



Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 14-17 and 21, 22 and 24 November 2017

Site visit made on 23 November 2017

by John Woolcock BNatRes(Hons) MURP DipLaw MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 03 April 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/C3240/W/17/3167459

Pave Lane Quarry, Pave Lane, Newport, Shropshire TF10 9AX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a failure to give notice within the prescribed period of a decision on an application for planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mick George Ltd against Telford and Wrekin Council.
 - The application Ref: TWC/2016/0437, is dated 11 May 2016.
 - The development proposed is extraction of sand and gravel and importation of inert fill material to achieve a beneficial restoration of the site.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed, and planning permission is refused for a quarry for the extraction of sand and gravel and importation of inert fill material for the progressive restoration of the site including the raising of ground levels to the south-west of Muster Hill.

Preliminary matters

2. Telford and Wrekin Council (TWC) failed to make a decision on the planning application in the required amount of time. However, had it been able to do so, TWC would have refused the application. The reason for refusal would have made reference to:

1. There is no need for the mineral and the proposal would result in an uncontrolled oversupply of minerals provision.
2. The application does not demonstrate that the site is significantly more acceptable overall than the allocated sites or the preferred area at Woodcote Wood. The proposal would not offer significant environmental benefits, but would have significant harmful effects on the countryside.
3. The need for the waste facility as an additional landfill site has not been established and any purported benefits of the proposal would be significantly outweighed by the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.
4. The potential cumulative impact of working both the Woodcote Wood and Pave Lane sites concurrently is not considered sustainable.

And that the proposal would be contrary to relevant policy in relation to each of these reasons.

3. In addition, third parties and local residents raised concerns about the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, residential amenity, highway safety, hydrology and biodiversity.
4. The application was accompanied by an Environmental Statement dated May 2016 (ES), in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 (hereinafter the EIA Regulations).¹ **However, the appellant's closing submissions to the Inquiry stated that the proposed altered landform in the restoration scheme shown on Drawing No.P2/16/04A had not formed part of the formal stated assessment in the ES.**
5. To address this matter an EIA Regulation 22 request for further information was made on 5 December 2017. Subsequently ***Additional Information – Regulation 22 Request***, December 2017, Volume IV of the ES (abbreviated to FEI), was submitted on 19 December 2017.² I requested additional cross-sections to show the proposed restoration levels in the context of the nearby hills. These were subsequently submitted on 9 January 2018 (AA-BB).³
6. Notwithstanding that the Inquiry had been closed on 24 November 2017, the parties and interested persons were given the opportunity to submit written representations about the FEI and AA-BB.⁴ In considering the appeal I have taken the ES, FEI, AA-BB and representations into account, along with the rest of the Environmental Information, which includes all the evidence adduced at the Inquiry. The latter includes information about the likely cumulative effects of the scheme with other development proposed in the area. I am satisfied that the information before the Inquiry reasonably complies with the EIA Regulations.
7. The FEI **amended the description of the proposed development to “Proposed quarry for the extraction of sand and gravel and importation of inert fill material for the progressive restoration of the site including the raising of ground levels to the south-west of Muster Hill.” TWC has no objection to this amended description, which more accurately reflects the proposal as shown on the submitted drawings. No-one would be prejudiced by this alteration at the appeal stage. I have, therefore, dealt with the appeal on the basis of the revised description.**
8. TWC adopted the Telford & Wrekin Local Plan 2011-2031 (LP) on 11 January 2018.⁵ The emerging plan was discussed at the Inquiry. Relevant LP policies supersede the saved policies cited in appeal documents and referred to at the Inquiry. The parties were given the opportunity to comment on the adoption of the LP.
9. **The Minutes of Shropshire Council’s South Planning Committee meeting held on 13 February 2018 state that it was resolved to grant planning permission for the construction of access to the B4379, extraction and processing of sand and gravel, re-profiling and restoration of the site, and related highway works to the B4379 and A41, at Woodcote Wood, Weston Heath, subject to conditions and legal obligations.⁶ These applications are for a site located about 1 km to**

¹ The transitional provisions in the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Regulations 2017 mean that the 2011 EIA Regulations continue to apply here.

² ID51.

³ ID52.

⁴ Eight submissions were received in the period provided for comment. ID54.1-8

⁵ ID53.

⁶ ID55.1, ID55.2 and ID55.3.

the south of the appeal site. The Woodcote Wood scheme would provide about 2.55 million tonnes of sand and gravel over a period of 13 years. Much of the evidence presented to **the Inquiry took the form of a 'beauty contest' between the Pave Lane and Woodcote Wood schemes.** But it is not for me to consider the relative merits of the schemes. I have dealt with the appeal on the merits of the Pave Lane proposal, having regard to all relevant considerations. This includes evidence about likely cumulative impacts in the event that both the Woodcote Wood and Pave Lane schemes proceeded concurrently.

10. The appeal scheme proposes the phased extraction of an estimated 2.65 million tonnes of sand and gravel and infilling with 1.5 million m³ of inert waste. The business model advocated by the appellant involves backhauling. The proposal includes provision for planting and woodland management for nine areas, comprising 8.96 ha, to enable biodiversity and landscape gains to **be achieved at the earliest stage of development as part of a 'Restoration First' policy.** Progressive restoration of the appeal site would be to agriculture, woodland and nature conservation. The appellant states that the project would be completed within a 15 year timeframe.
11. A planning agreement, dated 30 November 2017, would prohibit Heavy Commercial Vehicles (HCVs) associated with the proposed development from using Pave Lane to the west of the proposed site access, Pitchcroft Lane, and the lane to Stockton. The agreement would also provide that matters and actions set out in a Nature Conservation Management Plan would be implemented for a period of 25 years from the commencement date or until active extraction ceased (whichever was later). This would apply to several areas, including some existing woodlands located outside the appeal site. A Habitat Restoration and Monitoring Scheme would apply to land within the appeal site and would provide for woodland, grassland, wetland pools, hedgerows and conservation headlands around the margin of fields. These areas would be subject to an extended 15 year period of aftercare from the date of restoration. Provision would be made by the agreement for a local liaison group. The agreement would provide for the temporary diversion of the Public Right of Way (PRoW) currently across the site. On restoration, the temporary diversion would be dedicated as a permanent Public Bridleway Route in perpetuity.

Main issues

12. The main issues in this appeal are the effects of the proposed development, having regard to relevant policy, on:
 - (a) The character and appearance of the area.
 - (b) The living conditions of nearby residents and the amenity of the area.
 - (c) Agricultural land.
 - (d) Highway safety.
 - (e) Biodiversity.
 - (f) The steady and adequate supply of aggregate minerals.
 - (g) Waste management.
 - (h) The local and national economy.

I have also considered whether the need for aggregates and for a site for inert landfill, and/or any environmental benefits of the scheme, would be sufficient to outweigh any harm that might be caused.

Planning policy

13. LP Policy ER4 supports proposals for new sand and gravel sites if, amongst other things, the need for the mineral outweighs the material planning objections (Policy ER6) or if significant environmental benefits would be obtained. It adds that such proposals should demonstrate that they are environmentally acceptable to work and would be consistent with Policy ER6 and other relevant plan policies. The supporting text states that; **“Where the need for additional extraction of sand and gravel reserves can be demonstrated then consideration will be given to Pave Lane for sand and gravel extraction in line with policies ER4 and ER6, with reference to cumulative impact concerns if the site was to come forward in close proximity to Woodcote Wood site.”**
14. LP Policy ER6 supports mineral extraction, processing or associated development subject to no unacceptable impact, including cumulative impact, upon a number of factors. These include, amongst other things, local amenity; water resources; drainage systems; the soil resource from the best and most versatile agricultural land; farming; road safety and capacity; recreation facilities, including PROW; the appearance, quality and character of the landscape, countryside and visual environment; land stability; biodiversity; and heritage assets.
15. LP Policy ER7 sets out criteria for waste management facilities. These considerations include; (i) moving waste further up the waste hierarchy; (iii) rates of recycling, employment, impact on the local environment and contribution to the local community; and that (vi) new landfill (or land raise) sites would only be considered where there is an established need and provision would only be made for waste that cannot practically be recycled, composted or recovered.
16. Sand and gravel are defined in the Glossary to the *National Planning Policy Framework* (hereinafter the *Framework*) as minerals of local and national importance, which are necessary to meet society’s needs. Paragraph 142 states that minerals are essential to support sustainable economic growth and our quality of life, and that it is therefore important that there is a sufficient supply to provide, amongst other things, the goods the country needs. The *Framework* states that minerals of local and national importance should be identified and policies for their extraction included in preparing local plans, along with setting out environmental criteria against which applications should be assessed so as to ensure that operations did not have unacceptable adverse impacts, to include taking into account cumulative effects of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or a number of sites in a locality (paragraph 143). Great weight should be given to the benefits of mineral extraction, including to the economy (paragraph 144).
17. The *National Planning Policy for Waste* (NPPW) seeks to drive waste management up the waste hierarchy. Disposal is the least desirable solution where none of the other options in the hierarchy is appropriate. In determining applications the NPPW states that applicants should only be expected to demonstrate market need for waste facilities where proposals are not consistent with an up-to-date local plan. It adds that land raising or landfill

sites should be restored to beneficial after uses at the earliest opportunity and to high environmental standards. Appendix B of the NPPW sets out locational criteria for waste management facilities.

18. The *National Planning Practice Guidance* (hereinafter the *Guidance*) sets out guidance on, amongst other things, planning for mineral extraction, including assessing environmental impacts, restoration and aftercare. It refers to appropriate noise standards for normal mineral operations, along with limits for noisy short-term activities. It cites the provisions in the *Noise Policy Statement for England* (NPSE), which aims to avoid significant adverse impacts, and to mitigate and minimise adverse impacts, on health and quality of life.

Reasons

Character and appearance

19. The 51.6 ha appeal site comprises agricultural land, mostly under arable cultivation, with hedgerow boundaries, some of which are gappy. There are blocks of woodland to the north and east of the site. The land rises to the centre of the site, which is part of Muster Hill. This ridge is an outlier of the higher land to the south that includes Woodcote Hill and Heath Hill. As its name suggests Muster Hill is of some historic interest and it is a prominent feature because it is located in this transition zone between higher land to the south and lower land to the north beyond Pave Lane.
20. The site lies within National Character Area 66 'Mid Severn Sandstone Plateau', but its eastern boundary adjoins Area 61 'Shropshire, Staffordshire and Cheshire Plain'. In the Shropshire Landscape Typology the site lies within landscape type 'Sandstone Estatelands', a gently rolling, open landscape formed over sandstones. To the north of Pave Lane the land is described as rolling lowland with valley floor landscapes, as type 'Estate Farmlands'.
21. Although the appeal site is not the subject of any landscape designations, the rolling countryside and blocks of nearby woodland give the area a pleasant rural character. The existing PRoW across and adjacent to the site provide attractive views into the wider countryside. Greens Wood, an area of ancient replanted woodland, adjoins part of the western boundary of the site, and is a local feature in the landscape. **I concur with the appellant's assessment that the site and its immediate context is of medium landscape value.** However, the hills and woodland, and open aspect from the ridge, give the area considerable visual amenity.
22. An operational sand and gravel quarry, with a processing plant, would add activity from plant and equipment in this rural location. It would also reshape landforms, and so would significantly alter this part of the countryside. The resultant harm from the operational scheme, albeit temporary, would have a substantial adverse impact on the landscape character of the area.
23. In terms of likely visual effects, I accept that vehicles, plant and equipment operating within the void and within the processing plant could be effectively screened from view by mounding and the local topography. However, many views from public vantage points would then be towards engineered mounds. These could be grassed or planted, but they would still result in a loss of views over the wider rural landscape, which currently exist for those enjoying this part of the countryside. The proposed development would have a substantial adverse effect on the visual amenity of the area.

24. The proposed land raising in the south-western part of the site would create a domed landform on the lower and mid-slopes of the ridge that comprises Muster Hill. This is apparent from the cross-sections AA-BB. The appellant confirmed at the Inquiry that the dome is not required for drainage purposes. The dome would in places be more than 6 m higher than the existing ground levels. It would extend over a large area of up to about 300 m long and 300 m wide. It would rise to a height of over 128 m AOD, which would only be about 4 m lower than the height of Muster Hill (just over 132 m AOD). The overall scale of the dome would be such that it would compete for dominance with Muster Hill in some views, especially from the approaches to it from the south and west along Byways No.9 and No.10. From these vantage points the dome would appear as a substantial feature that would compete with Muster Hill for prominence in the local landscape because the dome would be sited closer to the viewer. The dome would be high enough to obscure some views of parts of Greens Wood from sections of these PRoW.
25. I consider that the proposed dome would appear as an engineered and unnatural feature in the context of the nearby hills. These comprise the hill to the south-east beyond Marl pits Wood (136 m AOD), the hill that contains Greens Wood (128 m AOD) to the north-west, along with Muster Hill to the north-east, of the proposed dome. I find that the proposed land raising would have a significant and permanent adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area because it would diminish the visual impact of Muster Hill in its local context. The wetland and tree planting as part of the proposed restoration would add interesting landscape features, but the harm in perpetuity that would result from the land raising would, in my judgement, far outweigh any such benefits.
26. If the Woodcote Wood scheme were to be implemented, a sand and gravel extraction operation and processing plant in this location would have some effect on the overall character of the wider area. However, I saw at my site inspection that the Woodcote Wood site is well screened from public vantage points by trees that would be retained as part of the proposal. I do not consider that the Woodcote Wood scheme would alter the character and appearance of the area to the extent that the Pave Lane scheme could be absorbed into the altered landscape without significant adverse impact. The same considerations would apply in assessing the likely cumulative landscape impact if both the Woodcote Wood and Pave Lane schemes were operational. The separation distance and intervening topography and vegetation would limit any combined or sequential cumulative effects. If both schemes were implemented I do not consider that the likely cumulative impact on the local landscape would add much to the impact of the Pave Lane scheme.
27. The PRoW across the site would be diverted during the operation, and the diverted route would become permanent on restoration of the appeal site. This addition to the local PRoW network would be useful, particularly in providing a circular route. However, it would in large part run between Greens Wood and the raised screening embankment that is proposed to be retained. It would therefore offer few views into the wider countryside. I do not consider that this addition to the local footpath network would be a benefit that should attract much weight in the planning balance.
28. On the first main issue, I consider that the proposed development would have a substantial adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area during its operation, and that significant and permanent harm to the local

landscape would result from the proposed land raising. This harm weighs heavily against the proposal.

The living conditions of nearby residents and the amenity of the area

29. The proposed mounding along the eastern, southern and western sides of the proposed operation would largely screen views into the operational void and mineral processing area, and would limit noise emissions from the site. As outlined above, these mounds would alter the appearance of the area, but would not be so high or close to residential properties so as to become overbearing or dominating features in the outlook from dwellings. The construction and removal of mounds would result in noise and disturbance, but this would be for a limited duration. Noise from diesel vehicles and plant could be restricted by conditions, but there would be occasions when particular activity in certain locations, combined with particular atmospheric or weather conditions, would result in noise, particularly low frequency noise, affecting the occupiers of dwellings located to the east off the A41, to the north off Pave Lane/Pitchcroft Lane and to the west off Childpit Lane.
30. Vehicles engaged in the land raising in the western part of the site might not be fully screened at all times by the proposed mounds and planting. If a direct line of sight were to exist from properties located off Childpit Lane, vehicle noise could be intrusive, especially when the wind was from the north-east. The section of this decision on waste management notes that the duration of this part of the operation might be dependent upon the availability of suitable fill material. I am not, therefore, convinced that this part of the scheme would accord with the NPSE with respect to its aims of minimising adverse impacts on the quality of life of those living nearby.
31. Similar considerations apply to concerns about the spread of dust from the operation. Measures could be required by condition to control dust, but fugitive dust might at times affect those using nearby PRow or living close to the site, depending upon the weather conditions.
32. Notwithstanding that the proposed operation could be subject to planning conditions that would contain noise and dust within acceptable standards, the development would at times likely be audible at nearby residential properties, and dust could at times affect those using this part of the countryside. Those experiencing these effects may well consider themselves to be adversely affected, even though the emissions might be compliant with relevant planning conditions. If so, this would, at times, harm the amenity of the area, and any such harm is a consideration that should properly be weighed against the benefits of mineral extraction.

Agricultural land

33. The ***Framework*** provides that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural environment by, amongst other things, protecting and enhancing soils. For mineral sites it notes, albeit for the preparation of local plans, that worked land should be reclaimed at the earliest opportunity, and that high quality restoration and aftercare takes place, including for agriculture (safeguarding the long term potential of best and most versatile agricultural land and conserving soil resources). Soil analysis indicates that 85% of the application site is classified as Grade 3a. The proposal would therefore affect the best and most versatile agricultural land.

34. Appropriate measures could be taken in handling and storing soils to safeguard them for future restoration of the site for agricultural use. However, some 8 ha of the site would be disturbed at any one time as the site was worked **progressively throughout the duration of the operation. The appellant's** intention is to restore agricultural land to its former best and most versatile status. But no examples of successful restoration of inert landfill sites to Grade 3a agricultural land were submitted in evidence to the Inquiry. In the **appellant's submission it would take** 5 years after completion of restoration for land to regain its Grade 3a status. But in reality much would depend upon how long soils were stored for, along with the weather conditions during their handling.
35. In practice it might not be possible to restore all the land to its former status, or it could take considerable time to do so. **Even if the appellant's submission** is correct, there would be a significant temporary loss of best and most versatile agricultural land. Land of lower agricultural quality should therefore be sequentially preferred in accordance with paragraph 112 of the **Framework**, which provides that the economic and other benefits of best and most versatile agricultural land should be taken into account, and that, where significant development of agricultural land is necessary, areas of poorer quality should be sought in preference to those of higher quality.
36. I consider that the proposal would result in the significant development of agricultural land, and that any need for sand and gravel should preferentially be sought from areas of poorer quality land than that which prevails at the appeal site. The evidence before the Inquiry does not demonstrate that the need for sand and gravel cannot be met from other sites comprising agricultural land of lower than Grade 3a quality. The temporary loss of best and most versatile agricultural land, along with the possibility of permanent harm to soil quality, is a factor that weighs against the proposal.

Highway safety

37. There is much local concern about the effects of HCVs from the proposed development on the local road network. HCVs would use an improved existing access onto Pave Lane and then join the A41. The A41 is no longer a trunk route, but a busy road well used by HCVs. Given the volume and speeds of traffic on the A41, I understand local concerns about the impact of the proposal on highway safety. However, there is no technical evidence to indicate that the existing junction onto the A41, with minor improvements, could not reasonably accommodate the likely traffic generated by the appeal scheme. Furthermore, there is nothing to indicate that the additional HCVs could not be reasonably absorbed into the existing flows along the A41.
38. I have also considered local concerns about the potential for a cumulative highways impact if the Woodcote Wood and Pave Lane schemes both proceeded. However, in that scenario it seems to me likely that the local market for sand and gravel might to some extent be shared between the two sites. So the number of HCVs on local roads, with both schemes operational, might not be substantially different from that if just one of the schemes was being worked. In any event, there is no technical evidence before the Inquiry that cumulative traffic impact on the A41 would overall result in unacceptable harm to highway safety or conflict with relevant policy. I find no reason to dismiss the appeal on highway safety grounds.

Biodiversity

39. During the operation the scheme would have an adverse impact on local wildlife. However, a Nature Conservation Management Plan would be implemented for a period of 25 years from the Commencement Date or until active extraction ceased (whichever was later). This would apply to several areas, including some existing woodlands located outside the appeal site. I consider that this would largely comprise necessary mitigation for the wildlife impact of the operational scheme, and as such should not be given much weight as a benefit in the planning balance.
40. A Habitat Restoration and Monitoring Scheme would apply to land within the appeal site and would provide for woodland, grassland, wetland pools, hedgerows and conservation headlands around the margin of fields. These areas would be subject to an extended 15 year period of aftercare from the date of restoration. It seems to me that the majority of the habitat restoration proposals in this scheme would be required to secure the proper restoration of the site. Nevertheless, the completion of the scheme would have some benefits for nature conservation.
41. I consider that the proposed development would, overall, have a neutral effect on biodiversity during its operation. Thereafter, given that the wildlife management measures proposed are time limited, I do not consider that much weight can be given to the nature conservation benefits of the scheme in the long term. Overall, I believe that the proposal would result in a benefit to biodiversity of minor significance.

The steady and adequate supply of aggregate minerals

42. The ***Framework*** states that authorities should plan for a steady and adequate supply of aggregates by, amongst other things, preparing an annual Local Aggregate Assessment (LAA), either individually or jointly by agreement with other authorities, based on a rolling average of 10 years' sales data and other relevant local information and an assessment of all supply options, and making provision for the maintenance of landbanks of at least 7 years for sand and gravel, and ensuring that large landbanks bound up in very few sites do not stifle competition. It adds that authorities should use landbanks principally as an indicator of the security of aggregate minerals supply.
43. The Shropshire LAA takes account of the supply and demand for aggregates for both Shropshire and TWC. This is a reasonable approach given the likely sub-regional nature of the market for aggregates that operates here. The 2016-17 Shropshire LAA indicated a landbank of 17 years, but noted potential issues about productive capacity given that about 70% of reserves were contained within three sites. However, it added that further sites were being allocated in Shropshire and further resources expected through windfall applications. The LAA notes that there is evidence of increased demand for aggregates with the recovery following the recession, but no known national or strategic infrastructure projects likely to increase demand.
44. Telford is identified as a growth area, but I do not consider that the evidence before the Inquiry indicates any significant changes in circumstances that would warrant coming to a different overall conclusion from that outlined in the latest LAA. However, it is questionable whether the local need for sand and gravel is being met in the most sustainable way. A substantial proportion is imported from quarries in Staffordshire and from distant quarries in

Shropshire. There are also some doubts about the ability of the Staffordshire quarries to continue supplying the Shropshire/Telford market at the current rate. There is the possibility that other quarries in Shropshire could make good any shortfall in supply, but the Pave Lane site would have some advantage given its proximity to Telford.

45. I have had regard to all the evidence before the Inquiry about the likely future demand for and supply of sand and gravel. Assessing future need is far from an exact science and various outcomes result from applying different assumptions. I agree with the appellant that it is simply impossible to demonstrate anything other than the broadest trends in terms of where supplies will be made to and what markets will be served.
46. **On balance, it seems to me that the appellant's submission overstates the likely demand, and I prefer TWC's approach.** This does not indicate any compelling local need. In coming to this finding I have had regard to the criteria set out in the *Guidance* for the grant of permission even if it is considered that the landbank is adequate. However, there would be some sustainability advantages in having a source of sand and gravel close to Telford. In the circumstances that apply here, I find that need for the sand and gravel is a consideration of some, but minor significance, which nonetheless is a benefit that weighs in favour of the proposal.

Waste management

47. Available data on the need for the disposal of inert waste and the capacity of sites likely to be used for this purpose is far from comprehensive. This is particularly so for waste soils, which the appellant considers would predominantly comprise the inert materials likely to be filled at the Pave Lane site. I have had regard to the submissions about the need for the disposal of inert waste, along with the likely availability of suitable landfill sites. However, it seems to me that this evidence, which includes the likely level of construction activity in Telford, falls far short of establishing a particular need for a landfill site in this locality that would provide for 1.5 million m³ of inert waste over the proposed 15 year operation.
48. **I share TWC's concerns about the potential for the operation to take longer than envisaged to restore because of insufficient suitable fill being available due to measures to promote the recycling of construction, demolition and excavation waste.** If this occurred it would either prolong the operation and any resultant harm, or require a revised restoration scheme that will not have been considered in determining the appeal. In addition, there might be commercial pressure to achieve the required restoration levels by using material that could otherwise potentially be recycled. The appellant accepts that the scheme would not constitute recovery within the technical definition of the term. So the proposed landfilling and land raising would be disposal for the purposes of applying the NPPW. The appellant also acknowledged at the Inquiry that in some cases mixed loads were considered to be too expensive to sort, and so the whole load was sent to landfill. It seems to me that such commercial decisions might be affected by the need to provide sufficient fill for the timely restoration of the site, and so would result in more recyclable material going to landfill than would otherwise be the case.
49. I have particular concern in this regard because the scheme includes a significant element of land raising above that which would be required to restore the site to its existing land levels. The proposed land raising in the

western part of the site would require 223,000 m³ of inert material. The appellant argues that 35% of this would come from the extraction of the void to construct embankment screens, and that a further 22% would arise from discarded silt and clay from the on-site centrifuge, and so only 97,000 m³ would be imported to the site. Nevertheless, that would still amount to a significant quantity of inert waste, where in future it is likely that less of this waste material will result from works as recycling is encouraged.

50. Furthermore, I am not convinced that there would be much landscape advantage in retaining the embankment screens instead of restoring the land to its existing levels. Even if tree planting had become established, these embankments would alter the appearance of the area and adversely affect views of Greens Wood. In addition, I see no reason why the discarded silt/clay could not ultimately contribute to filling the void up to the existing ground levels. If sufficient suitable inert waste was, for whatever reason, not available for the timely restoration of the site, then the scheme would be at odds with the advice in the NPPW that land raising or landfill sites should be restored to beneficial after uses at the earliest opportunity.
51. Notwithstanding that there would be some sustainability advantages in providing an inert landfill site close to Telford, I am not convinced that there is an established need for this landfill, or that provision would only be made for waste that cannot practically be recycled. In the circumstances that apply here, I am not satisfied that the proposal would move waste up the waste hierarchy. Notwithstanding the contribution the scheme would make to the local economy, I find that the proposed development would conflict with LP Policy ER7.

The local and national economy

52. The scheme would generate economic activity and employment in providing a supply of aggregate for the local construction industry and for the disposal of inert waste. Providing such a local facility could help in reducing transport costs and emissions. The appellant states that the proposal would create 42 full-time equivalent jobs, with a capital injection of £2.3 million and annual spend in the local economy of £1.45 million, along with an annual wage bill of £1.3 million and tax contribution of £1.2 million. The estimated gross value added to the local economy would be £3.4 million each year.
53. These are considerable benefits. I find that the local and national economic benefits of the mineral extraction and waste disposal would weigh significantly in favour of the proposal.

Planning balance

54. The appellant considers that LP Policy ER4 is out-of-date because it is not consistent with the ***Framework***. I disagree for the following reasons.
55. This policy supports sand and gravel extraction if one or more of certain criteria apply. Criterion ii is consistent with paragraph 143 fifth bullet point of the ***Framework*** concerning potential sterilisation of mineral resources. Criterion iii provides that significant environmental benefits would support sand and gravel extraction. There is nothing to indicate that this planning balance would be at odds with the balancing exercise required by the ***Framework***. The final sentence of the policy fully accords with paragraph 143 sixth bullet point concerning unacceptable adverse impacts.

56. **The appellant's submission that the policy is inconsistent with the *Framework*** stems from concerns about paragraph 144, and that Policy ER4 does not properly reflect provision in the *Framework* about securing the timely extraction of minerals. The first bullet point of paragraph 144 states that great weight should be given to the benefits of the mineral extraction, including to the economy.
57. Paragraph 142 of the *Framework* provides that it is important to make best use of finite mineral resources to secure their long-term conservation. That implies only using mineral resources when they are needed. Policy ER4 criterion i **refers to need. It seems to me that any 'need' arises directly from the likely** benefits of the minerals to society, including any economic benefits, of their timely extraction. If so, then Policy ER4 i sets out a balancing exercise involving need, which should properly incorporate likely benefits. It is not, therefore, inconsistent with paragraph 144 for this reason.
58. However, Policy ER4 i is silent about any weighting to be included in this balancing exercise. But it is not necessary for a policy to repeat *verbatim* extracts from the *Framework* for it to be up-to-date. Paragraph 215 of the *Framework* refers to due weight being given to relevant policies in existing plans according to their degree of consistency with the *Framework*. So weight can be given to policies that are not identical to those in the *Framework*. I do not consider that the omission of a reference **to 'great weight' is sufficient, by itself, to render the policy sufficiently at odds with the *Framework* such that it is 'out-of-date' for the purposes of applying paragraph 14.** Therefore, the planning balance that applies in determining this appeal is a straightforward balancing exercise of weighing the benefits of the proposed development against the harm, having regard to the three dimensions of sustainable development, as set out in paragraphs 6-10 of the *Framework*, without **applying a 'tilt' in favour of the grant of planning permission.** This planning balance is a matter of judgement.
59. Minor benefits would result from the additional PRow and to biodiversity. The need for the sand and gravel here is a consideration of minor significance. Awarding great weight (as required by the *Framework*) to a minor benefit would not increase by very much its contribution in the balancing exercise. Nevertheless, I consider that the benefits of these minerals, and to the economy, along with the other benefits, would be sufficient to outweigh the harm I have identified to agricultural land, the potential harm I have identified to waste management, and any harm to the amenity of the area. However, in my judgement, the overall benefits of the scheme would not be sufficient to also outweigh the temporary and permanent harm that would result to the local landscape. I find that the planning balance here falls against the proposal.
60. If I am wrong about Policy ER4's consistency with the *Framework* and it is out-of-date, **then the 'tilted' paragraph 14 balance would apply. In this scenario I** consider that the overall harm, especially to the landscape, would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the *Framework* taken as a whole. Even if the LP was found not to be up-to-date I find that the proposal would not accord with the policy set out in the *Framework*.
61. I consider that the proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on the appearance, quality and character of the landscape, the countryside and

the visual environment, and so would not be consistent with LP Policy ER6. The need for the mineral does not outweigh the material planning objections and no significant environmental benefits would be obtained. The proposal does not demonstrate that it would be environmentally acceptable to work, and is at odds with relevant plan policies concerning waste management. The scheme does not, therefore, gain support from LP Policy ER4.

62. I have found that the planning balance here falls against the proposal. The development would not be consistent with LP Policy ER6, and so would conflict with LP Policy ER4. The scheme would also be contrary to the provisions of LP Policy ER7 concerning waste management. This conflict with relevant development plan policies weighs heavily against the proposal and is sufficient to render the proposal at odds with the development plan as a whole. The **Framework** states that proposed development that conflicts with an up-to-date local plan should be refused unless other material considerations indicate otherwise.

Other matters

63. I have taken into account all the other matters raised in the evidence, including local concerns about the effects of the proposal on nearby heritage assets and on hydrology.
64. The settings of listed buildings located on Pave Lane, including Pave Lane Farmhouse, are limited to their immediate context within the settlement. The proposed development would be located a considerable distance from these buildings and so would not have a material effect on these heritage assets. Woodcote Hall, located about 340 m to the south of the appeal site, is a grade II listed building. But it was apparent at my site visit that its setting is limited by the surrounding woodlands and rising ground to the north. Given the separation distance and local topography, the proposed operation would preserve the setting of this designated heritage asset.
65. I have had regard to concerns about drainage and flood risk, but I am satisfied that these are matters that could be reasonably addressed by the imposition of appropriate planning conditions.

Conclusions

66. I am required to decide this appeal having regard to the development plan, and to make my determination in accordance with it, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. I have found that the proposal would conflict with the development plan when taken as a whole. There are no other material considerations here which indicate that a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan.
67. For the reasons given above and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed and planning permission refused.

John Woolcock

Inspector

SCHEDULE OF PLANS

P2/16/01	Site location plan
P2/16/02	Existing features
P2/16/03A	Working scheme
P2/16/04A	Restoration proposals
P2/16/05	Phasing plans
P2/16/06	Nature conservation management areas

APPEARANCES

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Vincent Fraser QC	Instructed by Jonathan Eatough, Assistant Director Governance, Procurement and Commissioning, Telford & Wrekin Council
-------------------	--

He called

Deborah Sacks MRICS MRTPI	Principal Sacks Consulting
Grahame French DipTP BSc(Hons) MRTPI	Principal Planning Minerals and Waste Shropshire Council

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Andrew Fraser-Urquhart QC	Instructed by Sloan Plumb Wood LLP
---------------------------	------------------------------------

He called

John Gough	Planning Director Mick George Limited
Dr Suzanne Mansfield BSc(Hons) PhD CIEEM CMLI	Director FPCR Environment and Design Limited
Gary Holliday BA(Hons) MPhil CMLI	Director FPCR Environment and Design Limited
Simon Tucker BSc(Hons) MCIHT	Director DTA Transportation Limited
Leslie Jephson BEng(Hons) IOA	Director LF Acoustics Limited
Dr Hugh Datson BSc PhD CSci FIO FGS	Retained Consultant to DustScanAQ
Christopher Leake BSc MSc FGS	Managing Director Hafren Water Limited
Malcolm Ratcliff MBA MA BSc(Hons) BSc MRICS MRTPI	Managing Director Charis Consultancy Limited

INTERESTED PERSONS:

Amanda Mattison	Local resident
Cllr Andrew Eade	Ward Councillor Telford and Wrekin Council
David Bridgwood	Wardell Armstrong
Cllr Peter Ward	Sheriffhales Parish Council
Gordon Tonkinson	Local resident
Bridget Page	Local resident
Cllr Bill Harper	Chetwynd Aston and Woodcote Parish Council
David Griffin	Newport Civic Trust

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE INQUIRY (ID)

ID	1	Report on the Examination of the Telford & Wrekin Local Plan 2011-2031.
ID	2	Environmental Permit for Granville/Woodhouse Landfill Site.
ID	3	Highways Agency extracts from Geometric Design of Major/Minor Priority Junctions.
ID	4	Highway Advice Note re Woodcote Wood
ID	5	Proposed access layout for Woodcote Wood.
ID	6	Extract from Woodcote Wood Transport Assessment.
ID	7	Shropshire Council Development Management Report re Woodcote Wood.
ID	8	Shropshire Council deferral notice re Woodcote Wood application.
ID	9	Opening statement of Mick George Limited.
ID	10	Extract from Inspector's Overview of Preferred Areas for sand and Gravel , Shropshire Minerals Local Plan.
ID	11	Written statement by Amanda Mattison.
ID	12	Petitions submitted by local residents.
ID	13	Shropshire Local Aggregates Assessment 2016-17.
ID	14	Statement of Cllr Andrew Eade.
ID	15	Supplementary evidence of Mr French on mineral proposals in Shropshire.
ID	16	Adopted Policy Maps Shropshire Council.
ID	17.1	Ms Sacks response to Inspector's questions.
	17.2	Digest of Waste and Resources Statistics – 2017 Edition.
ID	18.1	Supplementary Statement of David Bridgwood Wardell Armstrong.
	18.2	Appendices 1-6.
ID	19	Emails from Andy Savage WSP to Shropshire Council 8 and 9 November 2017.
ID	ID	Plan of Hanson Condover site.
ID	21	Application form for sand and gravel extraction at Land near Shipley.
ID	22	Email from Adrian Cooper with list of sites contributing to the landbank, dated 15 November 2017.
ID	23	Summary Proof of Evidence by John Gough.
ID	24	Supplementary Statement by John Gough
ID	25	Defra Guidance for Successful Reclamation of Mineral and Waste Sites August 2004.
ID	26	Cambridge and Peterborough Minerals and Waste Development Plan SDP July 2011.
ID	27	Summary Proof of Evidence of Gary Holliday
ID	28	Summary Proof of Evidence of Dr Mansfield.
ID	29	Summary Proof of Evidence by Mr Jephson.
ID	30	Response to statement by Ms Mattison regarding noise at Greenbank by Mr Jephson.
ID	31.1	Plan showing base of mineral OAD.
ID	31.2	Plan showing mineral isopachytes.
ID	32	Photomontages Drawing No.6752-L-01 C.
ID	33	Note by Mr Holliday about heights of soil mounds in model.
ID	34	Summary Proof of Evidence by Mr Tucker.
ID	35	Minutes of Sheriffhales Parish Council 14 July 2016.

ID	36	Letter of authority for Mr Peter Ward to speak on behalf of Sheriffhales Parish Council.
ID	37	Summary Proof of Evidence by Dr Datson.
ID	38	Summary Proof of Evidence by Mr Leake.
ID	39	Additional information by Mr Gough about the destination of inert waste.
ID	40	Statement of Gordon Tonkinson.
ID	41	Statement of Bridget Page.
ID	42	Committee report for Shire Oak Quarry 6 July 2017.
ID	43.1	Planning permission for Saredon Quarry 16 December 2015.
ID	43.2	Extract from Environmental Statement for Saredon Quarry July 2013.
ID	43.3	Agricultural land classification Saredon Hill Farm.
ID	44	Statement by David Griffin.
ID	45	Planning obligation under section 106 dated 30 November 2017.
ID	46	Joint statement on sand and gravel and inert landfill sites 24 November 2017.
ID	47	Email from Dr Powell-Davies dated 16 November 2017.
ID	48	Suggested planning conditions.
ID	49	Planning authority closing statement.
ID	50	Closing submissions of the appellant.
ID	51	Additional Information – Regulation 22 Request December 2017 Volume IV of the ES.
ID	52	Additional cross-sections AA and BB submitted 9 January 2018.
ID	53	TWC adoption of the Telford & Wrekin Local Plan 2011-2031 (LP) on 11 January 2018.
ID	54.1	Comments by TWC dated 8 February 2018.
ID	54.2	Comments by Mick George Ltd.
ID	54.3	Comments by residents of Childpit Lane.
ID	54.4	Comments by Dr Philip Powell-Davies.
ID	54.5	Comments by Chetwynd Aston and Woodcote Parish Council.
ID	54.6	Comments by Mr PG Walsh.
ID	54.7	Comments by Mr R and Mrs P Yates-Ward.
ID	54.8	Comments by Amanda Mattison and David Bowsher.
ID	55.1	Decision Notice Woodcote Wood Construction of access to B4379, extraction and processing of sand and gravel, dated 16 February 2018.
ID	55.2	Woodcote Wood Development Management Report, 13 February 2018.
ID	55.3	Minutes of Shropshire Council meeting 13 February 2018.

CORE DOCUMENTS (CD)

MGL Reference	Date of Correspondence/Document	Author	Description
MGL 1 A	03/02/2016	JG	Letter from John Gough (JG) to David Fletcher (DF) - Potential Pave Lane Quarry. Enc. Pave Lane Quarry Drg 114
MGL 1 B	08/02/2016	VK	Letter from Vijay Kaul (VK) to John Gough - General excavation works and mineral mining
MGL 1 C	11/02/2016	JG	Letter from JG to VK - Progressing the planning application
MGL 1 D	22/02/2016	SC	Email from Sarah Clifton (SC) to JG - Pave Lane Pre-app
MGL 1 E	22/02/2016	VK	Email from VK to Kelly Sanderson - FAO Mr V Kaul : Potential Pave Lane Quarry
MGL 1 F	23/02/2016	JG	Letter from JG to Sarah Clifton - Potential Pave Lane Quarry
MGL 1 G	29/02/2016	JG	Letter from JG to Fran Lancaster (FL) - Discussion of working schemes and restoration proposals Pave Lane Quarry Drg 114
MGL 1 H	07/03/2016	VK	Letter from VK to JG - General excavation works and mineral mining, latest Policy position
MGL 1 I	28/04/2016	JG	Letter from JG to VK - Update on progress and response to Authority's Local Plan
MGL 2 A	11/05/2016	JG	Covering Letter
MGL 2 B	11/05/2016	JG	Application Form
MGL 2 C	11/05/2016	JG	Non-Technical Summary
MGL 2 D	11/05/2016	JG	Environmental Statement Vol I
MGL 2 E	11/05/2016	JG	Environmental Statement Vol II
MGL 2 F	11/05/2016	JG	Environmental Statement Vol III
MGL 2 G	11/05/2016	JG	Planning Statement
MGL 3 A	20/05/2016	VK	Letter from VK to JG - Acknowledgement of Application
MGL 3 B	03/06/2016	JG	Letter from JG to VK - Proposed Pave Lane Quarry. Letter enclosures not provided -see items MGL 2C and 2D.
MGL 3 C	24/06/2016	JG	Letter from JG to VK - Proposed meeting with David Fletcher (DF) and Kate Stephens (KS)
MGL 3 D	27/06/2016	VK	Email from VK to JG - Chase up response - Pave Lane
MGL 3 E	28/06/2016	JG	Letter from JG to VK - Statutory Consultation Responses
MGL 3 F	08/07/2016	VK	Email to JG from VK - TWC/2016/0437 - Pave Lane Quarry. Email attachments not provided, see items 4H and 4L.

MGL 3 G	20/07/2016	JG	Letter from JG to VK - Response to EHO queries and consultation responses to noise Processing Plant Drawing
MGL 3 H	20/07/2016	VK	Email to JG from VK – Pave Lane Quarry. Email attachments not provided, see items 2D and 2F.
MGL 3 I	21/07/2016	JG	Letter from JG to VK - Market "Needs" Appraisal and HGV routing. Letter enclosures not provided, see item 2F.
MGL 3 J	26/07/2016	JG	Response to Ecological Consultant's queries
MGL 3 K	27/07/2016	JG	Letter from JG to VK - Archaeological Evaluation report provided. Email attachment not provided, see item 4O.
MGL 3 L	27/07/2016	VK	Email from VK to JG - TWC/2016/0437 - Pave Lane – Quarry.
MGL 3 M	03/08/2016	JG	Letter from JG to VK - Response to EA consultation response
MGL 3 N	15/08/2016	JG	Letter from JG to VK - Response to Wardell Armstrong and Shropshire County Council consultation responses
MGL 3 O	16/08/2016	JG	Letter from JG to VK - Extension of time and determination date
MGL 3 P	13/09/2016	JG	Email from JG to VK – Chaser regarding Extension of time
MGL 3 Q	13/09/2016	VK	Email from VK to JG – Pave Lane TWC/2016/0437 – Extension of Time
MGL 3 R	14/09/2016	JG	Email from JG to VK – Pave Lane Extension of Time
MGL 3 S	21/09/2016	JG	Email from JG to VK – Pave Lane Quarry Highways
MGL 3 T	22/09/2016	JG	Letter from JG to VK - Concern on potential impact on dwellings answered and Revised working plan. P2 16 03 Rev A and P2 16 07
MGL 3 U	23/09/2016	VK	Email from VK to JG - TWC/2016/0437 - Pave Lane Quarry – Highways. Email attachment not provided, see item 4U.
MGL 3 V	26/09/2016	JG	Letter from JG to VK - Response to comments made by Jacobs
MGL 3 W	04/10/2016	JG	Letter from JG to VK – Extension of time to allow determination of the application
MGL 3 X	07/10/2016	VK	Email to JG from VK - Pave Lane Quarry - Extension to time to allow determination of the application
MGL 3 Y	07/10/2016	JG	Letter from JG to VK - Extension of time
MGL 3 Z	12/10/2016	JG	Letter from JG to VK - Extension of time
MGL 3 AA	12/10/2016	VK	Email to JG from VK – Re. Extension of Time

MGL 3 AB	13/10/2016	JG	Letter from JG to VK - Extension of time. Datasheet_kleeman_mc110_EVO_en and Photo Mobile Plant
MGL 3 AC	14/10/2016	JG	Letter from JG to VK - Updated noise Report and Photomontage. 6752_L_01_Photomontage RevB and Pave Lane Childpit Baseline Noise Report
MGL 3 AD	18/10/2016	JG	Letter from JG to VK - Ecological Matters
MGL 3 AE	26/10/2016	JG	Letter from JG to VK - Ecological Matters
MGL 3 AF	03/11/2016	JG	Letter from JG to KS - Proposed Pave Lane Quarry
MGL 3 AG	04/11/2016	JG	Letter from JG to VK - Proposed Pave Lane Quarry. Copy Correspondence ref Barnsely Lane site 19-10-16 and Fig SMS 1
MGL 3 AH	08/11/2016	VK	Email to JG from VK – Proposed Pave Lane Quarry
MGL 3 AI	09/11/2016	VK	Email to JG from VK - Pave Lane Application Queries and Ecological Comments. Email attachment not included, see item 4Y.
MGL 3 AJ	11/11/2016	JG	Email to VK from JG – Pave Lane Application Queries
MGL 3 AK	11/11/2016	VK	Email to JG from VK – Pave Lane application Queries. Email attachment not included, see item 4X.
MGL 3 AL	21/11/2016	JG	Letter from JG to VK – Pave Lane Quarry, Application Ref. TWC/2016/04. Fig PRoW 1, Photograph P1, Photograph P2, Photograph P3, Photograph P4, P2/16/04 Rev A
MGL 3 AM	29/11/2016	JG	Letter to VK from JG – Pave Lane Quarry, Application Ref TWC/2016/0437
MGL 3 AN	29/11/2016	VK	Email to JG from VK – R.E. Pave Lane Quarry TWC/2016/0437
MGL 3 AO	30/11/2016	JG	Letter to VK – Pave Lane Quarry, Application Ref. TWC/2016/0437
MGL 3 AP	01/12/2016	VK	Email to JG – TWC/2016/0437 – Pave Lane – Permissive Bridleway
MGL 3 AQ	02/12/2016	JG	Letter to VK – Pave Lane Quarry, Application Ref. TWC/2016/0437 – Section 106 Provisions
MGL 3 AR	15/12/2016	JG	Letter to VK – Pave Lane Quarry, Application Ref TWC/2016/0437
MGL 3 AS	03/01/2017	JG	Letter to VK from JG – Pave Lane Quarry, Application Ref. TWC/2016/0437, Determination of the planning application.

MGL 3 AT	11/01/2017	VJ	Email to JG from VK - RE: Pave Lane Quarry - TWC/2016/0437
MGL 3 AU	12/01/2017	JG	Letter to VK from JG – Pave Lane Quarry, Application Ref. TWC/2016/0437
MGL 4 A	27/05/2016	Alison MacDonald	Response from Historic England. See item 3E for MGL’s response to the comments.
MGL 4 B	31/05/2016	Patrick Thomas	Response from Highways England. See item 3E for MGL’s response to the comments.
MGL 4 C	Unknown	Melissa Fraser	Response from Severn Trent Water. See item 3E for MGL’s response to the comments.
MGL 4 D	08/06/2016	Unknown	Response from Shropshire County Council’s Policy & Environment Sustainability Group re Archaeology. See item 3E for MGL’s response to the comments.
MGL 4 E	09/06/2016	Unknown	Response from Telford & Wrekin Council’s Built Heritage Conservation Group. See item 3E for MGL’s response to the comments.
MGL 4 F	10/06/2016	Grady McLean	Response from Natural England. See item 3E for MGL’s response to the comments.
MGL 4 G	19/06/2016	Mrs A. Bowsher and Mr D. Bowsher	Public response from residents of Greenbank re drainage. See item 3E for MGL’s response to the comments.
MGL 4 H	20/06/2016	Mr R and Mrs P Yates-Ward	Public response from residents of 33 Childpit Lane re land levels. Topographical Survey 16/014_01. See item 3G for MGL’s response to the comments.
MGL 4 I	21/06/2016	Anthony Francis-Jones	Response from Telford & Wrekin Council’s Local Access Forum. See item 3E for MGL’s response to the comments.
MGL 4 J	22/06/2016	Unknown	Response from Telford & Wrekin Council’s Arboriculture Team. See item 3E for MGL’s response to the comments.
MGL 4 K	23/06/2016	Unknown	Response from Telford & Wrekin Council’s Drainage Team. See item 3E for MGL’s response to the comments.
MGL 4 L	05/07/2016	George Fowler	Public response from resident of Childpit Lane re noise. Environmental Noise Report (Soundtesting). See items 3G and 3AC for MGL’s response to the comments.

MGL 4 M	Unknown	Mike Atherton	Response from Church Aston Parish Council
MGL 4 N	08/07/2016	Fran Lancaster	Response from Telford & Wrekin Council's Ecologist . See item 3J for MGL's response to the comments .
MGL 4 O	21/07/2016	Graeme Irwin	Response from the Environment Agency. See item 3M for MGL's response to the comments .
MGL 4 P	29/07/2016	Graeme French	Response from Shropshire Council's Development Services . See item 3N for MGL's response to the comments .
MGL 4 Q	29/07/2016	J.D. Pears	Response from Wardell Armstrong on behalf of Apley Estate. See item 3N for MGL's response to the comments .
MGL 4 R	Unknown	Paula Doherty	Response from Telford and East Shropshire Ramblers
MGL 4 S	Unknown	Unknown	Response from Chetwynd Aston and Woodcote Parish Council
MGL 4 T	18/08/2016	Lee Jakeman	Response from Newport Town Council
MGL 4 U	19/08/2016	Owen Witherow	Jacobs report commissioned by Telford & Wrekin Council (Highways). See item 3V for MGL's response to the comments .
MGL 4 V	23/08/2016	Unknown	Response from the Newport Society
MGL 4 W	23/08/2016	Cllr John Pay	Second response from Church Aston Parish Council
MGL 4 X	24/08/2016	Fran Lancaster	Second response from Telford & Wrekin Council's Ecologist . See item 3AL for MGL's response to the comments .
MGL 4 Y	13/10/2016	Fran Lancaster	Third response from Telford & Wrekin Council's Ecologist . See item 3AL for MGL's response to the comments .
MGL 4 Z	18/10/2016	MR	Response from Telford & Wrekin Council Highways and Transport
MGL 4 AA	14/11/2016	Unknown	Response from Telford & Wrekin Council Environmental Health (Contaminated Land)
MGL 4 AB	28/12/2016	Rebecca Percox	Response from Telford & Wrekin Council's Scientific Officer (Noise)
MGL 5 A	April 2000		Shropshire and Telford & Wrekin Joint Minerals Local Plan 1996 – 2006 – Front Cover and relevant extracts
MGL 5 B	February 2000		Wrekin Local Plan 1995-2006 – Front Cover and relevant extracts
MGL 5 C	January 2016		Telford & Wrekin Local Plan 2011-2031, Publication Version – Front Cover and relevant extracts
MGL 6	April 2017		Committee Report
MGL MSR C1	12 Jan 2017		Telford and Wrekin Housing Land Supply Statement 2016-2021

MGL MSR C2	July 2017		Telford and Wrekin Inspector's Schedule of Proposed Modifications
MGL MSR C3	September 2017		Application of proposed formula for assessing housing need, with contextual data, DCLG September 2017
MGL MSR C4	June 2016		Telford and Wrekin Local Plan 2011-2031 Technical Paper – Employment June 2016
MGL MSR C5			Shropshire Local Aggregates Assessment 2015-16
MGL MSR C6	2016		Collation of the results of the 2014 Aggregate Minerals survey for England and Wales, BGS OR/16/005, 2016
MGL MSR C7	2010		Assessing Sand and Gravel Sites for Allocation in the Shropshire sub region: Site Assessment ENTEC 2010
MGL MSR C8 (See MGL 6)	2017		Pave Lane Committee Report
MGL MSR C9	2012		National Planning Policy Framework
MGL MSR C10	2014		Planning Practice Guidance – Minerals 2014
MGL MSR C11			Waste Evidence Base Report for Telford and Wrekin Council, Resource Futures and Sacks Consulting
MGL MSR C12	2014		Planning Practice Guidance – Waste 2014
MGL MSR C13			National Planning Policy for Waste
MGL MSR C14			Telford and Wrekin Council Technical Paper – Waste
MGL MSR C15 (See MGL 2 D-F)	May 2016		Pave Lane Environmental Statement

TWC1	April 2000		Shropshire and Telford & Wrekin Minerals Local Plan, 1996-2006 (JMLP)
TWC 2	Feb 2000		Saved Wrekin Local Plan 1996-2006
TWC 3	Dec 2007		TWC Core Strategy
TWC 4	Jan 2016		Telford & Wrekin Local Plan (Publication Version) 2016
TWC 5	July 2017		Inspectors Proposed Main Modifications
TWC 6	Feb 2011		Shropshire Core Strategy 2006-2026
TWC 7	Dec 2015		Shropshire Council – Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev)
TWC 8	Oct 2016		2015-2016 Local Aggregates Assessment
TWC 9	n/a		Draft/unpublished 2016-2017 Local Aggregates Assessment
TWC 10	Jan 2017		Shropshire AMR (2015-2016)
TWC 11	Aug 2016		Telford and Wrekin AMR 2016 (Housing Section)

TWC 12	Aug 2016		Telford and Wrekin AMR 2016 (Excluding Housing Section)
TWC 13	Jan 2017		Shropshire Council consultation response (2 nd)
TWC 14	Dec 2016	IP	Correspondence from NRS (Ian Pearson to Graham French)
TWC 15	Dec 2016	DB	Correspondence from Wardell Armstrong (David Bridgwood to Graham French)
TWC 16	Dec 2016		Staffordshire Council consultation response
TWC 17	April 2017		Planning Committee Report Pave Lane (TWC/2016/0437)
TWC 18	April 2017		Minutes of Pave Lane Committee (for 5 April 2017)
TWC 19	Sept 2017	VK	VK email to Mick George 22/09/17
TWC 20	Sept 2015		Waste Evidence Base Report for Telford and Wrekin Council
TWC 20a	June 2017		Addendum to Waste Evidence Base Report 2015
TWC 21	June 2010		ENTEC report <i>Assessing Sand and Gravel Sites for Allocation in the Shropshire sub region: Site Assessment Report</i> jointly commissioned by Shropshire Council and Telford & Wrekin Council (June 2010)
TWC 21a	Feb 2011		Addendum to the Entec Site Assessment Report (February 2011)
TWC 22	Adopted 2011		Black Country Core Strategy
TWC 23	Adopted in March 2013		Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Joint Waste Local Plan (up to 2026)
TWC 24	July 2006		TWC Planning Committee Report Woodcote Wood (W2005/0425)
TWC 25	July 2006		Shropshire Council Planning Committee Report Woodcote Wood SC/MB2005/0336/BR
TWC 26	Oct 2017		Shropshire Council Planning Committee Report Pave Lane (Access) (17-03661-EIA)
TWC 27	Nov 2017		TWC Application Form Woodcote Wood Access (TWC/2017/1252)