

SOUTH PLANNING COMMITTEE**SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS****Date: 16 March 2021**

NOTE: This schedule reports only additional letters received before 5pm on the day before committee. Any items received on the day of Committee will be reported verbally to the meeting

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	20/03173/MAW	Objector

The quarry traffic size and frequency poses a significant danger to pedestrians and cyclists within the village of Condoover. Extreme care and caution has to be adopted at all times. The roads and pavements (barely exceeding 50cm wide at points) are not designed to accommodate such large vehicle traffic and at no point is the road wide enough to permit two HGVs to pass each other. The supporting Traffic Report describes the highway as "suitable for this level of traffic", however, it then goes on to suggest a number of adjustments which could be made. This infers that it is in fact NOT entirely "suitable". It also contains a number of omissions which create a misleading representation of the issue. It does not categorise the agricultural traffic. We must therefore assume this is part of the 'HGV count', therein making the percentage of "quarry related HGVs" look very modest at less than 50%. This is a farming community and the traffic count was conducted at high Harvest. A general average would put the "quarry related HGV traffic" at over 80% of HGVs travelling through Condoover. The condition of the highway has reached an unacceptable level of degradation. No reparatory works have been conducted and the issue is greatly impacted by the persistent volume of large vehicles. The damage caused extends to listed buildings and sandstone walls within the conservation area.

The Local Authority invested time and money in drawing up a regulatory document for quarrying in Shropshire (The SAMDev Plan). This document states that "if any extensions are to be sought, a trunk road to the A49 should be constructed". Why create a regulatory document if it is then to be deviated from? The applicant himself stated in 2013 that a trunk road to the A49 would be viable for future extensions.

A satellite storage site does not mitigate the issue. The volume of traffic will not be reduced. It will pose a significant risk to road users as the increase in HGV activity at the entrance to Norton Farm, within meters of a blind bend, will be treacherous. The proposed site will also be a blot on the landscape and should not be entertained on conservation grounds, the visibility of it from Lyth Hill, an increasingly popular beauty spot, would be damaging for leisure and tourism in the county. It is not a suitable solution.

The applicant has persisted in being disingenuous with the local community.

Misrepresentation of figures and misleading estimates have been proffered in the full knowledge that these have been inaccurate. A multitude of breaches of planning conditions have been knowingly overlooked by the local authority with pitiful sanctions imposed following community pressure. Sanctions have not then been enforced. Monies due for reparatory work on the highways have not been paid. The integrity of an applicant or business SHOULD be considered when granting planning permission, otherwise, stipulations in the planning consent are not worth the paper they are written on. Mrs S Lean-Williams

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	20/03173/MAW	Objector

As a resident of Condoover, with a property that sits on the main road through the village, I am already concerned at the amount of quarry related traffic that passes through the

village and has done so for many years. However, over the years, I have seen this traffic increase in both numbers of vehicles and actual sizes of lorries, which are completely oversized for the size of the road heading through Condoover, causing issues for both properties in the village and road users on an almost hourly basis. The lorries that now appear to be accessing the quarry for 'processing' of materials also go against the original aim of excavation which appears never to have been addressed,

We live in a listed property, dating back to the 14th century. For as long as I can remember, the lorries have caused the windows in our house to rattle as they pass, starting from 7am in the morning and continuing throughout the day until gone 6pm. The frequency of these instances have increased and I have had to take advice as to the long-term damage this might be causing our home.

I am also acutely aware of the disruption the lorries cause along the main road in the village, the traffic issues of blocking the road and the danger they also cause by mounting pavements in order to pass each other, with apparent blatant disregard of other road users or pedestrians. As I am sure you are aware, these lorries pass directly past the local primary school but appear not to slow down when passing or be aware of the increased number of children around the road during drop-off and pick-ups. I am aware that numerous complaints have been made about the quarry traffic and strongly believe that this will not be looked into until a serious accident occurs when, clearly, this will be far too late for all concerned.

With the proposed extension of the Gonsal Quarry, the traffic issue is only set to get worse. Condoover is not suited to the current level of traffic so I cannot understand how an increase in this can even be considered. It is not right for the village, it will continue to damage local properties and the road itself (which is in a terrible state of repair), it will only increase the concerns of pedestrians and put their safety in jeopardy and I cannot see any justification as to how this can be passed or accepted.

Profit and environmental damage cannot and must not be put above the safety and welfare of the residents of Condoover.

Regards,
Neil Daly.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	20/03173/MAW	Objector

I write to you with in the hope that you fully understand the magnitude of misery that the Gonsal Quarry currently causes the village residents of Condoover, Shorpsire and that you can see how allowing any expansion of the quarry and installation of a satellite yard would make our lives even more miserable.

In short, I strongly and wholeheartedly an opposed to both of the connected planning applications 20/05371/FUL (Development of a satellite stocking yard to serve operations from Gonsal Quarry | Norton Farm Condoover Shrewsbury Shropshire SY5 7AR) as well as 20/03173/MAW | Formation of southern extension; new extraction beneath existing lagoons and progressive restoration for a period of 6 years | Salop Sand & Gravel Supply Co Ltd Gonsal Quarry Condoover Shrewsbury Shropshire SY5 7EX.

As a resident of Condoover I simply cannot believe that a single commercial enterprise is being put before the health, safety and wellbeing of men, women, Children and families of Condoover. You may well have seen comments already from the Condoover Neighbourhood Parish Council as well as other community members regarding how devastating the quarry currently is to the village and I also share the view that the detrimental effects of these new proposals are very, very troubling. I need to personally stress how important it is for you not to approve these planning applications.

Since I moved to the village some years back, I have been shocked by the high volume of heavy vehicles & goods that travel through the village on a constant basis to & from the quarry. Not only are the roads in a very poor state of repair as a result of the heavy vehicles but the trucks continually mount the pavements, sound their horns, rub against the homeowners' walls, break the speed limit sign (I have repaired it personally 4 times in the past 3 months and it is again broken and been knocked to the ground) and generally frighten anyone on foot in the village. Moreover, I live on the main through road and my windows rattle when the trucks are passing and it is quite frankly intolerable.

I have three young children who are unable and unwilling to play anywhere in the street in this village because of the danger and intimidation caused by the heavy vehicles coming through from the quarry. Surely this alone; the right of children to feel comfortable to go out into the street in their own village, should be a primary consideration in this matter. I might also add that the road from Condover to the Quarry is constantly muddy and covered with stones and rocks and the owner seems to have no desire or is not compelled to rectify this on a regular basis.

I have taken the liberty of attaching some example photographs taken from my house where two of the quarry trucks are passing in the village, which is a common occurrence. The issue is that BOTH have mounted the pavement to get past one another and, in this case, you can see how an elderly couple were forced to take immediate retreat in a driveway and only emerge after the vehicles had gone and had nowhere else to go. I will add that I ran out immediately afterwards to enquire as to how the couple were and they were both visibly shaken. Please really look at these photographs that are an example of what we see, hear and feel constantly throughout the week every day and Saturday mornings. Furthermore, I frequently see quarry vehicles passing near the primary school during drop off and pick up times and every time fear for the safety of the parents and small children that have to endure the heavy vehicles that are so near to them. Again, I am simply shocked how any of the SC Southern Planning Committee could even contemplate ignoring the dangers this quarry already presents and how much extra imposition on everyone's lifestyle would be should you approve the extension and satellite docking yard. Will it take a serious road traffic accident in Condover to get your attention on this matter? I truly hope not.

On a purely factual basis, the current quarry owner has not respected the legal extraction limits imposed upon them by a factor of three (150,000tonnes/annum instead of 50,000tonnes/annum). Three!. . I am flabbergasted therefore that you would even consider granting such a scofflaw additional rights when he is not honouring current contractual conditions.

On the matter of installing a satellite docking yard, it is clear that the proposal needs to be rejected outright as it will only exacerbate all of the problems identified above and make our lives more miserable going forwards. The real issue that needs addressing is being avoided by even considering this satellite docking yard: In the past a relief access route was evaluated and found to be the best solution to serving the quarry from the A49 and this option again needs to be put into place rather than simply taking the 'easy' option of routing all heavy quarry vehicles through the village. Putting a plaster on this issue now will not fix the long term need and I urge you to take the time and plan longer term to allow the function of the quarry to be allowed in harmony with the Condover residents and plan the installation of a new relief access route directly from the Quarry to the A49.

In summary, please, for the health, safety, sanity and wellbeing of me, my family and my neighbours, reject these applications and focus the attention back onto creation of a new relief road between the Gonsal Quarry and the A49 across the empty farmland.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	20/03173/MAW	Objector
<p>Condover Residents Action Group (GRAG), OBJECTS to the above application</p>		
<p>Overview</p> <p>The first Planning Application is a proposal for sand and gravel extraction beneath existing lagoons, with an additional proposed southern extension and progressive restoration at Gonsal Quarry. The application states that a total of approximately 936,000 tonnes of saleable sand and gravel would be worked, lasting for 6 years at the proposed rate of 150,000 tonnes per annum. This would triple production at the quarry compared to the level currently permitted, and is the equivalent of 60 HGV movements a day, in and out. That is every 8 minutes during a working week.</p> <p>The second linked Planning Application, is to develop a stocking yard at Norton Farm (at the north side of Condover) to serve operations at Gonsal Quarry which lies approximately 1.6km to the south of Condover village. The intention is to create a traffic mitigation measure for the quarry's HGVs. However, these vehicles will still continue to go through the Conservation area despite the conditions stated in the SAMDev Schedule MD5b: Phase 2 Site Allocations' of Shropshire Council SAMDev, which explicitly stated that extension of Gonsal Quarry would be subject to conditions, including the creation of a new access to the A49.</p> <p>The proposed aftercare period is for six years, which runs counter to the requirements of the NPPF and the PPG section on minerals which requires restoration to the highest standard as soon as possible. Any further extraction should be appropriately conditioned and given previous breaches further extraction should be bonded to ensure appropriate and timely restoration. The Council are specifically requested to identify which measures they propose to implement to ensure restoration and to state how these will be enforced. Both applications are strongly opposed by the local community: by Condover Parish Council, and the majority of elected representatives.</p> <p>Matters arising from general planning policy</p> <p>The applicant has not provided in writing detailed evidence of the reason why the road link to the A49 as per SAMDev requirement is not viable. It is not acceptable that such 'valid reasons' were only communicated verbally to the officer, instead they should be put in writing so that Southern Planning Committee, the SC elected representative, Condover Parish Council and members of the public objectively review and validate them. Without details of such reasons the rules of interpretation would conclude that such explanations do not exist. Given the central basis on which previous permissions were granted, the failure to provide such a relief road, and the lack of respect shown both to Council Members and to residents by failing to provide even the most basic explanation it must be concluded that any future conditions will be ignored. Accordingly, any future extraction permissions should be robustly conditioned and bonded. However, without any explanation as to why a relief road cannot be constructed and without effective proposals as to alternative solutions should this be the case, planning permission cannot be granted, and to do so most certainly creates the situation where such decisions would be open to judicial review. The considerations given by the applicant to justify not pursuing the new access to the A49 required by the local plan don't have any standing:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) There isn't any comment from SC Highways on either planning applications. Did they do their own assessment or did they just rely of the traffic assessment made by the applicant, which was done over two days in October 2020 during the Harvest season and with COVID restrictions in place? 2) The mitigation proposals are not effective because the annual production of 150,000 		

tonnes (three times the current rate of production) will still transit through the conservation area and pass by the primary school and children's nursery. Although the planning permission is for a further 4.5 years only, it would require PERMANENT CHANGES to the look of the village. Particularly undesirable would be the proposed trimming of the grass triangle in the middle of conservation area, which houses the historic village water pump in the centre. It appears that the appropriate statutory consultees, including the Shropshire Conservation team have not been consulted regarding this point. 3) It also appears that Highways England, the statutory consultee responsible for the A49, have not been consulted. The junction between the A49 and the road to Condover is on a 60mph stretch and is considered already busy and extremely dangerous by the local residents. The impact of the increased vehicular traffic exiting onto and off of this road needs to be assessed, and in particular the risks of heavily loaded vehicles turning north across a busy carriageway. In many similar situations the construction of an over or underpass has been a requirement to manage traffic safely, and this should be recommended.

4) Minor extension after minor extension, the applicant has exploited the site at Gonsal Quarry for 50 years. This proposal is presented as small scale, but it's not if you consider the numerous extensions over such a long time.

5) Condover is not the same place as 50 years ago, every year there are more houses, more cars, more businesses and the HGV vehicles are much bigger.

6) There have been fundamental changes in the circumstances of the local highway given the recent village growth (over 50 houses in the last few years).

7) We refute the transport assessment made by the applicant, especially given it was done during the pandemic when many businesses have been closed. It should be completed independently by Shropshire Highways/WSP and Highways England. It should cover a longer period of time, otherwise it's extremely easy for the applicant to give an appearance that doesn't correspond to the reality. The residents have done several traffic surveys and what the applicant declared (the quarry traffic is between 15% and 50% of the HGV traffic) is not realistic. The peak hour flows of 277 movements recorded by the applicant's consultant is definitely not what you would have in normal times (all businesses opened) and with a quarry production of 150,000 tonnes per year.

When viewed against more general policy:

i) National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraph 109: "Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety". Residents think that these two planning applications would have a significant impact on road safety: using the number of road accidents in the village occurred in the past in order to justify a statement of future safety is misleading. The village was much smaller, over 50 new houses in the past five years and new businesses in the area had a great impact. Trebling the production will mean trebling the number of HGV transits and our roads are already unable to cope.

ii) NPPF 170: the extension would entail the permanent destruction of 4.7 ha of arable field.

iii) NPPF 203: while "it is essential that there is a sufficient supply of minerals to provide the infrastructure, buildings, energy and goods that the country needs", given that Shropshire Council has recently approved in Condover the extension for Hanson Quarry to extract almost three million tonnes (sic) of sand and gravel over the next 14 to 15 years which was not in even SAMDev, the village contribution to the national production has definitely been fulfilled. There is no evidence in the new planning applications for Gonsal Quarry of the fact that the county landbanks are in need. We have asked for this specific information several times and have never received an answer.

iv) NPPF 205 a): "In considering proposals for mineral extraction, minerals planning authorities should provide for the maintenance of landbanks of non-energy minerals from outside (...) conservation areas". All the Gonsal Quarry HGVs directly impact and damage the historic centre of the village almost as if the production site was inside the conservation area.

v) NPPF 205 b): “In considering proposals for mineral extraction, minerals planning authorities should ensure that there are no unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural and historic environment, human health (or aviation safety), and take into account the cumulative effect of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or from a number of sites in a locality”. The number and quality of the residents’ comments to the applications prove that the impact of the quarry activities on the environment and the people’s health has now become unacceptable: our biodiversity is at risk (many Great Crested Newts live on the lakes they want to dig again). Gouged walls, direct impacts and vibration are constantly damaging our listed buildings. Noise, dust and particle emission from the diesel-engine HGV are affecting our health. Consider that in our village there is another quarry for sand and gravel, which doesn’t affect the residents as much as the current applicant because their HGV don’t pass through the centre.

Conclusions

Since 2015 the quarry operators have extracted up to 3.5x the amount they were permitted to extract per year, under the previous planning, without any sanction or impunity. How could they now be rewarded for flouting previous planning conditions with a new planning permission that doesn’t take into account the requirements of the local plan and would even triple their current production?

Why in 2018 did Shropshire Council grant planning consent (13/00336/EIA - 25/04/18) limiting the production to 50.000 tonnes per annum? The conditions at the time must have required that that was the limit that the village could withstand. Now, consider that since then, in the last three years, many new houses have been built in the village (including 20 two and three bedroom affordable houses), all absorbed without a single improvement to the local highways. Can the officers explain why the roads of Condover can now cope with three times the previously permitted production? Is it because the applicant by breaching the previous planning conditions has already tested the limits and no one has been injured, yet? Can the officers explain how they will ensure that these new proposals will not be ignored and we’ll see even greater tonnages passing through the heart of the village?

The lack of any written document from SC Highways (it almost seems they passively and uncritically accepted the Traffic Assessment provided by the applicant) and the failure to consult Highways England about the impact of the applications on highway safety represent a major fault: they should be submitted prior to any determination. Also the SC Conservation team should comment about the proposed removal of part of the grassed triangle in the conservation area.

Given that the Samdev requirements for a direct access to the A49 have been ignored and the various issues related to the NPPF, we reserve in case the applications are passed, to check if this case would be suitable for Judicial Review. For the reasons stated above, CRAG object to the proposed application for development.

Note: See below for officer clarifications in response to GRAG objection.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	20/03173/MAW	Officer

OFFICER CLARIFICATIONS IN RESPONSE TO CRAG OBJECTION
(Red Italic)

The first Planning Application is a proposal for sand and gravel extraction beneath existing lagoons, with an additional proposed southern extension and progressive restoration at Gonsal Quarry. The application states that a total of approximately 936,000 tonnes of saleable sand and gravel would be worked, lasting for 6 years at the proposed rate of 150,000 tonnes per annum. This would triple production at the quarry compared to the level currently permitted, and is the equivalent of 60 HGV movements a day, in and out. That is every 8 minutes during a working week.

The satellite proposals would result in 60 individual movements by 20 tonne rigid chassis vehicles over a 9 ½ hour working day. Excluding 1 hour for school drop off and pick up times which equates to just over 1 movement every 8 ½ minutes. With 30 tonne loads this reduces to 1 movement every 12 minutes and 45 seconds.

The second linked Planning Application, is to develop a stocking yard at Norton Farm (at the north side of Condoover) to serve operations at Gonsal Quarry which lies approximately 1.6km to the south of Condoover village. The intention is to create a traffic mitigation measure for the quarry's HGVs. However, these vehicles will still continue to go through the Conservation area despite the conditions stated in the SAMDev Schedule MD5b: Phase 2 Site Allocations' of Shropshire Council SAMDev, which explicitly stated that extension of Gonsal Quarry would be subject to conditions, including the creation of a new access to the A49.

The satellite depot scheme would allow improved control over quarry HGV's travelling through Condoover. The planning policy situation regarding the northern access to the A49 is explained in section 6 of the officer report. The new access is not economically viable for the limited amount of mineral in the proposed extension.

The proposed aftercare period is for six years, which runs counter to the requirements of the NPPF and the PPG section on minerals which requires restoration to the highest standard as soon as possible. Any further extraction should be appropriately conditioned and given previous breaches further extraction should be bonded to ensure appropriate and timely restoration. The Council are specifically requested to identify which measures they propose to implement to ensure restoration and to state how these will be enforced. Both applications are strongly opposed by the local community: by Condoover Parish Council, and the majority of elected representatives.

The recommended conditions on the satellite depot require cessation of use within 5 years (aligned with the life of the proposed quarry extension) and require restoration within 18 months which is standard.

Matters arising from general planning policy

The applicant has not provided in writing detailed evidence of the reason why the road link to the A49 as per SAMDev requirement is not viable. It is not acceptable that such 'valid reasons' were only communicated verbally to the officer, instead they should be put in writing so that Southern Planning Committee, the SC elected representative, Condoover Parish Council and members of the public objectively review and validate them. Without details of such reasons the rules of interpretation would conclude that such explanations do not exist. Given the central basis on which previous permissions were granted, the failure to provide such a relief road, and the lack of respect shown both to Council Members and to residents by failing to provide even the most basic explanation it must be concluded that any future conditions will be ignored. Accordingly, any future extraction permissions should be robustly conditioned and bonded. However, without any explanation as to why a relief road cannot be constructed and without effective proposals as to alternative solutions should this be the case, planning permission cannot be granted, and to do so most certainly creates the situation where such decisions would be open to judicial review. The considerations given by the applicant to justify not pursuing the new access to the A49 required by the local plan don't have any standing:

Section 6 of the committee report confirms that the amount of mineral in the proposed extension (now 610,000 tonnes) is too small to fund the substantial cost of a new access (>£2m) and technical problems preclude this. The developer has indicated that this includes the requirement to acquire third party land in order to achieve the required visibility splays at the junction with the A49.

1) There isn't any comment from SC Highways on either planning applications. Did they do their own assessment or did they just rely of the traffic assessment made by the

applicant, which was done over two days in October 2020 during the Harvest season and with COVID restrictions in place?

The comments of the Highway Authority were received late and have now been uploaded to the online planning register.

2) The mitigation proposals are not effective because the annual production of 150,000 tonnes (three times the current rate of production) will still transit through the conservation area and pass by the primary school and children's nursery. Although the planning permission is for a further 4.5 years only, it would require PERMANENT CHANGES to the look of the village. Particularly undesirable would be the proposed trimming of the grass triangle in the middle of conservation area, which houses the historic village water pump in the centre. It appears that the appropriate statutory consultees, including the Shropshire Conservation team have not been consulted regarding this point.

The applicant's highway consultant has suggested that existing kerb could be set back by 1.1m max in the area of the grass triangle to the south of the village hall. The officer considers that this would not materially affect the appearance of the triangle or the setting of the historic water pump but would deliver a highway safety benefit for larger HGVs'. However, the applicant's funding package could be used instead be used to maintain / repair the existing highway and secure a 20mph speed limit. This would be for the highway authority to decide in consultation with the Parish Council.

3) It also appears that Highways England, the statutory consultee responsible for the A49, have not been consulted. The junction between the A49 and the road to Condover is on a 60mph stretch and is considered already busy and extremely dangerous by the local residents. The impact of the increased vehicular traffic exiting onto and off of this road needs to be assessed, and in particular the risks of heavily loaded vehicles turning north across a busy carriageway. In many similar situations the construction of an over or underpass has been a requirement to manage traffic safely, and this should be recommended.

HGV's accessing Gonsal Quarry have used the junction with the A49 at an equivalent or greater rate than that currently proposed for 50 years. The current proposals do not amount to a material change to the existing situation which would justify consulting Highways England. The highway authority has not raised any highway safety or capacity issues in commenting on the current applications for Gonsal Quarry, including with respect to the A49 junction.

4) Minor extension after minor extension, the applicant has exploited the site at Gonsal Quarry for 50 years. This proposal is presented as small scale, but it's not if you consider the numerous extensions over such a long time.

5) Condover is not the same place as 50 years ago, every year there are more houses, more cars, more businesses and the HGV vehicles are much bigger.

6) There have been fundamental changes in the circumstances of the local highway given the recent village growth (over 50 houses in the last few years).

Quarry traffic has passed through Condover for over 50 years at rates of up to 250,000 tonnes per annum. Traffic levels have increased generally but the road infrastructure remains the same. The current proposals are temporary and include mitigation measures. Funding provided for highway maintenance would allow improvements to be carried out for the benefit of all traffic through the village.

7) We refute the transport assessment made the applicant, especially given it was done during the pandemic when many businesses have been closed. It should be completed independently by Shropshire Highways/WSP and Highways England. It should cover a longer period of time, otherwise it's extremely easy for the applicant to give an appearance that doesn't correspond to the reality. The residents have done several traffic surveys and what the applicant declared (the quarry traffic is between 15% and 50% of the HGV traffic)

is not realistic. The peak hour flows of 277 movements recorded by the applicant's consultant is definitely not what you would have in normal times (all businesses opened) and with a quarry production of 150.000 tonnes per year.

The loads recorded at the quarry weighbridge during the traffic monitoring exercise are consistent with the proposed level of quarry vehicle movements. This validates the level of quarry traffic stated in the transport assessment.

When viewed against more general policy:

i) National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraph 109: "Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety". Residents think that these two planning applications would have a significant impact on road safety: using the number of road accidents in the village occurred in the past in order to justify a statement of future safety is misleading. The village was much smaller, over 50 new houses in the past five years and new businesses in the area had a great impact. Trebling the production will mean trebling the number of HGV transits and our roads are already unable to cope.

The quarry has not been complying with its currently permitted output which is less than 1/3 of the level permitted prior to 2017. The level of production in 2020 was 150,000 tonnes which is the level proposed in the quarry extension application. The current application seeks to regularise this non-compliance. The possible need for enforcement will be reviewed in the event that the extension application is not approved.

ii) NPPF 170: the extension would entail the permanent destruction of 4.7 ha of arable field.

Not all of this is best and most versatile and 1.9ha would be restored as best and most versatile. The restoration proposals would also deliver a significant biodiversity benefit and the NPPF requires great weight to be given to the benefits of mineral extraction. Loss of some arable land is balanced by these other considerations.

iii) NPPF 203: while "it is essential that there is a sufficient supply of minerals to provide the infrastructure, buildings, energy and goods that the country needs", given that Shropshire Council has recently approved in Condover the extension for Hanson Quarry to extract almost three million tonnes (sic) of sand and gravel over the next 14 to 15 year which was not in even SAMDev, the village contribution to the national production has definitely been fulfilled. There is no evidence in the new planning applications for Gonsal Quarry of the fact that the county landbank are in need. We have asked for this specific information several times and have never received an answer.

The current Gonsal application is allocated for mineral working by Policy MD5b of the SAMDev plan. Hence there is a presumption in favour of working the site. Condover Quarry (Hanson Aggregates Ltd) has been dormant for 18 months so Gonsal has supplied the entire local market in this timescale.

iv) NPPF 205 a): "In considering proposals for mineral extraction, minerals planning authorities should provide for the maintenance of landbanks of non-energy minerals from outside (...) conservation areas". All the Gonsal Quarry HGVs directly impact and damage the historic centre of the village almost as if the production site was inside the conservation area.

The quarry is not located within a Conservation Area. Quarry vehicles have passed through the Condover at a similar or greater rate than that currently proposed for over 50 years. The highway mitigation proposals put forward would provide significantly improved control over quarry traffic through Condover and would provide funding for highway maintenance / improvement which would benefit all traffic and not just quarry vehicles.

v) NPPF 205 b): "In considering proposals for mineral extraction, minerals planning authorities should ensure that there are no unacceptable adverse impacts on the natural

and historic environment, human health (or aviation safety), and take into account the cumulative effect of multiple impacts from individual sites and/or from a number of sites in a locality". The number and quality of the residents' comments to the applications prove that the impact of the quarry activities on the environment and the people's health has now become unacceptable: our biodiversity is at risk (many Great Crested Newts live on the lakes they want to dig again). Gouged walls, direct impacts and vibration are constantly damaging our listed buildings. Noise, dust and particle emission from the diesel-engine HGV are affecting our health. Consider that in our village there is another quarry for sand and gravel, which doesn't affect the residents as much as the current applicant because their HGV don't pass through the centre.

Quarry traffic has passed through Condover for over 50 years at a similar or greater rate to that currently proposed. A significant amount of HGV traffic in the village (50-85%) is not related to the quarry. There is no objection to the current temporary 4½ year proposals from the highway authority who have acknowledged the mitigation measures which the current proposals would provide. This includes highway funding which could not otherwise be provided. Nor has the historic environment section objected. The NPPF advises that refusal can only occur on highway capacity grounds 'where the residual impact is severe'. Additionally, the quarry extension is allocated in the SAMDev Plan and the NPPF requires that 'great weight' should be given to the benefits of mineral extraction. The restoration proposals for both the quarry extension and the proposed depot would deliver significant biodiversity enhancements.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	20/03173/MAW	SC Archaeology

Background to Recommendation:

It is understood that the proposed development site has an overall area of 23.18Ha, comprising 18.06Ha of the existing permitted quarry area and a proposed 5.12Ha southern extension into an area of agricultural land.

Previous extraction within the existing quarry area will have removed any archaeological remains that previously existed there. There are currently no known archaeological sites or features recorded on the Shropshire Historic Environment Record within the area of the proposed southern extension. However, given the small number of localised find spots of Neolithic and Bronze Age material from the wider vicinity of the site there is considered to be low potential for archaeological remains of this date to be present within this area of the proposed extension.

RECOMMENDATION:

Volume 2 of Environmental Statement includes, at Technical Annex C, an Archaeological Desk Based Assessment by Worcestershire Archaeology. It is advised that this meet the requirements of Policy MD13 of the Local Plan and Paragraph 189 of the NPPF and that we concur with its findings.

Given the recommendations contained within the Assessment, and in relation to Policy MD13 of the Local Plan and Paragraph 199 of the NPPF, it is advised that a programme of archaeological work be made a condition of any planning permission. This should comprise an archaeological watching brief to be maintained during site stripping works in advance of extraction. An appropriate condition of any such consent would be: -

Suggested Conditions:

No development approved by this permission shall commence until the applicant, or their agents or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work in accordance with a written scheme of investigation (WSI). This written scheme shall be approved in writing by the Planning Authority prior to the commencement of works.

Reason: The site is known to hold archaeological interest.

Shropshire Council

HISTORIC ENVIRONMENT

Archaeology Service
Andy Wigley
Natural and Historic Environment Manager
25 September 2020

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7	20/04435/FUL THE BEEHIVE, CURRIERS LANE, SHIFNAL	Officer

Two updates to the Committee Report are as follows:

- 1) Condition 4 relating to external joinery (Page 100 of the Report) is deleted, for the reason explained at paragraph 6.5.4 of the Committee Report. This condition should have been removed from the list of recommended conditions. The application does not relate to a retained heritage asset and the level of information sought by this condition goes beyond what can reasonably be requested in connection with new build affordable dwellings outside of a conservation area.
- 2) In condition 14 (Page 103 of the Report) reference to 'Homes and Communities Agency' is changed to 'Homes England'.