

## **G16 – Shropshire and Telford & Wrekin Minerals Local Plan 1996-2006 Report of the Inspector into Objections to the Council's Proposed Modifications**

### **Evidence Document submitted by Telford & Wrekin Council post Submission**

Telford & Wrekin Council wishes to submit this document to examination, with reference to the council's response to Matter Q7.4 of the Inspector's Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQs) and the TWLP Submission Document Policy ER4

24<sup>th</sup> October 2016

**SHROPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL  
AND  
TELFORD & WREKIN COUNCIL**

**MINERALS LOCAL PLAN 1996-2006**

**REPORT OF THE INSPECTOR INTO OBJECTIONS  
TO THE COUNCILS' PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS**

Inspector: Ernest W Smith BSc,MSc,MICE  
Dates of Inquiry: 11/5/99 to 24/5/99

Mr Dominic Pagett FRICS  
Director of Environment  
Shropshire County Council  
The Shirehall  
Abbey Foregate  
Shrewsbury SY2 6ND

16 June 1999

Dear Mr Pagett

**SHROPSHIRE AND TELFORD & WREKIN MINERALS LOCAL PLAN 1996-2006  
PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS**

I was appointed by the Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions to hold a public inquiry into objections to proposed modifications to the deposit draft of the (then) Shropshire Minerals Local Plan 1996-2006. The inquiry was held between 11<sup>th</sup> May and 24<sup>th</sup> May 1999, and sat for two days. I made an accompanied site visit on another day within the same period. I also conducted a Pre-Inquiry Meeting on 31<sup>st</sup> March 1999. The Minerals Local Plan is now the joint responsibility of your Council and the Telford and Wrekin Council following reorganisation.

The proposed modifications were published in October 1998, and they followed the Councils' consideration of the report of the Inspector on objections to the deposit draft of the Plan. The modifications attracted four duly made objections and three letters of support. I understand that a further submission by Government Office West Midlands repeated an objection made to the deposit draft plan, and it has not been treated as a duly made objection.

In my consideration of all the objections, I have had regard to the submissions made by the objectors and the Councils, whether in writing or at the inquiry, and to all other material considerations. References to planning guidance relate to versions that were current at the close of the inquiry. The Councils will need to take into account any new policy guidance which may come forward between now and the adoption of the Plan.

The issues raised concerned the appropriateness of including a list of examples of planning obligations in the Plan (Policy M8), and whether Woodcote Wood should be included as a third phase area for aggregate extraction, in order to provide increased flexibility (Policy M14).

A complete set of documents submitted in connection with the objections is held by the Shropshire County Council Environment Department at The Shirehall, Shrewsbury.

A copy of this letter has been sent for information to the Head of the Development Plans Branch of the Government Office for the West Midlands, and to the Planning and Development Division of the Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions, Eland House, Bressenden Place, London.

In conclusion, I wish to express my thanks for the courtesy and assistance offered me during the inquiry by the officers of the two Councils, and their representative, Mr Bull. The arrangements

and organisation of the inquiry were in the capable hands of Mrs Woolfenden as Programme Officer, and she carried out her various duties with great efficiency and good humour. I am sure that all the parties involved in the inquiry would join me in expressing their appreciation of her for ensuring that the inquiry was so trouble free.

Yours sincerely

Ernest W Smith  
Inspector

Copies to:

Government Office for the West Midlands – Development Plans Branch  
DETR Eland House – Planning and Development Division

## **CONTENTS OF THE REPORT**

	page
Policy M8 – Planning Obligations	1
Policy M14 – The Future Working of Sand and Gravel	3
Annex 1      List of Objectors	10
Annex 2      List of Inquiry Appearances	11
Annex 3      List of Documents	12
Annex 4      Abbreviations used in the Report	16

## **Policy M8 - Planning Obligations**

Objection number 8008 – The Quarry Products Association (QPA)

### ***Summary of Objection***

1. The list of examples where Section 106 agreements might be sought should be deleted from the text of the Plan. The QPA objected to the deposit draft of the MLP on the basis that it was unnecessary and unwise to set out examples where Section 106 obligations might be sought.

### ***Background***

2. In the deposit draft of the MLP, Policy M8 included a list of typical situations where planning obligations might be sought in order to overcome relevant land use objections, mainly in situations which occurred off-site. Following his consideration of objections to the policy, the Inspector recommended deletion of the list. The Council accepted the recommendation in so far as they propose deletion of the list from the policy but they have included the list in the reasoned justification.

### ***Inspector's Conclusions***

3. The previous Inspector stated in his conclusions that he did not consider that such a list was necessary, and I do not disagree with that. Furthermore, the list does not claim to be comprehensive, and in some circumstances, a list can be confusing unless it includes all the circumstances where a condition or planning obligation might be appropriate. A developer may feel aggrieved if an obligation is sought in a situation not included in the list. The MPAs however, consider that the list is a useful guide to lay people in interpreting the Plan.
4. There is no dispute that the illustrative list of examples where planning obligations might be sought should be excluded from the policy. The issue is whether inclusion of the list in the reasoned justification makes a useful contribution to the interpretation of the Plan.
5. PPG12(5.15) states that the precise level of detail in a local plan is a matter for local decision by the planning authority. It is for them to balance the level of detail against the need for a plan to be concise. The guidance note also indicates (7.12) that a brief and clearly presented explanation of policies will be appreciated by *inter alia*, local residents and all those concerned with development issues.
6. The impact of many proposals for minerals development can extend over a wide area, and can cover a number of issues. They regularly attract many objections from local residents, and from a range of interested parties further afield. Objections relate to traffic, conservation and sustainability, noise, visual intrusion and other matters. Any or all of these may need to be overcome by means of conditions or planning obligations. In my view, the current modified wording of Policy M8 is clear, and capable of being readily understood by those regularly involved in the planning process. Many local residents who become involved in a minerals development proposal however, may well find the policy difficult to comprehend. While I do not consider that any detailed explanation of the policy is essential, it is my view that some illustrations in the reasoned justification, of the use of planning obligations could be helpful.

7. Since the objection was lodged, the MPAs have suggested a revision to the wording of the proposed modification to paragraph 5.44 which makes it clear that the list of examples is not comprehensive but merely illustrative. In my opinion, it would provide welcome assistance to local residents and others in interpreting the use of planning obligations to overcome some of the objections to proposed mineral developments.
8. I therefore conclude that the suggested wording of the proposed further modification contained in the written response by the MPA to Objection 8008, would be a useful component of this part of the Plan.

***Recommendation***

9. **I recommend that paragraph 5.44 of the Plan be further modified in accordance with the contents of Document W/MPA/2, paragraph 4.7.**

## **Policy M14 – The Future Working of Sand and Gravel**

Objections numbers 8006 - RMC Aggregates (Western) Ltd  
8007 - The Quarry Products Association

### ***Summary of Objections***

10. Woodcote Wood should be included in the list of Preferred Areas as a third phase site, in accordance with the previous Inspector's recommended modification. Without it, there is insufficient flexibility to ensure that the required 7 years' landbank throughout the Plan period can be provided.

### ***Background***

11. Woodcote Wood is a commercial woodland on a small hill, and forms a prominent feature in the landscape. There is a dwelling within the wood in the ownership of the woodland owners, and two dwellings in private ownership adjoin the woodland. The trees are a mix of conifers and deciduous trees. Most of them are about 60 years' old, and are approaching the time for felling, though some thinning out has occurred periodically. The wood is some 10 Kms north-east of Telford, and has frontages onto the A41(T) and the B4379 roads.
12. The RAWP apportionment requires Shropshire to provide for an annual output of 1.116Mt of aggregates per annum. Under the terms of MPG6(63-64), this translates to a requirement of the MLP to identify 18.97Mt of reserves for the duration of the Plan and for a landbank of 7 years thereafter. Annual production has consistently fallen short of the RAWP apportionment during the past 10 years, though there is evidence that some materials are being imported from neighbouring Staffordshire.
13. Policy M14 of the deposit draft MLP set out to meet the then calculated landbank shortfall of 3.4Mt by identifying five "preferred areas" with an estimated potential output of 5.1Mt. Three of these areas were included in the first phase for development, and two, including Woodcote Wood, were included as second phase areas. Following a reappraisal of the existing available resources, which reduced the landbank shortfall to 3.15Mt, the (then) MPA proposed a change which deleted the woodland's designation from the Plan. The Inspector accepted the reduced shortfall as correct. However, based on the information then before him, and in the light of other recommended modifications, the Inspector concluded that the sites with planning permission together with the first and second phase areas would match the reduced shortfall but would not allow for any flexibility. He therefore proposed a modification which reinstated the woodland but as a third phase area, to provide for some flexibility. The proposed modification also deleted a first phase area and replaced it with another, and contained a clause to the effect that the third phase area would be considered for development only in the event that existing committed sites and first or second phase areas, failed to deliver the necessary supply of aggregates. As a consequence of this recommended modification, the first phase areas were estimated to contribute 2.14Mt to the landbank and the second phase area a further 1.0Mt. Woodcote Wood as the third phase area, has a potential output of 1.58Mt.
14. Since the previous inquiry, a planning application for an extension to the Norton Farm site, which is a first phase preferred area, has demonstrated that the potential reserves there are more than was previously thought. Recent detailed studies indicate that there are some 2.2Mt of



workable materials compared with the 1.0Mt estimated at the previous inquiry, although reference was made then to the possibility of there being a potential for 1.67Mt of resources. A resolution to approve the application subject to the completion of an agreement, has been approved. In addition, planning permission to extract material at Hill Valley Golf and Country Club has been granted, and the resources available at Underton have been corrected. Hill Valley Club was not included in the deposit draft of Policy M14. These sites could produce an additional 1.51Mt of aggregate over and above the quantities which formed the basis for the landbank calculations at the previous inquiry. As a consequence of this new information, the Councils have not accepted the Inspector's recommendation to reinstate Woodcote Wood as a preferred area.

### ***The need for aggregates***

15. The recent planning permission at Hill Valley Golf and Country Club, and the resolution to grant planning permission at Norton Farm, now provide for 18.33Mt of aggregate at workable sites which are regarded as commitments. This is almost sufficient to provide the required landbank of 18.97Mt without identifying any further sites. If the 0.61Mt of underproduction during 1996-98 is added to this, then the committed sites by themselves would be adequate to meet the requirements of the MLP to provide a landbank for the Plan period and a further 7 years beyond. On the other hand, the delay of two years in commencing operations at Sleaf has reduced the landbank by 0.4Mt. This is a theoretical position however, and in practice it is unlikely that the RAWP apportionment could be achieved without some additional resources being made available. An element of flexibility is necessary to meet unforeseen circumstances. The previous Inspector referred also to the need to provide for the eventuality that some of the sites included in the Plan as commitments may not come forward [7.11] or that there could be a demand for a specific type of aggregate not available at all the sites [7.15]. I endorse that view, and propose to continue with that approach.
16. By including Woodcote Wood, the previous Inspector's approach would have produced a flexibility allowance of 51%. That however, presupposes that the whole of Woodcote Wood would be used up within the landbank period, which is unlikely. A flexibility allowance of 33% is commonly accepted as appropriate, though I disagree with QPA that this should be a target for purposes of landbank calculations. It is also necessary to ensure that the annual requirement of 1.12Mt output can be met each year throughout the Plan period and beyond.
17. Following receipt of the Inspector's Report, the Council members resolved to seek further advice from officers regarding sand and gravel issues. Independent consultants were appointed to assist in this, and Paper 4 of the ensuing report (Doc D7) examined the implications for the MLP of the RAWP Annual Report and the forthcoming review of MPG6. Figure 2 of the paper shows the schematic programme of site developments, and the anticipated annual output throughout the Plan period and for seven years beyond. Figure 2 was updated during the modification inquiry. The currently assumed coming forward of sites shows that although the RAWP annual apportionment has not been achieved for a number of years, it can be met from the currently permitted reserves and the first and second phase areas throughout the remainder of the Plan period and for the next following four years.
18. The Inspector's recommended modifications assumed that the three areas in the first phase and the single second phase area had potential reserves of 3.14Mt to meet the then estimated shortfall of 3.15Mt. The total of permitted reserves is now estimated to be 16.13Mt, leaving a

shortfall of 2.84Mt. The new proposed modifications retain the three first phase areas, including Norton Farm Extension for which approval in principle has been granted, providing estimated resources of 3.34Mt. The landbank requirement can thus be met with a flexibility allowance of some 16%. Inclusion of the 1.0Mt available at the second phase area at Barnsley Lane, gives a flexibility allowance of some 40%.

19. Based on the assumptions contained in Figure 2 of Paper 4, there would be no need for any production from other sites, such as Woodcote Wood, until well into the next decade, by which time the MLP will have been reviewed. There are however, questions regarding some of the sites which cast doubts on the reliability of the assumptions. A resolution to grant planning permission, subject to the conclusion of an agreement, for the extraction of sand and gravel at Sleaf Airfield was passed in 1986, and planning permission was subsequently granted in 1992. At that time, it was seen by the operators ARC Aggregates, as a replacement for their other sites at Norton Farm and Alington in Staffordshire. In 1994, permission was granted to defer the date for commencing the operations to 31 March 1998. Permission was granted in 1996 for a new commencement date of January 2001, and the development has not yet commenced. Recent correspondence indicates that the question of achieving a satisfactory access has not yet been resolved. The site is owned by ARC, now Hanson Aggregates.
20. Two other sites at Con-y-burg Wood and Coundarbour are currently redundant, and have no plant on site. They have been redundant for many years, and will need to comply with conditions yet to be agreed, in order to recommence operations. These sites are also under the control of Hanson Aggregates. Figure 2 assumes that at some time, all the four sites under the control of Hanson Aggregates will be in operation concurrently.
21. In their application to extend their working area at Norton Farm, ARC indicated that in the event of the application being approved, they would wish to delay the implementation of their planning permission at Sleaf. In 1988, an appeal against refusal of permission to allow extraction of sand and gravel at Baschurch was dismissed, partly on the basis that Sleaf Airfield would become operational in the near future, and there was no need for the proposed development. Recently however, Hanson Aggregates have stated that they intend to operate both Sleaf and Norton Farm concurrently, subject to sufficient market demand.
22. There has been considerable ambivalence regarding the operation of the Sleaf Airfield site, but having regard to the most recent correspondence from the new operating company, I accept that it is reasonable to assume that Sleaf will commence operations before the completion of the Norton Farm site. The alternative involves a further eight year delay in the implementation of a planning permission dating back to 1992. I find it difficult however, to assume that both redundant sites will be made operational at the same time as the sites at Norton Farm and Sleaf. I understand that Norton Farm is capable of an increased rate of production, and that would seem a more likely event than opening a new or redundant site.
23. In the worst case, should Hanson decide to work only one site at a time, there would be a shortfall in annual production for the remainder of the Plan period. Should Hanson decide to operate only one of their three other sites concurrently with Norton Farm from 2001, and delay operations at the other sites until reserves at Norton Farm are exhausted, it would be necessary to bring forward the site at Barnsley Lane into the Plan period in order to achieve the required annual output and provide an element of flexibility. This would maintain an allowance of about 17% above the RAWP annual apportionment during the Plan period but there would be a

shortfall towards the end of the next decade. Additional resources would be required at that time, and Woodcote Wood appears to be the most suitable site to follow on. Actual production rates may match, or continue to be below, the RAWP apportionment, in which case, the time scale for bringing forward new sites could well be deferred.

24. At the previous inquiry, the identified permitted reserves of 15.82Mt and the first and second phase areas would have provided sufficient aggregate to meet the RAWP apportionment of 1.12Mt annually for a period of 17 years. The currently proposed modification identifies 18.33Mt of reserves including the Norton Farm Extension for which approval in principle has been given, and together with the first and second phase areas could produce the RAWP apportionment for just over 18 years.

***The need to designate Woodcote Wood as a Preferred Area***

25. Detailed land use matters are not an issue before me. There was agreement between the parties that there were no insurmountable land use objections to the development of Woodcote Wood for aggregate extraction. The previous Inspector had found it acceptable though less so than the first and second phase areas.
26. MPG6(63) requires MPAs to maintain an adequate landbank for at least 7 years extraction, unless exceptional circumstances prevail. It goes on to advise that the development plan should ensure that the minimum 7 years landbank can be maintained at the end of the Plan period. Without Woodcote Wood, or an alternative, the Plan meets this requirement but allows only minimal flexibility. Should the assumptions of Paper 4 Figure 2 regarding the coming forward of sites not be met, there could be a need to bring forward Woodcote Wood during the early part of the next decade. On the other hand, should the present low market demand continue, then the existing committed and first and second phase areas will be sufficient without Woodcote Wood. The MPAs' approach is to be cautious and rely on an early review of the Plan in 2000/2001. In their view, designating Woodcote Wood now would create unnecessary blight through over provision, and prejudice their review of the Plan.
27. The Councils have been in discussion with DETR officials who inform them that they plan to issue a consultation draft MPG6 this year, and publish a revised MPG6 in 2000. A new RAWP apportionment exercise will follow in 2001, and the Councils propose to review the Plan immediately thereafter. There may be some delay in these target dates but the reviewed Plan is expected to be adopted well before the end of the current Plan period. It is therefore the Councils' view that there is no need to identify Woodcote Wood at this stage, and that to do so would create an excessive landbank. This would be particularly relevant should the revised MPG6 adopt a more sustainable approach, and reduce the targets for new aggregate production.
28. In favour of identifying Woodcote Wood as a Preferred Area now is that the Plan would then have sufficient flexibility to meet unforeseen circumstances, or cope with an operator's reluctance to develop other sites under the prevailing market conditions. Woodcote Wood contains a coarser aggregate than most other supplies in the area, and should the demand for concrete aggregate, as distinct from sand, increase, the need for it to become operational could be brought forward.
29. A further feature in its favour is the existing tree cover. Should the site be developed, it would be the intention of the operator to retain the perimeter trees, possibly with additional planting, to screen the working area from view. If the site is not to be developed in the foreseeable

future however, it will be felled as commercial woodland. The Councils' witness acknowledged that this would reduce its attraction as a potential site for aggregate working. The Objectors sought to have the site's potential recognised in the Plan, albeit as a third phase site, in order to manage the woodland accordingly.

30. The Plan describes the first phase and second phase sites as "preferred areas" which appears to have caused some confusion as to whether a site is allocated or not. Some of the sites are well defined, and comprise deepening and/or extensions of existing operational sites. I regard allocating a site as implying a presumption in favour of the site being developed during the Plan period, and some of the sites may have been better described as "allocated sites" rather than "preferred areas". Designating a "preferred area" however, does not carry the same implication in my view. It indicates that should it be necessary to develop a new site, then the first area of search should be within the preferred area. I consider that Policy M14 could express this more clearly.

### ***Conclusions***

31. The main issue in this case is whether the new information available since the conclusion of the previous inquiry, justifies amending the Inspector's recommendation regarding the designation of Woodcote Wood as a third phase preferred area.
32. I regard the issues raised by this case as being extremely finely balanced. It is not surprising that the members were unwilling to accept the recommended modification without further consideration. The Councils' concern that an over provision of designated sites could lead to blight and may be contrary to the principle of sustainability, is easy to understand.
33. A strong case can be made to demonstrate that there is no need to designate any further areas for aggregate production during the Plan period and beyond. The Councils have adopted the correct procedure in assessing the level of resources available, and were the Councils in a position to control output, there would be no need for any additional resources to provide flexibility. The question arises however, as to the reliability of the assumptions made in the calculations.
34. Commercial considerations and competition within the market are not normally planning matters. MPG6(84) however refers to the situation of a single outlet dominating the supply of aggregates. In assessing the circumstances most likely to exist in the future, I consider that it is necessary to make a judgement on market considerations which could affect the output of aggregates, and the ability of the MPAs to meet their commitments.
35. In my opinion, it is unwise to assume that Hanson Aggregates will operate all their four sites simultaneously. Neither do I consider the fact that Hanson Aggregates own Sleaf implies an early start to operations there. On the contrary, leasing land or holding an option on it can incur annual charges which do not accrue from land ownership. Should they operate only two of their sites at any one time, there would be a need for an additional site to become operative around 2008, and thus to complete the 7 years landbank period. In the event that they operate only one site at a time, the need would arise earlier, depending on the extent of any increased output from Norton Farm. A significant part of the previous Inspector's reasoning for including Woodcote Wood as a third phase was to cover against the uncertainties in the landbank assumptions. I take the point that in a given set of market conditions, a supermarket

chain with one outlet in a town may not wish to open a second outlet whereas a competitor might decide to open one.

36. I do not consider that possible early reviews of MPG6 and the Plan should obviate the need for the current Plan fully meeting the requirements of current planning guidance. One purpose of the development plan system is to provide certainty. I accept the likelihood of the Plan being reviewed and adopted before the end of the current Plan but assuming that the Plan is adopted this year, a review in 2000/2001 appears optimistic. Should a revised MPG6 be published in late 2000 or early 2001, the RAWP apportionments are unlikely to be made until 2001 or possibly 2002. This could be later should the RAWP be subject to an EIP as suggested. While a review of existing resources can be carried out at any time, and actual output is monitored regularly, it is difficult to see what new evidence of future need will be available before the RAWP apportionment exercise. Whether the current importing of materials from Staffordshire should be assumed to continue or to cease, is a matter for consideration at the regional level. Paragraph 6.66 of the Plan states the possibility of the MLP Review assessing the need to revise any of the allocated areas. Furthermore, the previous Inspector would have been aware of the development plan review process, though the Council seem now to be hoping for an earlier review than would normally be the case.
37. Since the previous inquiry, an additional 0.84Mt of aggregate has been identified as a committed resource, over and above the possible 0.67Mt at Norton Farm of which that Inspector was aware. This corresponds to an additional reserve less than the equivalent of one year's output. None of the calculations can be regarded as precise, and much of the future is a matter of speculation. The previous Inspector was well aware of the potential danger of over supply, and worded his recommendation accordingly. On balance, it is therefore my opinion that there is insufficient justification for me to depart from the previous Inspector's conclusion that identifying Woodcote Wood as a potential long term reserve would allow for some necessary flexibility in the Plan.
38. As worded, the Inspector's recommended modification ensures that any operational development of Woodcote Wood would not take place unless and until there is a demonstrable need for the material which cannot be met from other sites, though I propose to reword it slightly. I consider that the Council's position is adequately protected by the wording of the policy and by paragraph 6.66 of the Plan.
39. An additional feature in favour of designating Woodcote Wood now is the benefit to woodland management. While blighting land unnecessarily serves no purpose, I regard the possibility of managing the woodland in a way that serves both the interests of the commercial felling of trees and helping to mitigate the effects of any aggregate working, is consistent with the principles of sustainability.
40. A further matter raised at the inquiry concerned the principle of possibly starting a new site selection process so soon after the current exercise. MPG6(64) does not require sites to be identified at the start of the plan period for the full landbank requirement as long as the necessary resources can be brought forward at the appropriate time. Nevertheless, the previous Inspector considered the merits of the five designated areas, and a further ten suggested locations. He concluded that Woodcote Wood was the best option after the designated first and second phase sites. In the event that the MLP Review identifies the need for an additional site, it does not seem a good use of resources to start the selection process again, possibly involving another public inquiry. Should the review conclude that no further sites are needed,

then paragraph 6.66 would cover that eventuality. Meanwhile, Woodcote Wood is available should it be needed, but without any presumption of its development in the near future unless a need arises.

41. The Council will no doubt wish to reconsider their proposed modifications to paragraphs 6.63B and 6.63C of the Plan. They may also wish to consider whether the contents of paragraph 6.66 may be more appropriate in the reasoned justification for Policy M14 rather than Policy M15.

***Recommendation***

- 42. I recommend that Policy M14 be modified in accordance with the Inspector's recommendation in Document CD3, amended as follows:-**

**delete the final paragraph (beginning “In the event . . .”), and substitute therefor:**

**In the event that difficulties arise with production from sites either with planning permission or in the first phase, the Mineral Planning Authority will consider an application for earlier development of the second phase site on its merits. It is unlikely that the third phase site will be required during the plan period. However, should circumstances arise which prevent the required production rate being achieved from the existing sites with planning permission, or those in the first and second phases, the Mineral Planning Authority will consider a proposal to develop the third phase site on its merits.**

## LIST OF OBJECTORS

<b>Objection No</b>	<b>Objector No</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Policy</b>
8005	504	D. Thadeus, Mathews & Son	M14(Woodcote Wood)
8006	505	A.P. Jackson, RMC Aggregates (Western)Ltd	M14(Woodcote Wood)
8007	506	C. Mead, Quarry Products Ass'n	M14(Woodcote Wood)
8008	506	C. Mead, Quarry Products Ass'n	M8(Planning Obligations)

Representations were also received from the Government Office for the West Midlands (507), repeating their previous objection to Policy M16.

Consultations on the proposed modifications brought written support from:-

Mr Peter Bradley MP (501),  
Bridgnorth District Council (502),

Farming and Rural Conservation Agency (503).

## LIST OF INQUIRY APPEARANCES

*REF*

### **505 For Objector No: 505**

Mr. Jeremy Cahill

of Counsel, instructed by Mr. A. Jackson, solicitor, of RMC Group Services Ltd., Legal Dept., RMC House, Coldharbour Lane, Thorpe, Egham, Surrey TW20 8TD.

*He called :*

Mr. Graham Jenkins

BA MRTPI AMIQ, of Wyn Thomas plc, 21 Park Place, Cardiff CF1 3DQ.

### **MPA For SHROPSHIRE AND TELFORD & WREKIN M P A**

Mr. R. Bull

Solicitor and Partner, Evershed Solicitors  
10 Newhall St., Birmingham

*He called:*

Mr. Adrian Cooper

MA(Hons) MSc MSc MRTPI, Assistant Planning Officer,  
Shropshire County Council.

Cllr. Philip Davies

elected Member for the Dawley Magna Ward of Telford & Wrekin Council, member and former Chairman of the Structure Plan Joint Committee (SPJC)

#### **Present at the Site visit (Woodcote Wood)**

For RMC

Mrs A Pritchard (RMC), Mr J Donald (Landowners' agent)

For MPA

Mr D Coxill, Mr M Bell, Mr A Cooper

Interested Person Mr J Hunt (STEP)



## LIST OF DOCUMENTS

### **Volume 1      Core Documents**

- CD/1**      Shropshire, Telford & Wrekin Minerals Local Plan 1996-2006
- CD/2**      Shropshire, Telford & Wrekin Minerals Local Plan 1996-2006:  
Statement of Proposed Changes and Further Proposed Changes at 22.9.97
- CD/3**      Shropshire, Telford & Wrekin Minerals Local Plan 1996-2006, Draft MPAs' Statement of Decisions  
and Reasoned List of Proposed Modifications
- CD/4**      Shropshire, Telford & Wrekin Minerals Local Plan 1996-2006, Deposit Draft: Statement of  
Decisions on Modifications
- CD/5**      Shropshire, Telford & Wrekin Minerals Local Plan 1996-2006, Deposit Draft: Inspector's Report  
into Objections and Counter Objections. *Inspector: Anthony Vaughan BSc CEng MICE MRTPI*

### **Volume 2      Core Documents**

- CD/6**      Structure Plan Joint Committee, Tues. 6/10/98:Shropshire, Telford & Wrekin Minerals Local Plan  
1996-2006,: Response to the Inspector's Report by Shropshire County Council and Telford &  
Wrekin Council.
- CD/7**      Shropshire, Telford & Wrekin Minerals Local Plan 1996-2006:Technical Report on Sand and Gravel  
Issues
- CD/8**      List of documents available for purchase
- CD/9**      Press notice 19/3/99 : Pre-Inquiry meeting
- CD/10**      Press notices 23rd & 30th March : Public Inquiry

### **Volume 3      Objections and Statements of Support**

- CD/30**      Shropshire, Telford & Wrekin Minerals Local Plan 1996-2006, Deposit Draft: Statement of  
Decisions on Modifications: Objections and statements of support

### **Volume 4      Shropshire, Telford & Wrekin Minerals Local Plan 1996-2006, Deposit Draft Statement of Decisions on Modifications:- Proofs of Evidence, Further Written Representations, LPA Responses and Closing Submissions**

## Objectors

<b>8006/1</b>	RMC Group Services Ltd: Proof of evidence re Policy M14 8006/1
<b>8006/2</b>	RMC Group Services Ltd: Supporting documentation for 8006/1
<b>8006/3</b>	RMC Group Services Ltd: Copy of appeal by Redland Ltd, Dec 98, handed in to Inquiry 11/5/99, in support of 8006/1.
<b>8006/4</b>	RMC Group Services Ltd: Handed in to Inquiry 24/5/99, in support of 8006/1 - a) Shrewsbury District Planning Committee meeting 8.3.94 b) North Shrops District Planning Sub Committee meeting 9/12/96 c) North Shrops District Planning Sub Committee meeting 4.3.97
<b>8006/5</b>	RMC Group Services Ltd: Handed in to Inquiry 24/5/99, in support of 8006/1 - Copies of correspondence from RMC, Hanson Aggregates and Bygott Properties, (21st - 22nd May 1999)
<b>8007/1</b>	Quarry Products Association: Further written representation re Policy M14
<b>8007/2</b>	Quarry Products Association: Supporting documentation for 8007/1
<b>8008/1</b>	Quarry Products Association: Further written representation re Policy M8
<b>8008/2</b>	Quarry Products Association: Supporting documentation for 8008/1

## Supporters

<b>S1/1</b>	STEP : Written representations in support of plan
-------------	---

## Minerals Planning Authority

<b>P/MPA/1</b>	MPA Proof of Evidence of Councillor Philip Davies re Objection No 8006
<b>P/MPA/2</b>	MPA Proof of Evidence of re Objection No 8006
<b>D/MPA/2</b>	Document supporting Proof P/MPA/2
<b>D/MPA/2</b> <b>(Appendix 12)</b>	Document handed in to Inquiry 11/5/99 in support of proof P/MPA/2, (letter re Condover Quarry).
<b>D/MPA/3</b>	Handed in at Inquiry 24.4.99 - copies of correspondence from Minerals Planning Authority, RMC and Hanson Aggregates, (19th - 21st May 1999), supporting Proof P/MPA/2
<b>D/MPA/4</b>	Revised schematic Programme of Site Development, "Figure 2 Sand and Gravel", (supersedes figure 2 in CD7), in support of P/MPA/1
<b>W/MPA/1</b>	MPA Response to Further Written Representation 8007/1
<b>W/MPA/2</b>	MPA Response to Further Written Representation 8008/1

## Inquiry Closing Submissions

**CS/MPA** Closing Submission on behalf of Minerals Planning Authority in respect of non-allocation of Woodcote Wood.

**CS/8006** Closing Submission on behalf of RMC Aggregates (Western) Ltd, re Objection 8006

**Volume 5      Core Document**

**CD/50** Material relating to Woodcote Wood from Plan Preparation Process to date:

**CD/50/1** Objections and Support

**CD/50/2** Proposed Changes

**CD/50/3** Counter Objections and Support

**CD/50/4** Proofs of Evidence

**CD/50/5** Minerals Planning Authority Response

**CD/50/6** Closing Statements

**CD/50/7** Minerals Planning Authority Closing Submissions

**CD/50/8** Inspector's Report

**CD/50/9** Proposed Modifications

## **ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THE REPORT**

Councils, the	- Shropshire County Council, and Telford & Wrekin Council
MLP	- The Minerals Local Plan
MPA, the	- The Minerals Planning Authority
MPG	- Minerals Planning Guidance Note
Plan, the-	The Shropshire, Telford & Wrekin Minerals Local Plan (deposit draft)
PPG	- Planning Policy Guidance Note
QPA	- The Quarry Products Association (BACMI/SAGA)
RAWP	- The Regional Aggregates Working Party
RMC	- RMC Aggregates (Western) Limited
STEP	- “Stopping Tomorrow’s Environmental Pollution” Group
[ ]	- numbers indicate the paragraph in the previous Inspector’s Report
( )	- numbers indicate the paragraph in the relevant guidance note