

Application SCC/0093/25SC- Westerfield Quarry; Re-Consultation post Regulation 25

Swilland and Witnesham Parish Council Response

The Parish Council re-affirms all the objections it made to the original proposal on 10 September 2025 and asks for these to be fully considered in determining the application.

In addition, the Parish Council asks that full account is taken of the following comments and objections on the Regulation 25 Re-consultation.

Massive Public Concern

Suffolk County Council needs to fully consider the massive level of local public knowledge and concern shown in the nearly 2000 objections made to this proposal in the initial consultation and the level of continued objection shown in the Re-consultation.

Inadequate Response to Regulation 25 Request

TRU has not provided adequate or reasoned answers to the Regulation 25 questions put to it by Suffolk County Council in October 2025.

TRU has not engaged with the public or parish councils in developing the amended proposals. As with the initial proposals TRU has failed to engage and consult with the public, contrary to NPPF 16c

None of the information in the amendments or appendix submitted by TRU reduce the impact of the quarry proposal on the local communities of Westerfield, Tuddenham, Witnesham and North Ipswich. The proposal would be an unacceptable highway safety, environmental and business risk to these communities, contrary to national and local planning policy, particularly NPPF 8,12,116 and 214

Transport and Highway Safety

Despite the Suffolk County Council request, TRU has not submitted any verification of its stated increased number of 86 HGV movements per day. This is a huge and unacceptable 151% increase in HGV traffic on the B1077. Moreover, this is considered to be an underestimate. If the proposed 1.7 million tonnes of aggregate are to be extracted over 16 years and an infill of 1.3 million tonnes, (which again is considered to be an underestimate) this would require up to 116 HGV movements per day, causing an even greater impact on highway safety and traffic congestion. There is no way of enforcing the number of HGV movements on the B1077 initially, or as TRU may change them in the future

Section 6 of the Transport Environmental Impact Assessment remains entirely deficient as it does not take any account, as required by the Institute of Sustainability and Environmental Professionals guidelines of the impact of the increased level of HGV movements on groups in our communities who would be adversely affected, including children, the elderly, cyclists, schools, nursing homes, recreation areas and our pubs.

The additional road and travel mitigation measures through Westerfield do not make the B1077 any safer.

No account has been made of the increased congestion that would be caused at Westfield level crossing by an increase of at least 151% of HGV traffic nor the planned increased frequency of crossing closures due to the planned increase in train traffic, nor the two proposed sets of traffic lights between the crossing and the A1214 roundabout.

Nor from the increased roadside parking outside Henley Gate Country Park as the car park has limited spaces.

The new proposed staggered layout for Westerfield crossroads would cause more congestion, especially at peak hours on Church Lane and Lower Road, with greater risk to highway safety.

The applicant remains dismissive, with no adequate assessment of the impact of the increased levels of HGV on the A1214 and the safety impact of this on cyclists, school crossings, other road users and road junctions, including the Colchester Road roundabout.

It is completely unacceptable that there has been no assessment nor assurance of the levels of increased HGV traffic on the B1077 north of the quarry site through Witnesham. The southern part of the village has a minimum road width of 4.75m on a sharp bend with a pavement width of 0.7m, close to a nursing home and children's recreation area. It is already a very high safety risk for 2 HGVs to pass (minimum requirement 5.5m) along this stretch of road. At the north end of the village, children and parents walk on a narrow pavement beside the B1077 and have to cross the road to get to the school. Witnesham is extremely vulnerable to any increase in HGV movement. No mitigation measures are proposed and it is difficult to see any that would resolve an unacceptable impact on highway safety that would be caused by the increased level of HGV traffic.

The TRU travel management plans to reduce traffic impact for HGV on the B1077 are not plausible and there is no way of enforcing the number of HGV movements on the B1077 initially, or as TRU may change them in the future.

There continues to be no assessment of the extra costs of maintaining the B1077 and that will result from the large increase in HGV traffic. This could be up to £1.8 million

over the 16-year operating period of the quarry and would have to be borne by Suffolk County Council.

There remains a completely unacceptable impact the quarry would have on highway safety along the whole on the B1077 between the A1214 and the B1078 caused by the increased level (at least 151%) of HGV traffic. This would be contrary to NPPF 116 and Policy GP3 of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan and is the clear conclusion reached by the "Westerfield Quarry Transport Review" undertaken by Railton TPC Ltd which is attached to the "Stop the Quarry" consultation response as an appendix. This review raises serious questions on the applicants Transport Assessment/Travel Plan, Create March 2025 and Addendum January 2026. The Parish Council asks the County Council to fully consider the findings and conclusions of the Railton review.

Failure to Show a Need for the Quarry and Landfill

TRU was asked to provide a "Needs Case" for the quarry. It has not been able to make a sound or reasoned one. Its bogus case is based on incorrect figures and calculations. It claims 350 tonnes of aggregate are needed for every new house built for the Ipswich Strategic Planning Area between 2020(!) and 2036, culminating in a need of 4.9 million to 6.2 million tonnes, whereas the real figures are only 43 tonnes per house equating in a need of 1.054 million tonnes pa which can already be supplied from existing, approved sites. The calculations carried out for the quantities of aggregate required for office, industrial and infrastructure projects are similarly overstated and cannot be taken seriously. The TRU Needs Case uses figures that are completely bogus

The Suffolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan (SMWP) 2020 to 2036 and its annual Suffolk Aggregate Assessment (latest March 2026) is the relevant base for a needs assessment against which applications should be determined. Suffolk County Council has confirmed that the "SMWP is still providing a robust framework for the supply of local aggregates as Suffolk has over eight years capacity of supply when the national requirement is seven and sites in the Plan provide for a further 10 years of supply". The Plan provides for a need of around 1.5 million tonnes pa, well above the current level of need. (0.74 million tonnes in 2024)

As there is no public need for the Westerfield quarry proposal, Suffolk County Council should consider this quarry proposal as non "Sustainable Development" and refuse this application on these grounds alone as it is contrary to NPPF 8,9,11.

Failure to Comply with the Development Plan

None of the proposed changes to the application make it compliant with the statutory Development Plan, comprising the Suffolk Minerals and Waste Local Plan 2020, the Suffolk Coastal Local Plan 2020 and the Westerfield Neighbourhood Plan 2025 as required by NPPF 11,12, 15.

Noise and Vibration; Public Health Risks and Disturbance

The applicant's responses to specific questions raised by Suffolk County Council on noise and vibration are dismissive and inadequate. No satisfactory assessment of noise and vibration effects from the proposed quarry have been provided. Fynn Valley Golf Club and its members, as a sensitive receptor, are ignored, as are the residents in houses along the B1077. TRU response to the impact of noise and vibration on public right of way users and on-site workers is dismissive.

Harm to Heritage Assets and Valued Landscape

The revised landscape amendments do not reduce the substantial impact of the proposed quarry on the local landscape or on the cultural setting of the local listed buildings including Grade II* Westerfield Hall. The impact of a quarry in this setting is unacceptable and contrary to NPPF 187, 212, 213, 214, 215.

The new proposal to provide a 4.5m high and 100m long straw bale screen in front of the Phase 4 workings would be alien and out of character with the local landscape and the setting of the grade 2*listed Westerfield Hall

Planting a 20m band of Gorse on the embankment is also out of character to the local farmland and furthermore it is an invasive species and there will be real concern of it spreading to the adjacent golf course as it is a nightmare to control.

Adverse Impact on Local Business

No independent economic assessment has been undertaken yet although Suffolk County Council agreed to do so in March 2025. This is a serious gap in the impact assessment of the quarry which this parish council called for in August 2025.

As there is no need for the quarry, the proposal would not create a net gain in employment. The claim of 9 new jobs is outweighed by the likely loss of jobs at other quarries and haulage firms, and businesses in the local recreation, tourism and hospitality businesses. Of particular concern is the impact of the quarry on the membership, operation, jobs and future investment of Fynn Valley Golf Club and its associated businesses, contrary to NPPF 103

Increased congestion from HGV traffic will impose delays and costs on local businesses, particularly those at Westfield Business Centre and will deter patrons from using the two pubs and restaurants in Westerfield. The proposal would be contrary to NPPF 85,88,200

Conclusion

None of the added information or changes submitted by TRU reduce the serious damaging impact the proposed quarry would have on the local communities of Witnesham, Westerfield, and Tuddenham.

Suffolk County Council needs to fully consider the massive level of local public knowledge and objections (over 2000) shown to this proposal.

This application should be refused as;

- There is no public need for this quarry, and it;
- Fails to provide adequate impact assessments on transport and traffic, noise and the economy and local businesses.
- Should not be considered as Sustainable Development, contrary to NPPF 8,9,11.
- Conflicts with the Development Plan, (SMLP, SCLP, and Westerfield NP), contrary to NPPF 11,12,15 and SMWLP GP3
- Causes an unacceptable and severe impact on road safety, failing to satisfy NPPF 115,116
- Causes unacceptable harm to heritage assets and the wider landscape, contrary to NPPF 212,213,215,219 and 187
- Adversely impacts on local businesses, contrary to NPPF 85, 88, 103, 200.
- Causes serious noise disturbance with risk to public health and loss of amenity contrary to NPPF 198
- Failed to engage with the public and Parish Councils, contrary to NPPF 16c

Swilland and Witnesham Parish Council urges Suffolk County Council to refuse this application and protect the wellbeing of our valued local community, heritage, environment and businesses interests against this unnecessary and unsafe speculative development.

Thank you

18/6/26