

## Appendix 2

### Call In information received from Councillors making the call in and other supporters.

*Cllr Geoffrey Hipperson*

*17 November 2019 07:13*

Dear Lorraine,

I would like to call in the cabinet decision on the Consultation regarding the Norfolk Waste and Minerals Plan because it raises issues of wider concern.

One of the reasons for wider concern is that although Shouldham Warren is only, at present, designated an "area of search" the area proposed includes part of a site that was previously part of a "preferred area" for sand extraction. This indicates that even without further survey part of the proposed area of search is already considered suitable for use.

The site ,although privately owned and let for forestry, is used to a wide extent as an amenity area for walkers, a safe cross country running place for both children and adults, and many other outdoor activities. In addition it is an environmentally beneficial area for both plants and wildlife, and the impact of disturbance by quarrying needs further study.

*Cllr Michael Howland – supporting Cllr Geoffrey Hipperson*

*14 November 2019 12:15*

Hello Lorraine,

Please accept this e-mail as confirmation of my support for Cllr. Hipperson calling in the above Preferred Options Consultation Decision regarding the NCC Minerals and Waste Local Plan Review Cabinets Decision.

I am supporting Cllr.Hipperson because we both share the same Ward and have issues of wider and greater concern.

*Cllr Alun Ryves – supporting Cllr Geoffrey Hipperson*

*18 November 2019 10:05*

I would like to call this decision in for the following reasons

1. This is an issue that effects Rural Parts of the Borough and a number of my constituents have commented to me that The Borough is really only about Kings Lynn., I understand why they sometimes might think that and believe that an issue such as this which effects these rural wards should be called in, not least so constituents can have access to detailed discussion by members of the matter.

2. Specifically, I am concerned that this document does not specifically rule out the future use of incineration as stated in WP10 below

“Policy WP10: Residual waste treatment facilities Residual waste treatment facilities will only be acceptable within a purpose designed or suitably adapted facility on the types of land identified within Policy WP3, and where the proposals meet the development management criteria set out in Policy MW2. The treatment of waste that could practicably be recycled or composted will not be acceptable. Conditions will be placed on planning permissions to ensure that only residual source-separated or pre-sorted waste is treated. Facilities that include thermal treatment of waste must provide for the recovery of energy and, where practicable, heat; and the use of combined heat and power will be encouraged”

I think new councillors should be given the opportunity to discuss the pros and cons of incineration in the County.

3. MIN74, 77, 206. Of particular concern to my constituents, as expressed in the public meeting attended by Councillor Long In Tottenhill, is the proposed extension of quarrying in that area, with the associated noise and transport issues. This is particularly so as there are plans to establish a Safari Park in this area and it is difficult to see how intensified quarrying will assist a project that might be a major tourist facility in West Norfolk. The disruption from these proposals also needs to be considered within the context of the planned growth of Watlington. In the view of residents, this area is over quarried.
4. Additionally, There is deep public concern at the threat posed to SHOULDHAM WARREN by AoS E which covers a wide area. Quite apart from the problem of transporting silicone sand to the reprocessing facility, this site is a valuable Borough amenity. Our local MP Ms Truss has participated in protests against this plan. A theme of this protest is that resources could be directed more towards recycling glass than extracting silicone sands to make more of it, and additionally, whilst West Norfolk is the only part of Norfolk with this resource there are more accessible deposits and infrastructure in other parts of the country and we would like NCC to challenge the strategic assumption that Norfolk should supply this material when there is no obvious advantage to the County from so doing. This is especially so as the assumptions underlying the need for silicon sand include a requirement for fracking (now on hold) and ignore the fact that considerable amounts are exported.

I would like these issues to be discussed and if found of merit be included in the response by the Borough to the NCC minerals and Waste Local Plan Review.

*Cllr Jim Moriarty – supporting Cllr Geoffrey Hipperson*

*18 November 2019 22:38*

Hello Lorraine

I believe you have had a number of requests to call in the above. I can already count more than four but to ensure Cllr Hipperson's is taken into consideration as his fellow ward councillor is away, I will add my name to his call-in.

*Cllr Alexandra Kemp*

*18 November 2019 14:51*

1. Draft Waste Plan leaves West Norfolk vulnerable to Incineration

I would like to call in this response because it does not do what it should do to protect West Norfolk and it has not considered the fact that the policies in the plan review are criteria-based and could leave West Norfolk open to speculative planning applications for large waste incinerators, like autoclave and pyrolysis, on any piece of ground permitted for waste or business use. This is clearly unacceptable.

The Cabinet's response does not consider the distress this would cause to West Norfolk residents, 65,000 of whom voted no to incineration in the Borough Poll.

Norfolk has a No-Incineration in Norfolk Policy, this is a material planning consideration but only applies to Norfolk County Council as Waste Disposal Authority, but not to third-party developers.

"The Criteria In Policy WP3: Land potentially suitable for waste management facilities – STRATEGIC POLICY state that Waste management facilities (other than landfill sites and water recycling centres) will be acceptable only on the following types of land:

- a) land benefiting from a permanent permission for an existing waste management use;
- b) land in existing general industrial use (B2 use class) or in existing storage or distribution use (B8 use class) (excluding open air composting);
- c) land allocated for B2 and B8 uses in a local plan or development plan document (excluding open air composting);
- d) land within or adjacent to redundant agricultural and forestry buildings; e) previously-developed (brownfield) land (excluding open air composting); f) former airfields (open air composting only);
- f) water recycling centres (composting and anaerobic digestion only)."

These criteria are much too wide.

Policy W10 in The Preferred Options Plan at Page 56 clearly leaves all forms of thermal treatment permissible under the plan. This places West Norfolk at risk. The Willows site does not yet have a definite future outcome. EP Energy have an option to build a Power Station but this is not a certainty as they have not yet been awarded the Energy Credits.

**The Borough's response should state that the plan must state that incineration as a form of residual waste facility is not acceptable in West Norfolk where 65,000 residents voted against incineration in the Borough Poll.**

2. Extraction of Abnormal Hydrocarbons - Fracking

The Borough's response does not mention material considerations of the risks relevant to West Norfolk of fracking and should say that the plan should exclude fracking certainly in West Norfolk.

King's Lynn is the only town in Norfolk vulnerable to applications from fracking as there is shale gas in West Winch.

The Government's current halt to fracking due to its causing earthquakes may not last due to industry pressure.

The draft policy MP12 at page 90 says that fracking would only be allowed where it would not cause unacceptable environmental impacts.

However, everywhere that prospecting for fracking, or fracking itself has happened has cause earthquakes and risks damage to people's homes and creates boreholes in the landscape.

*Cllr Alun Ryves – supporting Cllr Alexandra Kemp*

*18 November 2019 15:01*

I have already supported the proposal put forward by the mayor in respect of shouldham Warren which is being put forward as AoS e, and having read your concerns am pleased to put my name to your presentation.

MdW is also working on something I think....

*Cllr Jo Rust*

*18 November 2019 15:09*

I'd like to call this in too please?

For the following reasons

There is wider concern is that although Shouldham Warren currently designated an "area of search" the area proposed includes part of a site that was previously part of a "preferred area" for sand extraction . This indicates that even without further survey part of the proposed area of search is already considered suitable for use.

And also, although the site is privately owned and let for forestry, it is widely used as an amenity area for walkers, a safe cross country running place for both children and adults, and many other outdoor activities. At a time when our health and activity is an area of concern, this proposal could end this. In addition it is an environmentally beneficial area for both plants and wildlife, and the impact of disturbance by quarrying needs further study.

*Cllr Michael de Whalley – supporting Cllr Alexandra Kemp and Cllr Jo Rust*

*18 November 2019 16:50*

Dear Lorraine

I write to support both Alexandra Kemps' and Jo Rust's call-ins. I intend to write some additional points tonight after the hustings.

*Cllr Alexandra Kemp – supporting Cllr Jo Rust*

*18 November 2019 17:03*

Dear Lorraine and Lorraine,

I support Cllr Rust's call-in below about Shouldham.

*Cllr Michael de Whalley*

*19 November 2019 11:34*

Dear Lorraine,

Please accept this as my call-in for the council's delegated response to NCC's Mineral and Waste Strategy.

Policy WP10

In the local poll undertaken by the Borough Council of King's Lynn and West Norfolk regarding incineration, an overwhelming majority (65,516 voters – 93%) clearly demonstrated the public's rejection of incineration.

It is inconceivable that this same Borough Council now misses the opportunity to make any on residual waste thermal treatment. Rejection of this technology must be unambiguously stated by this council in the final definitive response to the minerals and waste consultation.

If the Council insists on not responding, at the very least it should explain why. This is particularly important due to the growing concerns that Norfolk may have secretly agreed to provide residual waste to the proposed Wisbech incinerator less than a kilometre from the Norfolk border. Incineration and air pollution does not recognise county boundaries. Generally, pollution from incinerators starts to reach the ground and is at its highest concentration one kilometer downwind of the stack. With prevailing southwesterly winds this means that the vast bulk of the pollution will fall in and across Norfolk. Cambridges' mineral and waste plan is its affair, how our waste is treated and where is ours.

Policy MW4 b)

Thermal treatment facilities fail the criterion to minimise carbon dioxide emissions. Combustion by its very nature produces carbon dioxide. The proposed Wisbech incinerator, with a 50MW generating capability, burning 500,000 tonnes of waste each year will make a substantial contribution to global warming. With 42% of the UK's residual waste being burnt in 44 operational incinerators any additional incineration capacity will harm recycling and increase carbon emissions.

SIL01 forms part of a valuable wildlife corridor on the edge of King's Lynn serving the Gaywood River, Roydon Common SAC, Sugar, Leziate and Derby Fen SSSIs. These important ecological assets cannot thrive if they are increasingly isolated by development and quarrying. The extraction sites worked by Silbelco and/or their predecessors, located to the North West, have been left in an appalling state with NO RESTORATION. The water in the resulting lakes is badly discoloured from low pH/contamination and therefore significantly detracts from the natural environment. Planning was recently granted for the development of housing on Leziate Sailing Club land with the loss of community assets. There is local concern that the site will not be appropriately restored and, if it is, that it will not be sufficiently protected long-term. This is typical of what can happen at extraction sites therefore West Norfolk deserves a much more robust and environmentally constructive response to these policies. The council's attention is drawn to the introduction in Breckland of protective buffer zones around Special Areas of Conservation (SAC) as an example of the kind of

measures that can be introduced. Such zones would be of value around for example Roydon Common and Dersingham Bog SAC. The council is encouraged to include such provision in its response to policy MW5.

*Cllr Alexandra Kemp – supporting Cllr Michael de Whalley*

*19 November 2019 11:35*

Dear Lorraine,

I support this call-in from Cllr de Whalley.

*Cllr Alun Ryves – supporting Cllr Michael de Whalley*

*19 November 2019 11:52*

I support this call in by cllr de Whalley