



# Much Wenlock Town Council

Corn Exchange  
Much Wenlock  
Shropshire  
TF13 6AE  
01952 727509

[townclerk@muchwenlock-tc.gov.uk](mailto:townclerk@muchwenlock-tc.gov.uk)  
[www.muchwenlock-tc.gov.uk](http://www.muchwenlock-tc.gov.uk)

**Town Clerk: Trudi Barrett BA (Hons)**

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that a meeting of the above-named Town Council **PLANNING & ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE** will take place in the **Guildhall**, Much Wenlock commencing at **7.00 pm** on **Tuesday, 7<sup>th</sup> June 2022** and Members are hereby summoned to attend for the purpose of transacting the following business.

Trudi Barrett, BA (Hons)  
Town Clerk

Date: 26<sup>th</sup> May 2022

# A G E N D A

## FILMING AND RECORDING OF COUNCIL MEETINGS AND THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE DATA PROTECTION ACT 2018

Any person present at a Council meeting may not orally report or comment about a Council meeting as it takes place but otherwise may: film, photograph, or make an audio recording of a meeting; use any other means for enabling persons not present to see or hear proceedings at a meeting as it takes place or later; report or comment on the proceedings in writing during or after a meeting, or orally report or comment after the meeting. Anyone making a recording for non-domestic purposes is advised to seek advice on their obligations to ensure any processing of personal information complies with the Data Protection Act 2018.

**Anyone who objects to being filmed or recorded should notify the Town Clerk prior to the commencement of the meeting.**

### 1. Election of Chairman

To elect the chairman of the committee.

### 2. Election of Deputy Chairman

To elect the deputy chairman of the committee.

### 3. Apologies

To receive apologies for absence.

### 4. Disclosure of pecuniary interests

Declaration of any disclosable pecuniary interest in a matter to be discussed at the meeting, and which is not included in the register of interests. Members are 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.

### 5. Dispensations

Requests for dispensation should be in writing, addressed to the Town Clerk, and received prior to the meeting.

### 6. Public session

At the discretion of the Chairman members of the public, who have given prior written notice to the Town Clerk, may speak with regard to a planning matter included on this agenda.

*Committee Members:*

*Councillors William Benbow, David Fenwick, Mike Grace, Wilfred Grainger, Daniel Thomas, Christian Toon, Chris Tyler and Linda West*

## 7. Minutes

To approve the minutes of a meeting held on 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2022.

## 8. Planning Applications \*

- a. To retrospectively approve the response to the following application, 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><b>Re-consultation due to amendment: additional highways information submitted.</b></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><b>Response submitted:</b></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"><li>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.</li><li>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.</li><li>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 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</li></ol>
--	--

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

*....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. To consider 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.
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.
22/02017/FUL Hazelwood, Homer, Much Wenlock	Erection of garden outbuilding to provide garaging and garden workshop/store.
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).
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.

*NOTE: \*Planning applications not listed above that are received after the issue of this agenda and included on Shropshire Council's website will also be considered due to response time frames.*

## 9. Planning decisions

To note the following planning decisions and any others received prior to the date of the meeting:

22/01456/FUL The Oaks, Callaughton, Much Wenlock	Erection of single storey double garage to side of existing residential property Decision: <b>Grant Permission</b>
---	---

## 10. Draft Shropshire Local Plan Review 2016 - 2038

To consider a report from the Shropshire Local Plan Review Working Group.

## 11. Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill

To note information regarding the Government's Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill and to consider signing up for alerts and events as the Bill progresses.

## 12. Housing for Older Residents in Much Wenlock

To consider proposals presented by a member of the public at the meeting held on 3<sup>rd</sup> May regarding housing for older residents in Much Wenlock and to decide how to address the matters raised.

## 13. Flooding issues

- To receive a written update from the Flood Group.
- To receive a report from the Strategic Flood Working Group.
- To consider any response received from Shropshire Council's Drainage and Flood Risk Manager regarding the request for a meeting on general flooding matters affecting Much Wenlock and concerns about flooding associated with Shadwell Quarry (NB. Referred to Shropshire Councillor Daniel Thomas for support).
- To consider the response from Shropshire Council, dated 9<sup>th</sup> May 2022, to the enquiry from Philip Dunne MP regarding drainage maintenance in Much Wenlock.
- To consider any other flooding issues arising.

## 14. Much Wenlock Community Flood Information, Prevention and Action Plan

To review the Much Wenlock Community Flood Information, Prevention and Action Plan, with particular reference to the roles and responsibilities outlined.

## 15. Transport Working Group

- To consider a report from the Transport Working Group.
- To consider any update on proposals for the pedestrian crossing on the A458, potential CIL funding and an application to the PCC's Community Fund – Safer Roads (NB. Support requested from Shropshire Councillor Daniel Thomas in eliciting a response from Shropshire Council officers regarding CIL funding).

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

To consider 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 and to consider any input from the Town Council.

### **17. Strategic Plan**

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

### **18. Climate Change and Ecological/Nature Emergencies**

### **19. Consultation\***

### **20. Street Lighting\***

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

### **21. Street naming \***

### **22. Footpath/Bridleway Creation Orders\***

### **23. Footpath Diversion Orders\***

To note the confirmation and coming into operation of the diversion of part of Footpath 52 and part of Footpath 177 in Atterley, Much Wenlock, on 15<sup>th</sup> February 2022.

### **24. Road closures\***

To note the following road closure:

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

### **25. Highways matters \***

- a. To note any update from Shropshire Council on
  - repairs to Victoria Road (most recent request and chasers date back to 7<sup>th</sup> March)
  - lorries mounting the pavement at the corner of Queen Street and Back Lane (dates back to October 2021)
  - a contact person for a member of the public to discuss on-street parking permits (dates back to 14<sup>th</sup> March)
  - maintenance of grass verges in relation to the Restoring Shropshire's Verges Project (dates back to 8<sup>th</sup> September 2021)
  - planting of trees along Bridgnorth Road verge (dates back to 9<sup>th</sup> February).
- b. To consider any response 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.
- c. To consider an update on any other highways matters.

### **26. Tree Preservation Orders\***

### **27. Stopping Up Orders\***

### **28. Speed Limit Orders\***

### **29. Prohibition Orders\***

### **30. Date of next meeting**

To **NOTE** that the next meeting will be held on Tuesday, 5<sup>th</sup> 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 will be **PROPOSED, SECONDED and RESOLVED** that the public and press should not be present.

### **31. Planning Enforcement \***