus 1.8 million tonnes (Sipson) = 2.95 million tonnes. Each of the three scenarios are incorrect as a result and should be reduced from 19.4 years, 22.4 years (should be 22.8 years) and 22.5 years to, respectively, 12.2 years, 14.3 years and 14.1 years.

#### 2.1.2.3 Summary:

- Unsubstantiated and optimistic yield/ha.
- No consideration of (or explanation of) the effect of reduced areas on resource calculations (Plan 8.1b, Plan 8.3, Table 8.6)
- No consideration of the discrepancy of 1.2mt between the reserves stated in the planning application and subsequent consultation documents.
- The combined effect of an overstated yield/ha, overstated areas and total tonnage provides an unrealistic basis for assessment.
- Site H14 should not be considered for designation as an Area of Search, a Preferred Area or a Specific Site (as defined in NPPF and PPG) as planning permission was granted in May 2009. Furthermore, remaining reserves are less than 100,000 tonnes.

2.1.3 Inconsistent use of terminology and such not compliant with national and local guidance and a resultant lack of clarity on the ability of sites to meet the LBH apportionment. Whilst the LBH LAA 2017 attempts to regularise the position with references at Section 4.2 to the correct guidance it perpetuates, at paragraph 3.4, the concept of safeguarding as a means of providing for the LBH apportionment. Specifically, it states, *'This means that a total of 4.75 million tonnes of aggregate are identified and safeguarded within LBH.'*

The use of the word 'identified' is imprecise in the context of mineral planning guidance; no sites have been proposed for designation, if that is the intended impression this is attempting to create. LBH has had an opportunity to address the points in Section 4.2 and the penultimate paragraph of Section 5 since my representations in 2014.

Additionally, the final paragraph on page 11 (Section 4.1) claims that.

*'...the emerging LBH Local Plan Part 2 proposes to allocate three mineral safeguarding areas with an identified reserve of 4.75 million tonnes.'*

Firstly, we would refer to the definition of safeguarding (this does not provide for LBH's London Plan allocation). Secondly a mineral reserve is a site with planning permission for mineral extraction. This term can only relate to the remaining reserves at Sipson, anything else is a potential resource which does not constitute an identified reserve.

#### 2.1.3.1 Terms used by LBH:

*'Mineral Areas for Safeguarding', 'Preferred Mineral Safeguarding Area', 'Mineral Safeguarding Areas', 'Preferred Mineral Area', 'Mineral Safeguarding Sites', Safeguard Areas for Minerals', 'Safeguarded Sites for Minerals' and 'Broad Locations'.*

*Refer to the references stated in paragraph 1.2 above*

## 2.2 Issue: Section 8: Mineral Safeguarding

### Document: Site Allocations & Designations

#### Considerations:

Any reference to Safeguarding in the context of designating sites for future mineral extraction is incorrect, refer to section 1.2 above. There appears to be no evidence of the correct application of PPG Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 27-008-20140306, Revision date: 06 03 2014.

- 2.2.1 *Prior to the publication of the LBH LAA 2017 no distinction was attempted for sites that could be Specific Sites, Preferred Areas or Areas of Search using the criteria described. This has important consequences for the effect on the ability of the sites stated as being 'safeguarded' to provide for the LBH apportionment and, furthermore, to accord with the anticipated timescale.*
- 2.2.2 *H12 (Land west of Harmondsworth Quarry): We would refer you to our representation in respect of MIN1 and MIN2 dated 31 October 2014. The position remains the same to the best of our knowledge.*
- 2.2.3 *H18 (Bedfont Court): We would refer you to our representation in respect of MIN1 and MIN2 dated 31 October 2014. Planning permission for mineral extraction was granted on 20 January 2003 (reference 58005/APP/2003/1389) but has since lapsed. Nevertheless, the landowner is supportive of mineral extraction and the site should therefore be afforded the status of a Specific Site as opposed to Area of Search currently.*
- 2.2.4 *Land at Moorbridge Farm (North of H18 (Bedfont Court)): The land is owned by LBH and it is understood that officers are prepared to report proposals to elected Members for their consideration in regard to entering into a legal agreement with an operator to facilitate mineral extraction. Should this be agreed then the site should therefore be afforded the status of a Specific Site as opposed to Area of Search currently.*
- 2.2.5 *In June 2017 Norfolk County Council issued a 'Call for Sites' & its e-mail dated 26 June 2017 and associated questionnaire are attached as Appendix 1. These highlight certain relevant issues in respect of landowner involvement and the status of sites. It is considered that these are useful in contemplating the sites being considered by LBH.*
- 2.2.6 *H14 (Sipson) should not be considered for designation as planning permission for mineral extraction already exists.*
- 2.2.7 *No consideration has been given to Mineral Consultation Areas, please refer to our submission in respect of MIN1 and MIN2 dated 31 October 2014 and the Planning Practice Guidance paragraph 003 Reference ID: 27-003-20140306, Revision date: 06 03 2014*

# Minerals Specific Site proposal form – Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan

## Section 1- Details of the person completing this form

- 1.1 Name.....
- 1.2 Address.....
- 1.3 Company.....
- 1.4 Contact telephone no.....
- 1.5 Email address.....
- 1.6 Are you the owner of the land proposed? Yes/No (delete as applicable) If yes go to Section 3
- 1.7 Are you a mineral operator? Yes/No (delete as applicable)
- 1.8 Are you an agent acting on behalf of the landowner? Yes/No If yes go to Section 2

## Section 2 – Details of the landowner of the site submitted

- 2.1 Name.....
- 2.2 Address.....
- 2.3 Company.....
- 2.4 Contact telephone no.....
- 2.5 Email address.....

## Section 3 – Landowner willingness

- 3.1 Does the landowner have full control of the mineral rights on the site (excluding those whose right is retained by the Nation)? Yes/No (delete as applicable)
- 3.2 Is the landowner willing for site to be allocated for mineral extraction? Yes/No

**There is a declaration at the end of this form which must be signed by the landowner.**

- 3.3 Has the landowner made a formal agreement with any mineral operator for the following?

- i) minerals exploration Yes/No (delete as applicable)
- ii) minerals extraction Yes/No (delete as applicable)

- 3.4 If a formal agreement has been made does it expire before the end of 2036? Yes/No

- 3.5 Is the proposal of this site for allocation, as a mineral extraction site, supported by a mineral operator? Yes/No (delete as applicable)

If a mineral operator is supporting this site please give their details

- 3.6 Company.....
- 3.7 Address.....
- 3.8 Contact name and job title.....
- 3.9 Telephone no.....
- 3.10 Email address.....

## Section 4 – Site Details

### Site Summary

4.0 Site name.....

4.1 Site area in hectares (two decimal places).....

**A location plan should be submitted with this form. The site proposed should be outlined in red and any other land in the control of the landowner outlined in blue. The scale of the map should be sufficient to show the whole of the site proposed and landholding.**

**A site plan should be submitted with this form. The site proposed should be outlined in red and show any additional site details relevant to the potential allocation of the site (see additional site details). The scale should be sufficient to show the site and any additional site details.**

**An access plan should be submitted with this form showing the proposed lorry route from the site to a suitable road (trunk road, A-road, main distributor or HGV access route).**

4.2 Have mineral investigations been carried out on the site? Yes/No (delete as applicable)

**If yes please supply, with this form, borehole logs and a mineral report containing information on the quality, quantity and extent of the mineral resource which is of commercial interest.** Only sites proposed for mineral extraction with an estimated resource of at least 500,000 tonnes will be considered for allocation, unless the site will be operated as an extension to an existing permitted site.

4.3 Estimated mineral resource on site (tonnes)?.....sand and gravel / carstone/ silica sand (delete as applicable)

4.4 Potential start date for mineral extraction on site.....

4.5 Estimated output per annum (tonnes)?.....

4.6 Estimated life of the mineral working in years?.....

4.7 Estimated number of HGV movements per day?.....

### Additional site details

#### Proximity to Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Area or Ramsar site

4.8 Is the site within five kilometres of a SAC, SPA or Ramsar site? Yes/No (delete as applicable)

In order for the site to be considered suitable for allocation evidence will need to show that no significant adverse effects on the SAC, SPA or Ramsar sites are likely from mineral extraction.

*Further information on the potential impacts of mineral extraction on wildlife and habitats and mitigation measures should be submitted if:*

- i) *the site is within 5 kilometres of a SAC, SPA or Ramsar site, or;*
- ii) *the site is further away than the distance in (i) but the proposer of the site considers that the potential for adverse impacts to a SAC, SPA or Ramsar site exists*

4.9 Are you submitting further information regarding potential impacts to a SAC, SPA or Ramsar site? Yes/No (delete as applicable)

### Proximity to Sites of Special Scientific Interest

In order for the site to be considered suitable for allocation evidence will need to show that no significant adverse effects on the SSSI are likely from mineral extraction.

**4.10** Is the site within 250 metres of a SSSI which has a geological interest? Yes/No

**4.11** Is the site within 3 kilometres of a SSSI which has a biological interest? Yes/No

*Further information on the potential impacts of mineral extraction on wildlife and habitats and mitigation measures should be submitted if:*

- iii) the site is within 250 metres of a geological SSSI,*
- iv) the site is within 3 kilometres of a biological SSSI, or;*
- v) the site is further away than the distance in (i) and (ii) but the proposer of the site considers that the potential for adverse impacts to a SSSI exists*

**4.12** Are you submitting further information regarding potential impacts to SSSIs? Yes/No

### Proximity to the Norfolk Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)

**4.13** Is the site within the Norfolk Coast AONB? Yes/No (delete as applicable)

**4.14** Is the site within 3km of the boundary of the Norfolk Coast AONB? Yes/No

*Further information on the potential impacts of mineral extraction on landscape and mitigation measures should be submitted if:*

- i) the site is within the Norfolk Coast AONB, or;*
- ii) the site is outside the AONB but the proposer of the site considers that the potential for adverse impacts to the AONB exists*

**4.15** Are you submitting further information regarding potential impacts to the AONB? Yes/No

### Proximity to the Broads Authority executive area

**4.16** Is the site within the Broads Authority executive area? Yes/No (delete as applicable)

**4.17** Is the site within 3km of the Broads Authority executive area? Yes/No (delete as applicable)

*Further information on the potential impacts of mineral extraction on landscape and mitigation measures should be submitted if:*

- i) the site is within the Broads Authority executive area, or;*
- ii) the site is outside the Broads Authority executive area but the proposer of the site considers that the potential for adverse impacts to the area exists*

**4.18** Are you submitting further information regarding potential impacts to the Broads Authority Executive Area? Yes/No (delete as applicable)

### Core River Valley

**4.19** Is the site within a Core River Valley? Yes/No (delete as applicable)

*Further information on the potential impacts of mineral extraction on the landscape and mitigation measures should be submitted if the site is within a Core River Valley.*

**4.20** Are you submitting further information regarding potential impacts to a Core River Valley? Yes/No (delete as applicable)

## Proximity of the site to local wildlife and conservation designations

Locally wildlife and conservation designations include areas such as County Wildlife Sites, Local Nature Reserves, and Roadside Nature Reserves.

**4.21** Is there a local wildlife and conservation designation on land within the site? Yes/No (delete as applicable)

**4.22** Is there a local wildlife designation on land within 250 metres of the site? Yes/No (delete as applicable)

*Further information on the potential impacts of mineral extraction on wildlife and habitats and mitigation measures should be submitted if:*

- i) there are local wildlife designations within the site, or;*
- ii) the proposer of the site considers that the potential for adverse impacts to local wildlife designations exists?*

**4.23** Are you submitting further information regarding potential impacts to local wildlife designations? Yes/No (delete as applicable)

## Trees and Ancient Woodland

The potential exists for mineral extraction to impact on Ancient Woodland through issues such as dust deposition (especially to micro-flora), disturbance of root-zones and fragmentation.

**4.24** Are there any trees of significance on the site? Yes/No (delete as applicable)

**4.25** If yes, are these covered by a Tree Preservation Order? Yes/No (delete as applicable)

**4.26** Are you submitting further information regarding potential impacts to trees of significance? Yes/No (delete as applicable)

**4.27** Is the site within 250 metres of Ancient Woodland? Yes/No (delete as applicable)

*Further information on the potential impacts of mineral extraction on Ancient Woodland and mitigation measures should be submitted if:*

- i) the site is within 250 metres of Ancient Woodland, or;*
- ii) the site is further away than the distance in (i) but the proposer of the site considers that the potential for adverse impacts to Ancient Woodland exists?*

**4.28** Are you submitting further information regarding potential impacts to Ancient Woodland? Yes/No (delete as applicable)

## Amenity

**4.29** Are there any sensitive receptors (e.g. residential dwellings, schools, workplaces, healthcare facilities) within 250 metres of the site? Yes/No (delete as applicable)

*Further information on potential amenity impacts and mitigation measures should be submitted with this form if:*

- i) the site is within 250 metres of a sensitive receptor, or;*
- ii) the site is further away than the distance in (i) but the proposer of the site considers that there is the potential for adverse amenity impacts on any sensitive receptors.*

**4.30** Are you submitting further information on amenity? Yes/No (delete as applicable)

## Historic Environment and Archaeology

i) The historic environment is defined as ‘all aspects of the environment resulting from the interaction between people and places through time...’. Heritage assets are buildings, monuments, sites, places, areas or landscapes having a degree of significance because of its heritage interest within the historic environment. In most cases the setting of a heritage asset will influence its significance. Heritage assets can be formally designated through national legislation as either scheduled monuments, protected wreck sites, battlefields, listed buildings, registered parks and gardens, World Heritage Sites, and Conservation Areas or assets identified by a local planning authority.

**4.31** Is the site within 250 metres of a heritage asset? Yes/No (delete as applicable)

**4.32** Is the site within the setting of a heritage asset? Yes/No (delete as applicable)

*Further information on the potential impacts of mineral extraction on the historic environment and mitigation measures should be submitted if:*

- i) the site is within 250 metres of a heritage asset,*
- ii) the site is within the setting of a heritage asset, or;*
- iii) the site is further away than the distance in (i) and (ii) but the proposer of the site considers that the potential for adverse impacts to the significance of a heritage exists?*

It should be noted that even if potential impacts are considered to be ‘less than substantial’ then section 66(1) and section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires that planning decision-takers give special regard to the desirability of preserving and enhancing a Listed Building or Conservation Area including its wider setting if this affects significance.

ii) Most, if not all proposed mineral extraction sites will require a site investigation to be undertaken prior to the submission of a planning application, influencing the mitigation strategy (e.g. preservation in situ, watching brief and/or preservation by record).

**4.33** Are there any areas of known archaeological interest within the site? Yes/No

**4.34** Are there any areas of known archaeological interest within 250 metres of the site? Yes/No

**4.35** Have there been any archaeological finds within the site? Yes/No (delete as applicable)

**4.36** If archaeological finds have been found on the site, what was it? and what is the Historic Environment Record no. if known?.....

## Agricultural Land classification

**4.37** Please state the Agricultural land classifications that occur within the site.....

**4.38** If agricultural grade 3 occurs within the site, has a detailed soil survey been undertaken to identify grades and sub-grades 3a and 3b? Yes/No (delete as applicable)

**If a detailed soil survey has been undertaken please submit it with this form.**

*If agricultural land grade 1 occurs within the site, the proposer of the site will need to provide further information to demonstrate that there are no alternative locations for the development, in accordance with policy DM16 of the adopted Minerals and Waste Core Strategy.*

**Electricity and Gas Transmission, and water infrastructure**

**4.39** Are there any electricity and gas transmission, or water infrastructure assets which cross the site? Yes/No (delete as applicable)

**4.40** If there are any electricity and gas transmission, or water infrastructure assets, please give details.....

**Restoration**

**4.41** Please provide details of the proposed restoration scheme and after-use

.....  
.....  
.....

**Landowner Declarations** (complete as applicable)

i) Land and mineral owner Declaration

As the land and mineral owner, I declare that, I am willing for the submitted site to be allocated for mineral extraction for the duration of the plan period (up to the end 2036), and that I have full control of the mineral rights on site (except those reserved by the Nation).

Signed..... Printed.....

Date.....

ii) Landowner Declaration

As the landowner, I declare that, I am willing for the submitted site to be allocated for mineral extraction for the duration of the plan period (up to the end 2036).

Signed..... Printed.....

Date.....

iii) Mineral owner Declaration

As the mineral owner, I declare that, I am willing for the submitted site to be allocated for mineral extraction for the duration of the plan period (up to the end of 2036), and that I have full control of the mineral rights on site (except those reserved by the Nation).

Signed..... Printed.....

Date.....

**Please return this form and any additional information required to:**

Planning Services, Norfolk County Council, County Hall, Martineau Lane, Norwich, NR1 2DH

Or by email to: [LDF@norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:LDF@norfolk.gov.uk) by **4 August 2017**

**From:** Jeffery, Caroline [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 26 June 2017 10:20  
**To:** Local Development Framework <[ldf@norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:ldf@norfolk.gov.uk)>  
**Subject:** Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review - call for mineral extraction sites

### **Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review – call for mineral extraction sites**

I am writing to inform you that the “call for mineral sites” for the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review, will take place for six weeks, from **26 June to 4 August 2017 (inclusive)**, and **I would welcome proposals for potential specific site allocations for carstone, sand and gravel, or silica sand extraction in the period up to 2036**. We are not seeking proposals for the extraction of any other minerals. Specific sites are where viable mineral resources are known to exist, landowners are supportive of minerals development and the proposal is likely to be acceptable in planning terms.

Only sites proposed for mineral extraction with an estimated resource of at least 500,000 tonnes will be considered for allocation, unless the site will be operated as an extension to an existing permitted site.

A form is available on the Norfolk County Council website at [www.norfolk.gov.uk/nmwdf](http://www.norfolk.gov.uk/nmwdf) (on the Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review page) which must be used for the submission of mineral extraction sites into the allocations process. The form contains a number of questions regarding the site proposed and the area surrounding it. Information that will need to be provided includes:

- a map of the site location and proposed HGV access route
- landowner willingness for the site to be included as a mineral extraction site allocation
- borehole data and a statement as to the quality, quantity and extent of the mineral resource which is of commercial interest
- information on planning constraints relevant to the proposed site location (including environmental designations, landscape, the historic environment, agricultural land, amenity and infrastructure)

Proposers of sites should ensure that sufficient information is provided to demonstrate, at examination, that a site is suitable for allocation.

The proposed specific sites will be subject to public consultation and therefore it is expected that the information provided, except for borehole data, may be made publicly available.

Specific sites for mineral extraction can be proposed to Norfolk County Council by post and email ([LDF@norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:LDF@norfolk.gov.uk)) and should be received by Norfolk County Council by **4 August 2017**.

### **Next steps**

Following the “call for mineral sites” process the County Council will assess the sites submitted, in consultation with other relevant statutory bodies. If the County Council concludes that the submitted information is insufficient to determine whether a site is acceptable in principle, the proposer of the site will be given the opportunity to supply additional information. A site specific

allocation will not be proposed in the draft Plan unless it is likely to meet the tests of soundness at Examination in Public.

After the “call for mineral sites” period finishes, the next stage in the preparation of the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review will be the publication of a public consultation document, which is planned to take place later in 2017.

### **Background information**

The Norfolk Minerals Site Specific Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) is part of a joint review process of all three of Norfolk’s adopted minerals and waste DPDs. In accordance with national guidance, part of the review process will consolidate these documents into a single Minerals and Waste Local Plan. Norfolk’s adopted minerals and waste DPDs are:

- Norfolk Core Strategy and Minerals and Waste Development Management Policies DPD (2010-2026)
- Norfolk Minerals Site Specific Allocations DPD
- Norfolk Waste Site Specific Allocations DPD

The national Planning Practice Guidance states that most local plans are likely to require updating in whole or in part at least every five years. The requirement for a planned five-yearly review was incorporated into the adopted Core Strategy.

The current adopted Plan period is up to the end of 2026; the Review will extend this Plan period up to the end of 2036 to ensure consistency with the other Plans being developed by the Local Planning Authorities in Norfolk.

As part of the production of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan, Norfolk County Council will assess the predicted demand for mineral extraction up to 2036 and aim to allocate specific sites to meet the predicted demand.

The sites that are allocated in the adopted Minerals Site Specific Allocations DPD, for which planning permission has not yet been granted, are being reassessed as part of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review, alongside any sites proposed in response to the current ‘call for mineral extraction sites’. There is no guarantee that existing allocated sites will continue to be allocated in the Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review.

Any enquiries should be made to [LDF@norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:LDF@norfolk.gov.uk). Please also contact Norfolk County Council if you do not wish to receive any further correspondence regarding the Norfolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review.

Regards

**Caroline Jeffery**

**Principal Planner (Minerals and Waste Policy)**

Planning Services

Environment and Planning

Community and Environmental Services Department

[Redacted]

[Redacted]

**Norfolk County Council**

General enquiries: 0344 800 8020 or [information@norfolk.gov.uk](mailto:information@norfolk.gov.uk)

[www.norfolk.gov.uk](http://www.norfolk.gov.uk)