

MUCH WENLOCK TOWN COUNCIL

Minutes of a **Planning & Environment Committee meeting**
held at 7.00 pm on Tuesday, 7th June 2022 at the Guildhall, Much Wenlock

Present: Councillors William Benbow, David Fenwick, Mike Grace, Wilfred Grainger, Daniel Thomas, Chris Tyler and Linda West

In attendance: Trudi Barrett – Town Clerk

1. Election of Chairman

It was **RESOLVED** to elect Councillor David Fenwick as Chairman of the committee.

2. Election of Deputy Chairman

It was **RESOLVED** to elect Councillor Mike Grace as Deputy Chairman of the committee.

3. Apologies

Councillor Wilfred Grainger – holiday, Cllrs Mike Grace and Chris Tyler for early departure.

4. Disclosure of Pecuniary Interests

Members were reminded that they are required to leave the room during the discussion and voting on matters in which they have a disclosable pecuniary interest, whether or not the interest is entered in the Register of Members' Interests maintained by the Monitoring Officer.

Cllr Benbow declared a pecuniary interest in the Woodland Management Plan for Corve Farm Woodland, minute number 20, Consultation.

5. Dispensations

None requested.

It was **RESOLVED** to bring forward agenda item 10, Draft Shropshire Local Plan Review 2016 - 2038

6. Draft Shropshire Local Plan Review 2016 - 2038

The submissions to the Examination in Public had been sent to the Programme Officer and all Members had received a copy of the documents. Thanks were expressed to Councillors and members of the public who had contributed. It was noted that there had been a change of Programme Officer.

Notification of the names of speakers who would be representing the Town Council at the hearings had to be provided to the Programme Officer by 13th June. Residents and some local groups had said they would collaborate with the Council and put forward joint representations, although some would also be speaking as individuals. The suggested representatives were as follows and the final list would be confirmed at the Town Council meeting on 9th June:

Matter 1 (Legal Compliance/Procedural Requirements): Cllr Mike Grace and a community representative

Matter 2 (Duty to Cooperate): Cllr Will Benbow and Howard Horsley

Matters 3 (Development Strategy) and 4 (Housing and Employment Needs): Cllr Chris Tyler and Lesley Durbin (this would include the strategic corridor issue)

Matter 7 (Strategic Settlements): Cllr Duncan White and Dan Thomas (including the Ironbridge Power Station)

Matter 8 (Infrastructure and Delivery, Monitoring and Viability): Cllr Mike Grace and Jim Orves

It was **RESOLVED** to recommend the finalised list of speakers to full Council.

It was **RESOLVED** to thank those Councillors, individuals and members of organisations who had contributed to the preparations for the Examination in Public.

7. Public Session

There were no members of the public present.

8. Minutes

It was **RESOLVED** that the minutes of the Planning & Environment Committee meeting held on 3rd May 2022 be **APPROVED** and signed as a true record.

9. Footpath Diversion Orders*

Members noted the confirmation and coming into operation of the diversion of part of Footpath 52 and part of Footpath 177 in Atterley, Much Wenlock, on 15th February 2022.

Some residents had raised concerns that there was now no circular route for residents of Much Wenlock as a part of the remaining path was on private land and not accessible. Councillors were keen to explore options for creating a circular route and to establish whether there was any historic record of prior use of the previous route.

Councillor Grace left the meeting.

10. Planning Applications

a. It was **RESOLVED** to approve retrospectively the following response to application 21/05023/OUT, drafted with the help of the Town Council's transport advisor, and agreed between meetings:

<p>21/05023/OUT Proposed residential and commercial development land at Tasley, Bridgnorth</p>	<p>Re-consultation due to amendment: additional highways information submitted.</p> <p>Hybrid application for phased development for: Outline planning permission (access only for consideration) for mixed use development of up to 550 dwellings, foodstore, neighbourhood centre, B2/B8 business use, 'sui generis' uses to include hotel, public house, petrol filling and electric vehicle charging station, livestock market, lairage and ancillary uses, green infrastructure and associated ancillary works, demolition of the existing livestock market; Full planning permission for five arm roundabout, spine road south of A458 and north of A458 with associated footway/cycleways and landscape verges, formation of junction with the spine road and Church Lane, upgrading of existing Livestock Market, drainage, associated earthworks, infrastructure and ancillary works.</p> <p>Response submitted:</p> <p>Much Wenlock Town Council has reviewed the Technical Note produced by the transport consultants to Tasley Estates Ltd, (PJA). The Technical Note has been produced specifically to provide a response to this Council's concerns about the impact of traffic from the Tasley Estates' development on Much Wenlock's Gaskell Corner junction. Based on the review of the Technical Note, Much Wenlock Town Council confirms that they wish to maintain their strong formal OBJECTION to this application (21/05023/OUT), for the following reasons:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rather than carry out their own independent assessment, PJA has used Transport Reports prepared by ADC Infrastructure on behalf of the developer of the former Ironbridge Power Station (IPS). Their reliance on this historical information does not appear to have included anything submitted by Much Wenlock Town Council in response to the reports and which was critical of the technical assessments carried out by ADC. The fact that PJA relies wholly on the ADC work means that MWTC has to re-introduce our objections to the IPS scheme. 2. The PJA Note (on behalf of Tasley Estates) states in paragraph 1.2.3 <i>....it is understood that a contribution was agreed between the applicant (IPS) and SC to mitigate the impact of the development at the junction.</i> Unfortunately PJA do not acknowledge that, logically, a similar approach should be taken in connection with the Tasley development. 3. At para 2.2.2 of the PJA Note they state:- <i>This assessment went on to undertake detailed modelling.....using the PICADY module.....</i> Much Wenlock Town Council has objected strongly to the use of PICADY to model the Gaskell Corner junction. It is an inappropriate
--	---

	<p>tool which is demonstrated by the results that it has produced. PJA in paragraph 2.2.3 take the trouble to describe why PICADY is not the correct tool, but they do not suggest what modelling technique <i>should</i> be used: they are content to accept that the PICADY results are nonsense. MWTC has argued that microsimulation modelling is the proper technique to use at the Gaskell Corner and it is disappointing that PJA, like ADC before them are incapable of acknowledging this.</p> <p>4. At para 2.2.4 PJA state:-</p> <p><i>Taking into consideration the limitations of the standalone modelling software.....</i></p> <p>They then completely fail to take into account <i>any</i> of the limitations. PJA merely reproduce the discredited ADC results at the junction, even supporting the completely inaccurate conclusion that the A4169 arm of the junction will experience queues of only <i>four</i> vehicles in the year 2036. Nobody consulted by MWTC believes that this forecast bears any resemblance to reality. And, yet PJA are happy to let this figure go forward in their assessment without any challenge.</p> <p>5. Paragraph 2.4 has the misleading title, <i>Ironbridge Power Station-Agreed Position</i>. Para 2.4.1 goes on to describe the two schemes submitted by the IPS developer, (with a complete absence of technical support or justification) as some form of mitigation at the Gaskell Corner.</p> <p>The Technical Note fails to remind the reader that SC Highways rejected both the schemes citing a total of <i>ten</i> reasons why they were unacceptable. Yet PJA appears to believe that they are an ‘agreed position’ with SC.</p> <p>In fact para 2.4.2 quotes ADC, correctly pointing out that the schemes would not provide:-</p> <p><i>....material headroom to cater for regional growth in the long-term, and therefore a more comprehensive improvement strategy could be considered for improving traffic conditions in Much Wenlock.</i></p> <p>In other words, as SC has already identified, the schemes do not work; so why has PJA described them as part of an ‘Agreed Position’ with SC?</p> <p>The final para in this section. 2.4.3 claims that the IPS developer and SC agreed that a s106 contribution would be provided,</p> <p><i>...equivalent to the cost of implementing the identified highway works at the Gaskell Arms junction, at a value of £350,000.</i></p> <p>This is completely wrong; the original IPS contribution was for £250,000. £50,000 of which was to be spent on a Transport Feasibility study for the Gaskell Corner junction. Only after strong technical objections were raised by MWTC was this sum increased to £350,000.</p> <p>6. Much Wenlock Town Council does not object to the methodology used to estimate the trips that will be generated by and attracted to the Tasley development during the peak periods. It is noted that the morning peak period will route an additional 74 movements through the Gaskell Corner junction plus 80 in the evening peak; and 58 during the Saturday peak. <i>(It is also noted that these flows are similar to, or greater than those predicted to use this junction from the IPS development.)</i> Unfortunately, rather than accepting their responsibility to address the impact of these trips properly, PJA resort to using the meaningless argument that this merely adds the equivalent of only one trip per minute to the junction at peak times. MWTC considers this to be a spurious argument and one that is designed to mislead over the true impact of development traffic.</p>
--	---

7. In para 3.1.10 PJA argue that the Construction Management Plan (CMP) will ensure that:-

....construction traffic does not have a detrimental impact on the local highway network and local communities.

They do not describe *how* the CMP will achieve this; are they suggesting that *no construction traffic* will route via Much Wenlock? PJA need to provide more technical reassurance that they can actually achieve it, before they claim:-

.....it is not considered that HGV traffic generated by the proposed development would exacerbate existing issues at the Gaskell Arms junction,

8. In para 3.2.1 PJA claim:-

It is not considered that there would be any material benefit in modelling the impact of the proposed development due to the inability to accurately model the junction.....

Whilst MWTC is pleased to note that the inadequacies and inaccuracies of the IPS traffic modelling are acknowledged, we also note that PJA are quite happy to rely on the outputs of the inaccurate models in their own assessment.

They then claim, in para 3.2.3 that their development traffic would not considerably increase existing levels of queuing and delay at the junction. Firstly, this claim is based on their Table 2, which provides traffic flows for the year 2036 + IPS, not 'existing' flows. And if they do actually mean year 2036 they need only to examine the outputs from the discredited PICADY program to realise that the IPS traffic had a very significant impact on delays (hence the s106 contribution). And if the Tasley traffic is added *on top of that* then this would in fact *considerably increase levels of queuing and delay* at the junction. It is disappointing that PJA do not feel the need to even attempt to model the impact of their traffic at the Gaskell Corner junction.

9. This lack of proper assessment of the Gaskell Corner junction contradicts PJA's own Transport Assessment. In their chapter 6 at para 6.2.1 they state:-

A threshold of 50 two-way development trips per hour during the network weekday peak periods has been agreed with SC as acceptable criteria to determine the scope for assessment.

Using this '*acceptable criteria*' there is no justification for PJA to fail to properly and fully assess the impact of the Tasley development traffic on the Gaskell Corner junction. Relying on the inaccurate work of other consultants is not acceptable. PJA are happy to use modelling tools such as ARCADY and PICADY in the assessment of other junctions; therefore they should also find and use the appropriate modelling tool to examine the Gaskell Corner.

10. In summary the PJA Technical Note provides us with no answers to the Gaskell Corner issue. It does, however, provide new information by confirming the amount of new traffic from the Tasley development that will use the junction.
11. Much Wenlock Town Council notes that the traffic from the Tasley development using the Gaskell Corner junction is *greater* than that predicted to come from the Ironbridge Power Station redevelopment.
12. Much Wenlock Town Council would remind Shropshire Council that the latter has made a commitment, both verbal and in writing, (see MWTC original Tasley objection) that appropriate contributions from developers at Tasley will be sought to enable improvements to be carried out at the Gaskell Corner junction in Much Wenlock.

b. Members considered a response to the following planning applications:

22/01782/FUL Woodhouse Field Cottage, Bourton, Much Wenlock	Erection of a new steel portal frame agricultural storage building to provide fodder and machinery storage together with undercover lambing accommodation. It was RESOLVED no objection.
22/01943/FUL 40 Barrow Street, Much Wenlock	Erection of part single storey part two storey extension to rear elevation and sub-division of building to form two properties. It was RESOLVED no objection to the application for the property, but Councillors were concerned about the impact of the creation of an additional dwelling on parking in Barrow Street and asked for this to be considered.
22/02017/FUL Hazelwood, Homer, Much Wenlock	Erection of garden outbuilding to provide garaging and garden workshop/store. It was RESOLVED no objection.
22/02140/TPO 15 High Street, Much Wenlock	Removal and replacement of 1 no. Weeping Willow (T1) protected by the Bridgnorth District Council (15 High Street, Much Wenlock) TPO 2008 (Ref. BR/TPO/157). It was RESOLVED to make the following representation: Councillors were concerned about the loss of a mature tree in the centre of the town but were mindful of the problems caused by the tree roots in damaging drains and the potential future risks. Should the application be approved, Councillors would wish to see a replacement tree of a more suitable species to provide environmental and amenity benefits.
22/02234/TCA 27 Sheinton Street, Much Wenlock	Removal of 2no. conifers (T1 and T2) leaving trunks of approx. 2ft high and crown reduction of 50% of 1no. Ash within Much Wenlock Conservation Area. It was RESOLVED no objection.
22/02284/FUL Proposed Dwelling to the East Of 25, Homer, Much Wenlock	Erection of a dwellinghouse following demolition of existing buildings (resubmission). It was RESOLVED to object to the application. The development would be contrary to the provisions of the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Development Plan and the Shropshire Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan.

Councillor Tyler left the meeting.

11. Planning Decisions

It was RESOLVED to note the following planning decisions:

22/01456/FUL The Oaks, Callaughton, Much Wenlock	Erection of single storey double garage to side of existing residential property Decision: Grant Permission
21/05911/FUL Site Of Burnetts, Callaughton, Much Wenlock	Renovation and reinstatement of dwelling to include single storey rear extension Decision: Grant Permission

12. Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill

Members noted information regarding the Government's Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill. **It was RESOLVED that Councillors should sign up individually for alerts on the progress of the Bill, if desired.**

13. Housing for Older Residents in Much Wenlock

Members considered proposals presented by a member of the public at the meeting held on 3rd May regarding housing for older residents in Much Wenlock. It was noted that the Town Council could not provide housing and had no land of its own for development. The Council could identify policies to support the provision of housing for assisted living when the Much Wenlock Neighbourhood Development Plan was reviewed.

It was noted that Shropshire Council was currently undertaking a county-wide housing needs survey which should identify housing need in Much Wenlock. The Town Council would review the outcome as an evidence base and seek to work to meet any identified needs arising.

14. Flooding issues

- a. There was nothing to report from the Flood Group.
- b. There was nothing to report from the Strategic Flood Working Group. It was noted that the Much Wenlock Place Plan identified stakeholders with regard to flooding and that the Place Plan could be a useful tool to hold Shropshire Council to account.
- c. It was noted that Shropshire Council's Drainage and Flood Risk Manager had now been in touch to arrange a meeting with WSP, the Environment Agency and the Town Council. A date was awaited. Concerns about potential flooding from Shadwell Quarry could also be raised at that meeting.
- d. Members noted the response from Shropshire Council, dated 9th May 2022, to the enquiry from Philip Dunne MP regarding drainage maintenance in Much Wenlock.
- e. There were no other flooding matters.

15. Much Wenlock Community Flood Information, Prevention and Action Plan

Members reviewed the Much Wenlock Community Flood Information, Prevention and Action Plan, with particular reference to the roles and responsibilities outlined. It was noted that there was no defined role for the Town Council but the decision to set up a Flood Information Centre could be taken by the Mayor, Clerk, etc.

It was RESOLVED to arrange a meeting between the Strategic Flood Group and Flood Action Group to discuss and identify individuals to fill the roles required in the Flood Plan.

16. Transport Working Group

- a. Members noted a report from the Transport Working Group. It was reported that traffic counts had been undertaken on the A458 beyond the Callaughton turning towards Bridgnorth and, previously, on the B4376 Barrow Street. It was noted that a further count would be undertaken on the A4169, Farley Road.
It was RESOLVED to approve expenditure of £120 for a PICADY analysis of the data by The Hurlstone Partnership.
- b. There was no update on proposals for the pedestrian crossing on the A458, potential CIL funding and an application to the PCC's Community Fund – Safer Roads.

17. Restoring Passenger Services on the Railway Line between Oswestry and Gobowen

Members considered correspondence from Stantec regarding the preparation of a Strategic Outline Business Case to determine the feasibility and benefits of reopening the railway line between Oswestry and Gobowen.

It was RESOLVED to support the initiative.

18. Strategic Plan

It was noted that Members should begin to consider priorities for inclusion in the Town Council's Strategic Plan for consideration at the next meeting.

19. Climate Change and Ecological/Nature Emergencies*

It was noted that Councillor Toon was arranging meetings with local environmental groups.

20. Consultation*

Members considered a woodland management plan for Corve Farm Woodland – Woodhouse Fields Plantation. Having declared a pecuniary interest in this matter, Councillor Benbow withdrew from the discussion.

It was RESOLVED no objection to the proposals.

21. Street Lighting*

Members noted the response received from Shropshire Council's Street Lighting team to the Town Council's comments on street lighting in the Conservation Area.

22. Street naming ***23. Footpath/Bridleway Creation Orders*****24. Road closures***

Members noted the following road closures:

- a. Location: 16 Barrow Street, Much Wenlock
- Date/Time: Monday, 25th July 2022, 09:30 – 15:30
- Agency: Balfour Beatty
- Purpose: Carriageway repair

- b. Location: High Street, Much Wenlock
Date/Time: Sunday, 10th July, 08.00 – 17.00
Agency: Severn Trent Water
Purpose: New connection

It was RESOLVED to suspend Standing Orders to allow the meeting to continue past 9pm.

25. Highways matters *

- a. No update had been received from Shropshire Council on
- repairs to Victoria Road
 - lorries mounting the pavement at the corner of Queen Street and Back Lane
 - a contact person for a member of the public to discuss on-street parking permits
 - maintenance of grass verges in relation to the Restoring Shropshire’s Verges Project
 - planting of trees along Bridgnorth Road verge

It was noted that Shropshire Councillor Daniel Thomas was following up these matters on behalf of the Town Council.

- b. Members noted that no response had been received from Councillor Lezley Picton to the Town Council’s request for a meeting to discuss how to improve communication between Shropshire Council and the Town Council, sent on 11th May, however, Shropshire Councillor Daniel Thomas would be holding discussions with Councillor Picton.
- c. There were no other highways matters.

26. Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs)*

27. Stopping Up Orders*

28. Speed Limit Orders*

29. Prohibition Orders*

30. Date of next meeting

It was **NOTED** that the date of the next meeting would be Tuesday, 5th July 2022 at 7pm at the Guildhall, Much Wenlock.

PUBLIC BODIES (ADMISSION TO MEETINGS) ACT 1960

Pursuant to Section 1(2) of the above Act and due to the confidential nature of the following business to be transacted it was RESOLVED that the public and press should not be present.

31. Planning Enforcement

Members noted planning enforcement matters 22/08783/ENF and 22/08834/ENF.

The meeting closed at 9.23 pm.

Signed.....(Chairman)

Date.....