



Essex Replacement Minerals Local Plan: Pre-Submission Draft Sustainability Appraisal and Strategic Environmental Assessment Environmental Report: Annex F - Consultation Responses November 2012

Contents

| 1 | Introduction | 1 |
|-----|------------------------|---|
| 1.1 | Background | 1 |
| 1.2 | Consultation Responses | 1 |
| 2 | Consultation Responses | 2 |

List of Tables

| Table 1: | Consultation | Responses and Actions | . 2 |
|----------|--------------|-----------------------|-----|
|----------|--------------|-----------------------|-----|

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

Essex County Council commissioned Place Services (formerly part of Essex County Council's Spatial Planning Group) to undertake a Sustainability Appraisal, incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA), on the proposed Replacement Minerals Local Plan: Pre-Submission Draft.

Place Services are acting as consultants for this work; therefore the content of the SA/SEA should not be interpreted or otherwise represented as the formal view of Essex County Council.

This document is Annex F to the Environmental Report and sets out the consultation responses of previous consultations.

1.2 Consultation Responses

This annex shows the consultation representations received on SA/SEA matters from the previous Preferred Approach Stage Minerals Local Plan, alongside those actions undertaken in response. Also included are those responses received for the SEA Statement on Additional Sites, August 2011.

2 Consultation Responses

Table 1: Consultation Responses and Actions

| Consultee | Comment | Action |
|---------------------------------|---|--|
| Silver End Parish Council | Object to the impact on Storeys' Wood (as per page 86 of the SA/SEA document) | Noted. |
| Rivenhall Parish Council | In the SA/SEA, at 7.7.2, table 11, sites A7 and A5 are described as extensions to Bradwell Quarry. Clearly they are not, and A6 is only marginally connected. | Noted. |
| Natural England (Q6) | Natural England notes that the purpose of undertaking the SA/SEA at this stage of the process is to identify potentially significant sustainability effects that may arise should the additional and revised sites that have been submitted during the consultation period for the MDD: Preferred Approach December 2010 be chosen as Preferred Sites. Having reviewed the SA/SEA, we agree with the Conclusions that it is not (yet) possible to determine how Sites A44, A45 and A46 will impact on biodiversity and landscape. However, it is clear that there are strong negative impacts on the sustainable use of land in the short and medium terms (with respect to Grade 1 and Grade 2 agricultural soils). Finally, we note that a full SA/SEA appraisal will be undertaken to accompany the MDD: Submission Draft. | Noted. |
| Maldon District Council (Q6) | The Sustainability Appraisal prepared by Essex County Council fails to consider a wide range of issues affecting the proposed development, as noted in para. 2.4 of the Issues and Options Paper, August 2011, including: • Biodiversity • Air quality • Greenhouse gases • Landscape character | Issues surrounding biodiversity, landscape character and transport have been addressed in the Pre-Submission SA/SEA appraisal of Site A46. |
| | • Economy | |
| | Transport | |
| | It is therefore not possible to address crucial elements of the impacts of the proposed workings and further information is required at this stage to | Strongly negative impacts were given for the impact on Grade 2 |

| Consultee | Comment | Action |
|---|--|--|
| | enable further consideration. This is particularly important as the SA itself notes that; "all three sites (including A44) have been assessed as having strongly negative impacts on the sustainable use of land in the short and medium terms." | soil under Sustainability Objective 4. |
| English Heritage (Q6) | We are concerned that Table 2.4 Appraisal of the Short, Medium and Long Term Impacts in the Sustainability Appraisal does not give sufficient weight to the historic environment impacts of the above sites (A44, A45, A46 & D6). | Noted. This has been addressed in the Pre- Submission SA/SEA appraisal of Site A44, A45 and A46. |
| Woodham Mortimer & Hazeleigh PC) (Q6) | Concern generally on the effect of the proposal over environmental, wildlife, agricultural, infrastructure. | Noted. |
| 484 (Q6) | Reaffirm previous objections to Tyndales Farm proposal due to potential environmental and health damage to Danbury. A414 through Danbury is already over capacity, the extra pressure from the gravel extraction lorries would be unacceptable. | Noted. |
| Rep 1287 | It is difficult to rationalise the non inclusion of site A20 Wivenhoe, an extension to an existing site situated with easy access to the main roads with the only operating tarmac plant in the area. The loss of the Tarmac plant will mean importation of black tarmac from either Ipswich or Chelmsford to the north Essex area including any bath side development. This does seem contrary to the aims of reducing traffic movement and environmental costs and impacts. | Noted. |
| | The inclusion of site A17 Frating Hall as a preferred site over A20 does suggest an issue with your scoring system. A17 is a green field site with no current infrastructure in open countryside containing very high quality agriculture land. Compare to A20 Wivenhoe where the land is of poor quality but more importantly the plant and equipment currently in place are low level and not intrusive. | |
| Rep 2411 | The assessment is flawed because it does not consider the cumulative impact on the local community of the Airport and the quarry combined. To take this quarry | Noted. Cumulative impacts are explored in the SA/SEA assessment of sites where |

| Consultee | Comment | Action |
|-----------|--|---------------------------|
| | in isolation would be a travesty. We have been subject to 8 years of planning blight form the airport and no sooner does that end than we are threatened with 5 years of blight from the quarry and 15 years of extraction misery. We are subject to noise, air pollution and stress. Our lives are turned upside down. We can't move because our houses are unsalable. So we must stay and tolerate the injustice of this proposes quarry. Cumulative impact must be considered. The quarry must be rejected and the people of Pledgdon Green given a chance to live life. | information is available. |



This information is issued by **Place Services Team at Essex County Council** You can contact us in the following ways:

Visit our website: essex.gov.uk

By telephone: 08456 430 430

By post: **Place Services, Essex County Council PO Box 11, County Hall, Chelmsford, Essex, CM1 1QH**

Read our online magazine at essex.gov.uk/ew

Follow us on **Essex_CC** Find us on **facebook.com/essexcountycouncil**

The information in this document can be translated, and/ or made available in alternative formats, on request.

Published November 2012