

MINUTES OF THE SHERIFFHALES PARISH COUNCIL VIRTUAL MEETING HELD ON THE 14th JANUARY 2021

Present: Councillors: Dr A MacWhannell (Chairman); N Edwards (Vice Chairman); N Pulker; G Tonkinson; K Turley, J Horne and A Edwards.

In attendance Clerk to the Council – Miss Jennifer Cree.

1/21. To receive apologies for Absence.

An apology of absence was received and accepted from Councillor Miss S Barratt due to previous commitments. This apology was noted and accepted.

2/21. To receive members declaration of Pecuniary Interests

There were no declarations of interest

3/21. To agree the previously circulated minutes of the Parish Council meeting held on the 10th December 2020.

It was proposed by Councillor K Turley, seconded by Councillor A Edwards that these minutes were accepted as a true and accurate record of both meetings with the following amendment:-

Item 96/20 – minute should read:-

Recommend Approval subject to Highways being satisfied that the access along Marsh Lane to the A5 is adequate for the use of an equine business and if improvements are required these must form part of the planning approval. In addition there should be signs stating that access to this business is only through one route from the A5 not through Marsh Lane from the B4379.

4/21. Public participation for a maximum of 15 mins for members of the public to address the Council for 3 minutes each in relation to an agenda item.

There were no members of the public present.

5/21. To discuss and comment on any Planning Applications received / outstanding

Planning Application no 20/05042/FUL The Manor, Sheriffhales – No objection

Planning Application no 20/05294/FUL Village Farm, Sheriffhales – No objection, subject to the gates being set back enough so any vehicles entering the site can safely pull off the road and clear the footpath. Any visibility splays and road clearance must be approved by Highways to ensure they are safe.

We also note that the development has already started without planning permission being granted.

Planning Application – 20/05097/FUL Woodcote Quarry

It was proposed by Councillor A MacWhannell and seconded by Councillor G Tonkinson to send a response objecting to the application based on the letter as attached as appendix 1 to these minutes and include how the area is to be back filled when it is finished, is the life of the quarry to

be reduced if more raw materials are being extracted and ensure signage is appropriate. In addition this planning application should be called into the full Planning Committee not decided by the Officers. On a vote this was agreed.

Action: Councillors A MacWhannell and N Edwards to prepare a response. Clerk to submit comments for all 3 applications.

6/21. To receive an update on Manor Farm applications

It was proposed by Councillor J Horne and seconded by Councillor A Edwards to send the response to the transport document submitted by the applicant as prepared by the Chairman as attached as appendix 2 to these minutes. On a vote this was agreed.

Action: Councillors A MacWhannell and N Edwards to prepare a response. Clerk to submit on the Planning portal.

7/21. To receive an update on Enforcement cases

It was proposed by Councillor G Tonkinson and seconded by Councillor A MacWhannell that photographs are taken of the changed area of the wall at Heath Hill, showing the pavement been narrowed and the bank of soil, also the narrowing of the road way. Older photographs to be found to show the detrimental impact of this wall to this area. On a vote this was agreed.

Action: Councillor G Tonkinson to prepare a response, with the Clerks help.

Hunger Hill Farm – There is no further action at this time , therefore it was proposed by Councillor N Edwards and seconded by Councillor A Edwards to take photographs of the partly developed site, compare them to previous photographs before the site was developed, and forward these to the Enforcement Officer to ask for the area to be re-looked at.

Action: Councillors A Edwards and N Edwards to prepare a response.

8/21. Update on compliance with the safety audits on the traffic calming scheme and Crackley Bank traffic lights scheme

It was agreed that the Clerk ask for updates on the above items (and copies of the reports) as a matter of urgency.

Action: Clerk to get update.

9/21. Update on action to address speeding through the village and use of the B4379 by unauthorised quarry and HGV traffic

Councillor A Edwards reported that since October, there has been a slow response from both the Police and Shropshire Council. Councillor N Pulker recently contacted the Crime Commissioners Assistant and this seems to be moving things forward.

The Parish have been informed that there is a meeting on the 25th February with the West Mercia Safety Forum, where Shropshire Council representatives will attend, they will discuss this problem at that meeting. Councillor A Edwards has

been told that they have been undertaking traffic surveys (in December) for the speed and volume / type of traffic passing along the B4379, and it is anticipated they will undertake further surveys and this data will be presented to the meeting in February.

Councillor N Pulker has checked all the signs around the area and all roads that should have the restricted Lorry weight sign have that on them. There is a road from Lillishall where the sign needs to either be moved further down the road or an additional road sign as once vehicles have got to the sign, they have little choice but to go against the traffic order at that point.

It was proposed by Councillor N Edwards and seconded by Councillor K Turley, to request a copy of the survey data undertaken to date, and for the additional data / report that is to be presented to the February meeting be forwarded to the Parish Council as soon as it is available. Further correspondence be sent shortly before the meeting in February to remind them of this issue and to get a copy of the report.

Action: Councillor A Edwards to request a copy of the data.

10/21. To discuss correspondence received relating to the Census (appendix 6)

The Clerk attended the Census information meeting and circulated to all members the paperwork.

The census is not been altered due to Covid and will go ahead on the planned date. The timetable of events is in the papers circulated.

Shropshire Council are employing 200 additional staff to deal with the Census and opening helplines to assist those that need help with completing the Census. It is expected most people to complete Census online, however, for that portion of the Community that cannot do this, they can request a paper copy of the form, go to a main service library for a set amount of weeks to help people complete this online or also request help in person from staff.

Members agreed that the Parish Magazine and Noticeboards would support putting posters in them.

11/21. To discuss issues relating to access on PROW within the Parish

It was noted that a review of paths that are not on the current definitive map is due to be completed in 2026. Members were asked to bring forward paths for including into the new plan.

It was noted that some funds could be requested to help clear some of the blocked paths within the Parish.

12/21. To discuss and agree any actions relating to the playing field update (ROSPA, Orchard and benches inc. oak benches)

It was noted that the trees have been delivered / paid for and are awaiting planting at the correct time. Councillor Miss S Barratt has kindly donated the tree guards for the trees for when they are planted to protect them.

The benches are due for delivery Friday 15th January to a local farmer, who will store them and then bring them over to the playing fields for installation. The works to the play area repairs are due to be completed by the end of the month.

13/21, To discuss the flooding within the Parish (Appendix 9)

It was agreed to invite Mathieu Faure to the next meeting to discuss the flooding problems within the Parish (Burlington, Marsh Lane, Kettlemore Lane, Church Lane), as many temporary measures have been put in place but a permanent solution is required.

Action Clerk to invite M Faure to the next meeting and outline areas of concern with him.

14/21. To receive the accounts for payment

The accounts detailed below were agreed:-

28/11/2020	208.00	1447	Neat n Tidy
28/11/2020	77.00	1448	RBL
28/11/2020	180.00	1449	G Rubini garden services
21/12/2020	4549.20	1450	Marmax
01/01/2021	399.14	1451	J Neal
01/01/2021	99.80	1452	Inland Revenue

5513.14

15/21. To receive the accounts up to 30th November 2020

The accounts as set out in the agenda papers as appendix 11 were noted and agreed.

16/21. EMG Grant application for 2021/22

Action: All members - It was agreed to bring forward ideas for this grant (possibly tying this in with PROW works if required) to the Clerk or Chairman, deadline for applications the end of January.

17/21. To discuss any actions relating to the current Covid restrictions

It was agreed that the Clerk liaise with Shropshire Council to see if the Parish Council are needed in any way.

18/21. Items for Future agendas

Roads to be cleared with the sweeper in Sheriffhales Parish
Invite M Faure / J Bellis to speak to members
Post holes on B4379

19/21. Date of Next meeting

11TH March 2021

SHERIFFHALES PARISH COUNCIL

*Including the communities of Sherifffhales, Lilyhurst, Burlington, Heath Hill,
Weston Heath, Redhill and Chadwell*

Clerk to the Council: Mrs Jennifer Neal,
35 Kingsford Park, Wolverley, Worcestershire, DY11 5TA
Telephone: 07512292579 Email: clerk@sheriffhalesparishcouncil.uk
Website: www.sheriffhalesparishcouncil.uk

21st December 2020

Southern Planning Team
Shropshire Council
Shirehall
Abbey Foregate
Shrewsbury

Dear Mr Evans

Planning App 20/05097/VAR

You may be aware that both Sherifffhales Parish Council (SPC) and a significant number of local residents raised objections to the planning applications made in respect of Woodcote Quarry in 2018. Many of the concerns related to Highway safety matters, environmental impact and disturbance and the potential negative impact on surrounding communities and environments.

Despite these objections SC granted planning approval and in addition applied a series of conditions and legally binding obligations. In addition, the applicant gave various commitments in respect to the planning application. Following the granting of planning permission SPC have sought on numerous occasions clarification from the case officer, Grahame French , as to what precisely were the conditions , and/ or legally binding obligations applied to the planning consent granted by SC , and equally what were the commitments made by the applicant as part of obtaining planning approval, in both cases specifically in respect of Highway Safety and operation and Traffic Management .

SPC also sought confirmation from the Case Officer that these conditions, legally binding obligations and applicant commitments had been met . Unfortunately we have never received a straight forward response that clarifies the position on either of these substantive matters.

Consequently, in considering this new application which represents a 60 % growth in potential output from the Quarry SPC would like to again request the information set out above relating to the 2018 application. Clearly the SPC does not have routine access to specialist planning advice so it would be helpful if the information requested could be set out in a straightforward manner. In very simple terms what did SC require the applicants to do in respect to Highway Safety and Traffic Management issues, have they delivered these requirements satisfactorily if not what is outstanding and how are SC addressing any outstanding issues and similarly for the commitments made by the applicants.

SPC would appreciate a prompt response on this issue so we can have regard to this information as part of considering the new application. In particular, we will be considering this matter at our meeting on 14/01/2021 so a reply prior to the Xmas break would be helpful

We look forward to your assistance on this matter and to the receipt of the requested information ASAP

Yours sincerely

Jennifer Neal
Clerk to the Council

Appendix 2 to the minutes of Sheriffhales Parish Council held on the 14th January 2021

Background and Introductory remarks

Sheriffhales Parish Council has previously submitted comments on this planning application which was originally submitted in May 2020. It has also already commented on two other related applications: the erection of an equestrian building west of Manor farm 20/00822/FUL and a proposed new pig farm development south-west of Manor farm 20/00820 as these three proposals are interlinked.

We had as part of our original response requested a detailed Transport Statement as none was provided initially with application 20/00821/OUT. We are grateful this has been provided at last.

We would note again that the site itself is in a Parish that Shropshire Council does itself not consider suitable for sustainable development. Secondly, the development is not in line with criteria used in the NPPF and exceptionality allowing this Planning framework to be set aside has still not been shown. Finally, the site of the development is located adjacent to a Conservation Area and the most congested area in the Village. Traffic generated can only travel through this area to reach the B 4379 main route in and out of Sheriffhales.

We would also reiterate that all the three developments when considered together have traffic effects that increase complexity with varying impact in the area under review but also across a wider part of our locality. The report specifically states the conclusions within it are in the context of the housing development specifically and is not intended to consider inputs from these related developments though does in fact touch on some of these effects when modelling.

The Parish Council stated in its initial response to 20/00821/OUT that a description of the highway network in the vicinity of the development would show the significant impact that this development and traffic associated with it would have on the existing highway resource, village and school. We believe the report confirms this.

Our response also noted there were no sustainable public transport links present and that the development did not enhance site accessibility by sustainable travel in any way.

The Parish Council also commented then that there was already significant local concern around increased traffic arising from the development affecting the way the School operated and the impact of this increased activity on local traffic pinch points. The Parish Council further noted then that some traffic generated by the equestrian business would still be routed past the development and the school and this would not be mitigated in any way by the housing development.

The report circulated has been considered against these comments and specific concerns which continue to be expressed within our community.

Specific Comments on Report Chapter1: Introduction

1.4 This states the report is intended to only consider the proposed residential developments impacts. For the reasons mentioned above this weakens the report given the complexity of the traffic impacts of the three related developments.

Specific Comments on Report Chapter2: Access Sustainability and The Road Network

2.1-2.2 The comments in paragraph 1 and 2 are noted. Figure2 shows the highway into the Conservation Area. There is no footway here and the area around the lodges at the junction with Sheriffhales Drive is well

known for flooding. A tributary of the River Worfe runs under the road near the speed limit terminal sign. The right-hand boundary of the conservation area is just before the sign and the Manor itself listed and within the conservation area is on the left. The modelled increase in highway traffic movement across this area past the houses mentioned is a considerable increase in traffic as mentioned in other consultee responses and will impact significantly on these households. Traffic will feed into the narrow area beyond by the Village Hall School and Church impacting here also. The images provided may give a misleading impression of this as these other areas are not shown.

Since farming activity locally in this area has changed the unadopted road (originally known as Sandy Lane) which continues West towards the A5, has not been maintained along its full length and has deteriorated. The Western end of this road is intended to be used as the main access to and from the new Pig Unit and possibly used also for some of the traffic generated by the proposed Equestrian Facility which is located further along this Road closer to the housing development. This route is stated as strategically unimportant although detail on using this route to mitigate traffic impact in the centre of the village has not been considered as an option in Chapter4.

2.3-2.4 The comments in these paragraphs are noted. Both Church Lane and The Rock are used to enter and exit the centre of the village as mentioned but we certainly do not agree that there is no safety concern in using these roads as routes given the projected increase in traffic arising from the development. The Rock narrows towards the B4379 junction and traffic currently must stop on the steep hill down to the centre of the village to allow safe passing. There is no footway or space for one on this road. More pedestrian traffic uses Church Lane which has limited footway availability but does have traffic generated by the Village playing field entranceway and is congested at school times.

2.3-2.4 The selected camera angles in Figure3 exaggerate the width of the road both next to the Church on Church Lane and at the bottom of The Rock. The latter picture is just before the sharp bend junction with Church Lane.

The statement that narrow sections of either road provide an element of traffic calming is surprising, but we would agree that increasing congestion on these roads is a highly likely impact and clearly undesirable.

2.5 We note the comments and do not agree. The visibility at the crossroads junction at the top of The Rock is significantly restricted to the North. Vehicles travelling south towards Shifnal accelerate out of the village across this junction. Sightlines at the top of Church Lane South are not optimal and the traffic calming in place on the B4379 just to the north of this junction directs traffic into the middle of the road here. The B4379 is increasingly busy at all times of day but particularly early mornings, school times and at the end of the working day. Traffic using this route has increased since traffic lighting the B4379 A5 junction. The data on collisions in the centre of the village does not record the fatal traffic accident that occurred over 5 years ago and in part resulted in the traffic calming now introduced.

2.7-2.11 This assessment of Sustainability and Transport is noted. The Census data provided and reproduced here explains why Shropshire Council considers Sheriffhales unsuitable for significant development and evidences our assertion that the balance of our community will be disrupted by development in the site this application refers to. Our small community has non-existent Public Transport Links currently with one bus on Saturday no cycle route and limited car parking in Shifnal. We do agree motor vehicles are essential to get to employment, services and major transport infrastructure. We consider that the Local traffic impacts generated from housing development at the Manor Farm site is particularly problematic given the site location in our community. Modelling later in the report unfortunately significantly underestimates this impact. There is unfortunately no evidence to support a community gain in sustainability in this submission with an emphasis on travelling out to interact with services or transport links.

Specific Comments on Report Chapter3: Development Traffic

3.1 The comments in this introductory paragraph confirm the importance of considering the traffic impacts of this development together with the traffic impacts of the other interlinked planning applications.

3.2-3.5 We note that the traffic movements in these two paragraphs are “derived” and essentially rough estimates. They derive from several assumptions made both of farming activity at the proposed new Pig Unit

and of the impacts of loading the highway network by residential development. We have concern that the car ownership, number of journeys generated, and infrastructure impact is underestimated given trends in car ownership, type of housing being considered and distance to services. Given the location of the residential development near listed property, conservation area and some distance from the B4379 and with difficult road access to this main road at least one statutory consultee has already commented unfavourably on development at this site. We are strongly concerned that the local impacts to residential property close to the development and certainly the impacts in the centre of the village are underestimated. We have noted that no modelling of impacts should the scale of the Residential development or the size of Pig Unit change is included in the report. A full transport assessment will be required in this event.

The data as presented does not suggest the housing development supports the national or Shropshire's sustainability agenda or indeed benefits our community locally. Other consultees have noted this.

With respect to Traffic movements, we note that trip vehicle rates are shown in Fig6 but feel these must underestimate the generated activity itself and hence the effects on other highway activity

3.5-6 We note the acceptance that there are issues arising from the housing development that will require infrastructure improvement.

We are concerned that the modelled increases of traffic density on The Rock and Church Lane arising from the development at a split of 70%/30% are not realistic and are presumably based on assumptions relating to traffic flows to the B4379 north and south from the development not just School or Village Hall activity. We remain concerned that safety and congestion on both roads will increase.

Specific Comments on Report Chapter4: Local Highway Improvements

4.1-4 We note the observations concerning traffic congestion and safety in the area around the school. It is accepted that congestion already is a problem which is significant at times given the popularity of the school. A Montessori preschool group also meets regularly in the Village Hall immediately next to the School. Though not mentioned pedestrian traffic is also considerable at these times as a considerable number of families do walk to and from both schools. There is significant housing north and northeast of the B4379 between The Pinfold and Kettlemore Lane and also further off Church Lane in the Evergreens. This pedestrian traffic uses the only safe route to these schools and Playing Field down Church Lane. Being able to walk to school in our rural community is valued. It also meets a fitness agenda as does the School or Preschool when using our Playing field for games or when exploring our local environment. Pedestrian traffic can only be safe if traffic levels are low. The suggested routes from the development increase the use of Church Lane considerably. It is unclear how much an off-road parking solution would mitigate road congestion in the area around the school. Traffic is still generated on both roads out of the area even if congestion due to Parking is reduced.

4.5-7. We note this paragraph concerns a proposal that a Parking area be created distant from the centre of the village where the School is located. This site is opposite Sherifhales Manor and just beyond the area subject to flooding. From the map provided it is also, in part, just within the conservation area and some distance from the school entrance. We infer from previous comment in 4.4 this proposal aims to significantly reduce the congestion presently occurring around the school and to be considered a community benefit. We infer an additional benefit to the developer might also, if successful, be to facilitate traffic flows through this area to the B4379 should the development go ahead as it has been accepted that the increased volume of traffic created by the development will make congestion worse.

We note that should this proposal be accepted some way of entry and exit from the lay-by site is required. We are unclear how given the width of the road if traffic is expected to "three-point turn" in the entrance way to the new development, use the private entrance way to the Manor or reverse down the road to Sherifhales Drive and reverse there. Children arriving or leaving by car still need to walk through a congested area.

The total volume of traffic using Church Lane and The Rock is not mitigated in any way by this proposal. It further creates an additional congested area and further nuisance to residents and indirectly impacts the conservation area appearance.

This proposal does not result in significant mediation of traffic impacts on our community or community betterment of any significance. We object to this proposal.

Final Comments

We are grateful for the opportunity to review this full report, the assessments within it and the proposal for community betterment. Unfortunately, our concerns related to this housing development and its impacts are, if anything, greater now we have read the report, the assumptions made within it and the negative impacts associated with development as submitted.

Yours faithfully
Jenny Neal

Sent from my iPad

Background and Introductory remarks

Sheriffhales Parish Council has previously submitted comments on this planning application which was originally submitted in May 2020. It has also already commented on two other related applications: the erection of an equestrian building west of Manor farm 20/00822/FUL and a proposed new pig farm development south-west of Manor farm 20/00820 as these three proposals are interlinked.

We had as part of our original response requested a detailed Transport Statement as none was provided initially with application 20/00821/OUT. We are grateful this has been provided at last.

We would note again that the site itself is in a Parish that Shropshire Council does itself not consider suitable for sustainable development. Secondly, the development is not in line with criteria used in the NPPF and exceptionality allowing this Planning framework to be set aside has still not been shown. Finally, the site of the development is located adjacent to a Conservation Area and the most congested area in the Village. Traffic generated can only travel through this area to reach the B 4379 main route in and out of Sheriffhales.

We would also reiterate that all the three developments when considered together have traffic effects that increase complexity with varying impact in the area under review but also across a wider part of our locality. The report specifically states the conclusions within it are in the context of the housing development specifically and is not intended to consider inputs from these related developments though does in fact touch on some of these effects when modelling.

The Parish Council stated in its initial response to 20/00821/OUT that a description of the highway network in the vicinity of the development would show the significant impact that this development and traffic associated with it would have on the existing highway resource, village and school. We believe the report confirms this.

Our response also noted there were no sustainable public transport links present and that the development did not enhance site accessibility by sustainable travel in any way.

The Parish Council also commented then that there was already significant local concern around increased traffic arising from the development affecting the way the School operated and the impact of this increased activity on local traffic pinch points. The Parish Council further noted then that some traffic generated by the equestrian business would still be routed past the development and the school and this would not be mitigated in any way by the housing development.

The report circulated has been considered against these comments and specific concerns which continue to

be expressed within our community.

Specific Comments on Report Chapter1: Introduction

1.4 This states the report is intended to only consider the proposed residential developments impacts. For the reasons mentioned above this weakens the report given the complexity of the traffic impacts of the three related developments.

Specific Comments on Report Chapter2: Access Sustainability and The Road Network

2.1-2.2 The comments in paragraph 1 and 2 are noted. Figure2 shows the highway into the Conservation Area. There is no footway here and the area around the lodges at the junction with Sheriffhales Drive is well known for flooding. A tributary of the River Worfe runs under the road near the speed limit terminal sign. The right-hand boundary of the conservation area is just before the sign and the Manor itself listed and within the conservation area is on the left. The modelled increase in highway traffic movement across this area past the houses mentioned is a considerable increase in traffic as mentioned in other consultee responses and will impact significantly on these households. Traffic will feed into the narrow area beyond by the Village Hall School and Church impacting here also. The images provided may give a misleading impression of this as these other areas are not shown.

Since farming activity locally in this area has changed the unadopted road (originally known as Sandy Lane) which continues West towards the A5, has not been maintained along its full length and has deteriorated. The Western end of this road is intended to be used as the main access to and from the new Pig Unit and possibly used also for some of the traffic generated by the proposed Equestrian Facility which is located further along this Road closer to the housing development. This route is stated as strategically unimportant although detail on using this route to mitigate traffic impact in the centre of the village has not been considered as an option in Chapter4.

2.3-2.4 The comments in these paragraphs are noted. Both Church Lane and The Rock are used to enter and exit the centre of the village as mentioned but we certainly do not agree that there is no safety concern in using these roads as routes given the projected increase in traffic arising from the development. The Rock narrows towards the B4379 junction and traffic currently must stop on the steep hill down to the centre of the village to allow safe passing. There is no footway or space for one on this road. More pedestrian traffic uses Church Lane which has limited footway availability but does have traffic generated by the Village playing field entranceway and is congested at school times.

2.3-2.4 The selected camera angles in Figure3 exaggerate the width of the road both next to the Church on Church Lane and at the bottom of The Rock. The latter picture is just before the sharp bend junction with Church Lane.

The statement that narrow sections of either road provide an element of traffic calming is surprising, but we would agree that increasing congestion on these roads is a highly likely impact and clearly undesirable.

2.5 We note the comments and do not agree. The visibility at the crossroads junction at the top of The Rock is significantly restricted to the North. Vehicles travelling south towards Shifnal accelerate out of the village across this junction. Sightlines at the top of Church Lane South are not optimal and the traffic calming in place on the B4379 just to the north of this junction directs traffic into the middle of the road here. The B4379 is increasingly busy at all times of day but particularly early mornings, school times and at the end of the working day. Traffic using this route has increased since traffic lighting the B4379 A5 junction. The data on collisions in the centre of the village does not record the fatal traffic accident that occurred over 5 years ago and in part resulted in the traffic calming now introduced.

2.7-2.11 This assessment of Sustainability and Transport is noted. The Census data provided and reproduced here explains why Shropshire Council considers Sheriffhales unsuitable for significant development and evidences our assertion that the balance of our community will be disrupted by development in the site this

application refers to. Our small community has non-existent Public Transport Links currently with one bus on Saturday no cycle route and limited car parking in Shifnal. We do agree motor vehicles are essential to get to employment, services and major transport infrastructure. We consider that the Local traffic impacts generated from housing development at the Manor Farm site is particularly problematic given the site location in our community. Modelling later in the report unfortunately significantly underestimates this impact. There is unfortunately no evidence to support a community gain in sustainability in this submission with an emphasis on travelling out to interact with services or transport links.

Specific Comments on Report Chapter3: Development Traffic

3.1 The comments in this introductory paragraph confirm the importance of considering the traffic impacts of this development together with the traffic impacts of the other interlinked planning applications.

3.2-3.5 We note that the traffic movements in these two paragraphs are “derived” and essentially rough estimates. They derive from several assumptions made both of farming activity at the proposed new Pig Unit and of the impacts of loading the highway network by residential development. We have concern that the car ownership, number of journeys generated, and infrastructure impact is underestimated given trends in car ownership, type of housing being considered and distance to services. Given the location of the residential development near listed property, conservation area and some distance from the B4379 and with difficult road access to this main road at least one statutory consultee has already commented unfavourably on development at this site. We are strongly concerned that the local impacts to residential property close to the development and certainly the impacts in the centre of the village are underestimated. We have noted that no modelling of impacts should the scale of the Residential development or the size of Pig Unit change is included in the report. A full transport assessment will be required in this event.

The data as presented does not suggest the housing development supports the national or Shropshire’s sustainability agenda or indeed benefits our community locally. Other consultees have noted this.

With respect to Traffic movements, we note that trip vehicle rates are shown in Fig6 but feel these must underestimate the generated activity itself and hence the effects on other highway activity

3.5-6 We note the acceptance that there are issues arising from the housing development that will require infrastructure improvement.

We are concerned that the modelled increases of traffic density on The Rock and Church Lane arising from the development at a split of 70%/30% are not realistic and are presumably based on assumptions relating to traffic flows to the B4379 north and south from the development not just School or Village Hall activity. We remain concerned that safety and congestion on both roads will increase.

Specific Comments on Report Chapter4: Local Highway Improvements

4.1-4 We note the observations concerning traffic congestion and safety in the area around the school. It is accepted that congestion already is a problem which is significant at times given the popularity of the school. A Montessori preschool group also meets regularly in the Village Hall immediately next to the School. Though not mentioned pedestrian traffic is also considerable at these times as a considerable number of families do walk to and from both schools. There is significant housing north and northeast of the B4379 between The Pinfold and Kettlemore Lane and also further off Church Lane in the Evergreens. This pedestrian traffic uses the only safe route to these schools and Playing Field down Church Lane. Being able to walk to school in our rural community is valued. It also meets a fitness agenda as does the School or Preschool when using our Playing field for games or when exploring our local environment. Pedestrian traffic can only be safe if traffic levels are low. The suggested routes from the development increase the use of Church Lane considerably. It is unclear how much an off-road parking solution would mitigate road congestion in the area around the school. Traffic is still generated on both roads out of the area even if congestion due to Parking is reduced.

4.5-7. We note this paragraph concerns a proposal that a Parking area be created distant from the centre of the village where the School is located. This site is opposite Sheriffhales Manor and just beyond the area subject to flooding. From the map provided it is also, in part, just within the conservation area and some distance from the school entrance. We infer from previous comment in 4.4 this proposal aims to significantly reduce the congestion presently occurring around the school and to be considered a community benefit. We infer an additional benefit to the developer might also, if successful, be to facilitate traffic flows through this area to the B4379 should the development go ahead as it has been accepted that the increased volume of traffic created by the development will make congestion worse.

We note that should this proposal be accepted some way of entry and exit from the lay-by site is required. We are unclear how given the width of the road if traffic is expected to “three-point turn” in the entrance way to the new development, use the private entrance way to the Manor or reverse down the road to Sheriffhales Drive and reverse there. Children arriving or leaving by car still need to walk through a congested area.

The total volume of traffic using Church Lane and The Rock is not mitigated in any way by this proposal. It further creates an additional congested area and further nuisance to residents and indirectly impacts the conservation area appearance.

This proposal does not result in significant mediation of traffic impacts on our community or community betterment of any significance. We object to this proposal.

Final Comments

We are grateful for the opportunity to review this full report, the assessments within it and the proposal for community betterment. Unfortunately, our concerns related to this housing development and its impacts are, if anything, greater now we have read the report, the assumptions made within it and the negative impacts associated with development as submitted.

Yours faithfully
Jenny Neal