



Shropshire Council  
Legal and Democratic Services  
Shirehall  
Abbey Foregate  
Shrewsbury  
SY2 6ND

Date: Friday, 18 September 2015  
:

**Committee:  
Environment and Services Scrutiny Committee**

**Date: Monday, 28 September 2015**  
**Time: 2.00 pm**  
**Venue: Shirehall**

You are requested to attend the above meeting.  
The Agenda is attached

Claire Porter  
Head of Legal and Democratic Services (Monitoring Officer)

**Members of Environment and Services Scrutiny Committee**

Vince Hunt (Chairman)	Roger Hughes
Keith Roberts (Vice Chairman)	Christian Lea
Peter Adams	Pamela Moseley
Ted Clarke	Vivienne Parry
Nigel Hartin	Arthur Walpole

Your Committee Officer is:

**Tim Ward** Committee Officer  
Tel: 01743 257713  
Email: [tim.ward@shropshire.gov.uk](mailto:tim.ward@shropshire.gov.uk)

# AGENDA

**1 Apologies for absence and substitutions**

**2 Disclosable Pecuniary Interests**

Members are reminded that they must not participate in the discussion or voting on any matter in which they have a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest and should leave the room prior to the commencement of the debate.

**3 Minutes of the meeting held on 22 June 2015 (Pages 1 - 6)**

To consider the Minutes of the Environment and Services Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 22 June 2015.

**4 Public Question Time**

To receive any questions, statements or petitions from the public of which members of the public have given notice. Deadline for notification for this meeting is Wednesday 23 September 2015

**5 Member Question Time**

To receive any questions of which members of the Council have given notice. Deadline for notification for this meeting is Wednesday 23 September 2015.

**6 Petition re Speed Restriction on New Street, Frankwell (Pages 7 - 14)**

**7 Petition re Speed restriction on Redstone Drive Highley (Pages 15 - 20)**

**8 Waste Management Service Update (Pages 21 - 24)**

To receive an update on the Battlefield ERF plant and waste activity in general.

**9 Date/Time of next meeting**

The Committee is next scheduled to meet at 2.00pm on Monday 26 October 2015.



**This page is intentionally left blank**



Environment and  
Services Scrutiny  
Committee

28 September 2015

2.00 pm

Item

**3**

Public

**MINUTES OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND SERVICES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE  
MEETING HELD ON 22 JUNE 2015  
2.00 - 3.30 PM**

**Responsible Officer:** Jane Palmer  
Email: jane.palmer@shropshire.gov.uk Tel: 01743 257712

**Present**

Councillor Vince Hunt (Chairman)  
Councillors Keith Roberts (Vice Chairman), Ted Clarke, Nigel Hartin, Christian Lea,  
Pamela Moseley, Vivienne Parry and Arthur Walpole

**5 Apologies for absence and substitutions**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors P Adams and R Hughes.

**6 Disclosable Pecuniary Interests**

None were declared.

**7 Minutes of the meetings held on 30 March 2015 and 14 May 2015**

**RESOLVED:**

That the Minutes of the meetings of the Environment and Services Scrutiny Committee held on 30 March and 14 May 2015 be approved as correct records subject to the addition of the following text to Minute 1 of the meeting held on 14 May 2015, 'Councillor V Parry was nominated as Chairman of the Committee for the ensuing year but the nomination did not receive sufficient support'.

**8 Public Question Time**

No questions had been received from members of the public.

**9 Member Question Time**

There were no questions from Members.

## 10 Shrewsbury Swimming Pool Update

The Director of Commissioning presented the update report on the detailed options being worked up by Officers for swimming provision in Shrewsbury.

Members noted the detailed site options as:

- Refurbishment of the existing Quarry pool
- Renovation of the existing Quarry pool
- New build on the site of the existing Quarry pool
- New build at Clayton Way
- New build on land at Ellesmere Road
- New build on land at the Shrewsbury Sports Village
- New build on land at Shrewsbury College

The Director of Commissioning explained that the Council was working closely with Energize, Sport England, the Amateur Swimming Association (ASA) and the Quarry Swimming Pool and Fitness Forum. He added that the development of a preferred future swimming pool option would be supported by a four month public consultation and detailed public and stakeholder engagement.

Members noted that two of the options related to four pool facilities and the other four, new build options, related to two pools. Referring to the revenue savings detailed for the option of new build on land at the Shrewsbury Sports Village, the Director of Commissioning explained that shared facilities [reception/changing rooms] would result in decreased build costs. He added that the combination of a pool alongside dry side facilities resulted in increased participation levels overall and increased income and cost reduction.

He cautioned that whichever option was chosen there was a risk of potential overspend and project creep in such a significant project. Members noted that the project was being developed by a Project Board chaired by the Director of Commissioning and included relevant internal Officers and external representation from Energize, Sport England and the Amateur Swimming Association. The Director of Commissioning explained that the Board had developed, and kept under review, a detailed project plan, risk management framework and Equality and Social Inclusion Impact Assessment (ESIIA).

The Committee noted the work carried out to inform public consultation on the swimming pool options that included:

- Ongoing liaison with partner organisations
- Building and mechanical and electrical condition survey of the Quarry Swimming and Fitness Centre
- Shortlisting of potential sites for swimming provision
- Contract variation with Shropshire Community Leisure Trust
- Sport England facilities planning model, May 2015
- Site options appraisal report, May 2015

The Committee noted that a four month consultation would end on 25 September and, to date, 621 responses had been received and this figure was rising. The Director of Commissioning explained that the views of current users and non-users were being

captured through a range of engagement and consultation processes and recommendations would be reported to Cabinet in December 2015. A Member commented that a notice on Arriva buses locally may generate additional input into the consultation. It was also suggested that the views of Members in Wards surrounding the town should be sought rather than focussing solely on those Members in the town; this point was accepted.

The Chairman commented on the merits of choosing a site that had easy access and stressed the importance of taking the needs of disabled users into consideration. The Director of Commissioning stated that this was the norm and was an integral part of the project.

Another Member commented on the merits of an Olympic size pool in order to provide training facilities locally for future Olympians, this would require a pool 50m in length [the current pool being 33 m]. Replying, the Director of Commissioning commented that Birmingham University had an Olympic size pool but this had little community use and was the only pool of this size in the region. He added that the Shrewsbury proposals took into consideration the predicted population growth to 2026 and predictions on the level of water space that would be suitable. He drew attention to the danger of comparing facilities in other authorities as the provision was carefully calculated in accordance with the level of local 'need'.

Referring to the transport implications of the various options, the Director of Commissioning explained that these had been factored in to the usage levels detailed in the report at paragraph 6. A member queried the merits of building a new facility on ground that was currently used for sport. The Director of Commissioning assured the Committee that the consultation aimed to be as transparent as possible and to engage with as many people as possible.

Responding to Members' concerns on the level of detail within the report, the Chairman stated that this was an interim report and further detail would be reported to the Committee prior to Cabinet's consideration of the options in December 2015.

**RESOLVED:**

- i) That the information presented on the options for swimming in Shrewsbury be noted; and
- ii) That a further, more detailed, report be presented to the Committee prior to Cabinet's consideration in December 2015.

**11 Update on Future Commissioning and Provision of Library Services**

The Library Service Manager presented the update report on the progress made on the county-wide redesign of library services since the Committee's last update received on 8 December 2014.

Prior to the debate, the Chairman drew Members' attention to the judicial review of the decision relating to the Church Stretton library facilities and cautioned Members to limit their comments to the wider implications rather than specific detail. The Director of Commissioning stated that he would be happy to discuss specific issues with any Member outside of the meeting; this was noted.

The Library Service Manager explained that the redesign of the service was being undertaken as a two way process of conversations with local communities; he stated that there was no 'one size fits all' and the aim was to keep libraries open. He added that if a solution could not be found then alternative modes of delivery would be considered.

Several Members commented that the report did not contain a sufficient level of detail relating to the financial implications of the service redesign and requested that the information needed to be provided to Members as soon as possible, the next meeting of the Committee if possible.

The Library Service Manager assured the Committee that the Project Board [comprising representatives from community enabling, customer services and the library service] met regularly to ensure good project management with Key decisions being taken by the relevant Portfolio Holder or Cabinet. A Member commented on the need to avoid getting too preoccupied with back office support and the need to try and retain the valuable service that was currently offered. The Library Service Manager stated that technology was being used in different ways to keep the service that resulted in a slight staffing reduction and stressed that the overarching library service would not disappear.

Referring to the current book stock, the Library Service Manager reported that the book stock was reduced/augmented in line with the population. He stated that Shropshire's very generous book fund had been reduced by 10% to £350K annually. Members noted that libraries had a 10% decline in usage nationally and each library had an Annual Plan of service delivery when stock and assets would be considered. The Library Service Manager added that the national agenda for libraries was to broaden their use to encompass reading facilities, Wifi base, public health, health and wellbeing and an information hub; Shropshire currently had 5 hubs in the county.

Responding to comments from some members of the Committee on the level of detail in the report, the Director of Commissioning gave assurances that greater financial detail and the use put to the Transformation Challenge Award [TCA] grant from the Cabinet Office would be included in the next report to the Committee.

**RESOLVED:**

- i) That the update report on the future commissioning and provision of Library services be noted; and
- ii) That a further, more detailed, report on the library service redesign and the development of Community Hubs be made to the Committee as soon as possible and by Spring 2016 at the latest.

**12 Shropshire Council's Play Area Provision**

The Director of Commissioning provided a verbal update on Shropshire Council's play area provision and the development of a Play Strategy for Shropshire. Members noted that Officers from public health, outdoor recreation and planning policy had met to discuss the issues to be included within the Strategy.



The following points had been agreed:

- The need to understand the current play provision within the county
- The need to update from the last review
- The need to review planning policy relating to outdoor space and recreation
- The need to identify and prioritise key areas where play provision is needed
- The need to look beyond 'play grounds'

Members noted that a further update would be provided to the Committee later in the autumn 2015.

### 13 **Date/Time of next meeting**

It was noted that the next scheduled meeting of the Environment and Services Scrutiny Committee was scheduled to be held at 2.00pm on Monday 20 July 2015.

Signed ..... (Chairman)

Date:

**This page is intentionally left blank**



Committee and date  
Environment and Services  
Scrutiny Committee

28 September 2015  
2.00 pm

Item

**6**

Public

## **Petition for a 20mph speed restriction on New Street, Shrewsbury**

**Responsible Officer** Michael Davies – Senior Traffic Technician, (Central)  
Email: michael.davies@shropshire.gov.uk Tel: 01743 254902 Fax:

---

### **1. Summary**

- 1.1. This report is intended to provide background information to the Environment and Services Scrutiny committee in response to a petition received by Shropshire Council calling for a 20mph speed restriction on New Street in Shrewsbury (between the junction with Copthorne Road and the Boat House public house).
- 1.2. Shropshire Council has a framework for dealing with road safety concerns raised by members of the public which is embedded in the Road Safety Policy adopted in March 2013. In addition, Shropshire Council also has an agreed approach for considering 20mph speed restrictions in Shropshire.
- 1.3. The Road Safety Policy was designed to take on road safety concerns not specific requests, enabling Shropshire Council to determine the most appropriate level and type of intervention using the expertise that it has access to.
- 1.4. An assessment for a community led concern in 2014 determined no further action. An assessment for a 2015 submission has not yet been carried out.

### **2. Recommendations**

The recommendation of this report is that the Scrutiny Committee support:

- a. The procedure for dealing with community led concerns about speed and safety management.
- b. The guiding principles of where Shropshire Council would consider 20mph speed limits.

**REPORT**

### **3. Road Safety Policy**

- 3.1. One objective of the Road Safety Policy is to overcome community concerns regarding traffic speeds, according to the function, nature and use of the road (to deal with perception of danger if considered appropriate).
- 3.2. In dealing with community led concerns, Shropshire Council's Road Safety Policy enables town and parish councils to take a primary role in filtering road safety concerns generated by the local community. Members of the general public are encouraged to approach town and parish councils directly with any road safety concerns. Town and parish councils accept these concerns first and then submit those that they support (and consider there to be a level of shared community concern) to Shropshire Council. Town and parish councils can make submissions to Shropshire Council three times each year and they are encouraged to prioritise those in concerns in order of importance.
- 3.3. Shropshire Council does not look to town and parish councils to submit desired solutions; just communication of road safety concerns i.e. issues affecting vehicle, pedestrian or cyclist safety. Traffic engineers then use expertise and a toolkit of possible measures to determine the best, and most appropriate, measure to mitigate concerns. This may not always be a speed restriction. Further information on defining an appropriate scheme is contained later in this briefing note.
- 3.4. Community led concerns must have the support of: the Shropshire Council local member, the town or parish council, West Mercia Police, and the local Shropshire Council traffic engineer if they are to be put forward for prioritisation.

### **4. Prioritisation**

- 4.1. Where the necessary support is evident, potential schemes are subject to a county wide prioritisation process to secure the necessary funding to undertake preliminary design and investigation work. On an annual basis, area teams across the county review the recommendations for schemes put forward and score them against a range of indicators that are embedded within the objectives of Shropshire Council's Community Strategy and Local Transport Plan. These are briefly outlined in the following table:

**Table 1: Prioritisation themes and indicators**

<b>Theme</b>	<b>Indicators</b>
<b>Accessibility</b>	Degree of benefit for vulnerable road users
	Is the scheme part of a wider network plan?
<b>Network management and modal shift</b>	Will a scheme have strategic traffic benefits?
	Potential to reduce the impact of transport on the local environment and communities
	Potential for modal shift
<b>Economy and environment</b>	Will the scheme support economic growth?
	Potential to reduce carbon emissions or have other environmental benefits
<b>Local support</b>	Is the concern identified in the Parish / Town's Place Plan?
	Does the scheme relate to a concern highlight through a recent school travel plan or directly from a school?
<b>Deliverability</b>	Known factors that may limit the potential for a scheme to be delivered (i.e. land acquisition)
	Potential for other necessary highways work to be carried out as part of the scheme
<b>Safety</b>	Separate scoring framework relating to network hierarchy and the number and severity of reported injury accidents in the last three years
<b>Cost (additional score)</b>	If external funding is available (i.e. developer contributions, CIL etc.)
	If future maintenance burden is low

4.2. A weighting factor is assigned to each of the six assessment criteria themes to allow for differentiation between those criteria that are more significant in achieving the aims of the Local Transport Plan. The following weightings are listed in priority order (highest first) and have been approved by the Portfolio Holder for Highways and Transport:

4.3. A weighting factor is assigned to each of the six assessment criteria themes to allow for differentiation between those criteria that are more significant in achieving the aims of the Local Transport Plan. The following weightings are listed in priority order (highest first) and have been approved by the Portfolio Holder for Highways and Transport:

- Safety
- Deliverability
- Local support
- Network management and modal shift
- Accessibility

4.4. The submission of this petition will strengthen the local support element that forms part of the prioritisation process.

## 5. Defining an appropriate scheme

- 5.1. In developing potential schemes, Shropshire Council traffic engineers are required to give consideration to perceived danger and agree that a perception is 'fair'. Submissions made by town and parish councils are taken as being supported by a weight of community concern.
- 5.2. The Road Safety Policy framework enables Shropshire Council traffic engineers to consider what traffic management measures will best address a defined problem taking account of road function, existing traffic and accident data and community led concerns. Further liaison is typically undertaken with key stakeholders as part of this process.
- 5.3. The Road Safety Policy is based upon a 'toolkit' of measures available for use by Shropshire Council's traffic engineers, enabling individual sites of concern to be looked at and the most appropriate traffic management intervention for that site determined. The use of speed restrictions is only one measure within the toolkit that can be used to address road safety.
- 5.4. Where a speed restriction is considered, the DfT Circular 01/2013 "Setting Local Speed Limits", is used to aid decision making. It states that speed limits should:
- be evidence-led and self-explaining;
  - seek to reinforce people's assessment of what is a safe speed to travel, and
  - encourage self-compliance.
- 5.5. Shropshire Council's approved technical guidance note on 20mph speed restrictions recommends that 20mph speed restrictions must be implemented with clear objectives and an understanding of potential future liabilities. There are a number of key considerations that need to be taken into account if such schemes are to be progressed:
- Is a 20mph speed restriction the most suitable measure to implement to address a defined problem?
  - Is it likely to have a measurable and positive speed reducing effect?
  - Is there something that would better address the community's concerns?
  - Is implementation of a 20mph speed restriction going to need additional physical measures to promote self-compliance and is this suitable in this location?
- 5.6. In addition, the guidance note states that 20mph speed restrictions will only be considered in the following locations:
- Outside schools or where there are high numbers of vulnerable road users;
  - On urban residential streets in specific cases (where wide community support can be demonstrated, where there is evidence that streets are

being used by people on foot and on bicycles and where the characteristics of the street are suitable) and,

- On town centre streets / pedestrian dominated areas.

## **6. New Street**

- 6.1. A concern about road safety and vehicle speeds on New Street is not a new issue. This concern is compounded by existing highway geometry in this location and narrow footway provision.
- 6.2. New Street is categorised as an urban main distributor road. Therefore, it is considered to be a strategic road for traffic within Shropshire's highway network.
- 6.3. In March 2009 Shropshire County Council implemented an experimental traffic order to reduce the entry speed into New Street from Frankwell roundabout by closing the slip road. This restriction became permanent in October 2010.
- 6.4. In addition, improved traffic signing was provided to promote alternative routes into and out of the town centre and reduce traffic volumes on New Street. A traffic survey carried out in November 2009 indicated a 2.5mph reduction in the mean speed of traffic and around a 33% reduction in volume of outbound traffic on the road over previous counts in the area.
- 6.5. For the period 2009 to 2013 the recorded speeds in the vicinity of the junction with Water Lane remained consistent with mean speeds of 27-28mph and 85% of traffic travelling at speeds of 31-32 mph or less.
- 6.6. The petition instigator approached Shropshire Council and their Local Member with a request for a 20mph speed limit on New Street in July 2014. The individual was advised to raise the issue as a site of community concern with Shrewsbury Town Council under the provisions contained in Shropshire Council's Road Safety Policy. Shrewsbury Town Council submitted the concern as part of the 2014 and 2015 submissions.
- 6.7. In summary, the findings of the 2014 review by the local traffic engineer are as follows:
  - The prevailing travelled speeds were considered to be acceptable for a 30mph speed limit, and additional engineering measures were not considered necessary to further improve compliance.
  - Based on current recorded vehicle speeds additional physical traffic calming measures would be required to obtain self-compliance for a lower speed limit.
  - The street function category of a main distributor route and an assessment of the likely number of pedestrian and cycle movements suggested that the location would not be suitable for the introduction of a 20mph speed restriction in line with the approved approach for considering such speed limits in Shropshire.

- The decision was taken not to put this concern forward for further prioritisation in 2014.

6.8. The assessment of the 2015 submission has not yet been carried out. However a review of recorded personal injury collisions has been carried out for the three year period to August 2015. Four accidents have been recorded on New Street between its junction with Copthorne Road and the Boat House public house and are summarised as follows. Vehicle speed is not considered to be a contributory factor in relation to these accidents.

**Table 2: Recorded accident history**

<b>Date</b>	<b>Severity</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Details</b>
02/05/13	Slight	Boat House public house car park	Cyclist hits parked vehicle whilst negotiating a path between stationary and parked vehicle
19/06/14	Slight	Vicinity of No 35 to 40	Cyclist rides into rear of stationary car that is awaiting oncoming traffic to pass
19/11/14	Slight	Vicinity of No 35 to 40	Pedestrian struck by wing mirror of passing vehicle
23/04/15	Slight	Vicinity of No 35 to 40	Driver about to enter their vehicle is clipped by passing vehicle

## **7. Risk Assessment and Opportunities Appraisal**

### **7.1. Risks**

- The petition could be seen as a challenge to the procedures contained within the Road Safety Policy and the agreed prioritisation process which could undermine how similar requests are dealt with by Shropshire Council in the future.
- Lack of a transparent process and inconsistencies across the county could pose a risk to the reputation of the authority.
- Pursuit of less appropriate highway measures could raise expectations at other locations. Shropshire has a diverse highway network and schemes need to be appropriate to highway function and user needs.

### **Opportunities**

- The Road Safety Policy and associated prioritisation process supports the appropriate allocation of capital funds and the delivery of the right outcomes:
- The prioritisation process gives Community Led Concerns and officer led proposals a ranked position allowing funds to be targeted to the highest scoring schemes first.
- The ethos of Policy is to use the expertise that Shropshire Council has access to designing the most appropriate intervention for a given concern; on this



basis overall scheme cost is not taken into account until after preliminary design work has taken place.

## 7.2. Consultation

- Shropshire Council's Road Safety Policy that was approved by Shropshire Council's Cabinet on 20th February 2013, following consultation with all Shropshire Council Members and town and parish councils. Community led concerns are submitted by town and parish Councils in line with this policy.

## 8. Financial Implications

8.1. This report refers to a potential scheme funded through the Integrated Transport Block element of the Department for Transport's annual grant settlement. In particular, the prioritisation approach is to inform a programme of design work that will be commissioned to Mouchel under the Term Engineering Contract. Once initial design and investigation work has taken place, a further decision will be taken on what schemes are to be taken forward to construction and form the next year's work programme for Shropshire Council's term contractor, Ringway.

## 9. Conclusions

- 9.1. Shropshire Council has set a robust framework in place to handle and consider road safety concerns from its residents. This framework is based upon demonstrable local support for the concern and the development of appropriate levels and type of intervention, where possible. Additionally, it has an established position on where 20mph speeds limits could be considered.
- 9.2. Speed reduction may not be the appropriate solution to address the core safety concern, and consequently within the Road Safety Policy Shropshire Council encourages parish and town councils to identify what the concern is rather than promoting a solution.
- 9.3. A petition for a 20mph speed limit does indicate the level of wider community support for an issue. However, it should be treated as a community led concern in accordance with Shropshire Council's Road Safety Policy.

### **List of Background Papers (This MUST be completed for all reports, but does not include items containing exempt or confidential information)**

- Shropshire Council's Road Safety Policy. Access via: <http://www.shropshire.gov.uk/highways-and-traffic/road-safety-in-shropshire/shropshire-council-road-safety-policy/>
- Decision Making Session by Portfolio Holder for Highways and Transport Friday, 20th December, 2013: Proposed Approach for the 20mph speed restrictions to be incorporated into Shropshire Councils Road Safety Policy. Accessed via: <http://shropshire.gov.uk/committee->

<services/CeListDocuments.aspx?Committeed=292&MeetingId=2608&DF=20%2f12%2f2013&Ver=2>

**Cabinet Member (Portfolio Holder)**

Simon Jones - Portfolio Holder for Highways and Transport

**Local Member**

Anne Chebsey

**Appendices**



Committee and date  
Environment and Services  
Scrutiny Committee

28 September 2015  
2.00 pm

Item

**7**

Public

## Petition for a 20mph speed restriction in Highley

**Responsible Officer** Victoria Merrill and Alice Dilly, Transport and Highways  
Email: victoria.merrill@shropshire.gov.uk ; Tel: 01743 255454 Fax:  
alice.dilly@shropshire.gov.uk 01743 257806

---

### 1. Summary

- 1.1. This report is intended to provide background information to the Environment and Services Scrutiny committee in response to the following petition received by Shropshire Council from Highley Community Primary School:
- 1.2. **“ We the undersigned, would like to see a 20mph speed limit introduced on Redstone Drive, Highley, near to the local school. We believe this will go some way towards ensuring the safety of the children of Highley”.**
- 1.3. There is an approved process for raising and submitting community road safety concerns such as that outlined above through Shropshire Council's Road Safety Policy.
- 1.4. The Road Safety Policy was designed to take on road safety concerns not specific requests, enabling Shropshire Council to determine the most appropriate level and type of intervention using the expertise that it has access to.
- 1.5. A submission has been made by Highley Parish Council for a 20mph speed limit on Redstone Drive in the vicinity of the school. Shropshire Council has allowed for a wider remit to the existing request to ensure the best opportunity for enhancing road safety in this location.
- 1.6. If this scheme is prioritised for design funding in 2016/17, Shropshire Council will liaise with Highley Parish Council and Highley Primary School to further understand and gauge where the main issues lie to enable a comprehensive, and appropriate, scheme to be developed which may or may not include a 20mph speed restriction.

## **2. Recommendations**

- To progress with the submission made under the Road Safety Policy, and
- If prioritised for funding, to develop an appropriate scheme on Redstone Drive which may or may not include a 20mph speed restriction.

## **REPORT**

### **3. Road Safety Policy**

- 3.1. Shropshire Council's Road Safety Policy (2013) enables town and parish councils to take a primary role in filtering road safety concerns generated by the local community. Members of the general public are encouraged to approach town and parish councils directly with any road safety concerns. Town and parish councils accept these concerns first and then submit those that they support (and consider there to be a level of shared community concern) to Shropshire Council. Town and parish councils can submit up to five 'community led concerns' to Shropshire Council three times each year.
- 3.2. Shropshire Council does not look to town and parish councils to submit desired solutions; just communication of road safety concerns i.e. issues affecting vehicle, pedestrian or cyclist safety. Traffic engineers then use expertise and a toolkit of possible measures to determine the best, and most appropriate, measure to mitigate concerns. This may not always be a speed restriction. Further information on defining an appropriate scheme is contained later in this briefing note.

### **4. Community led concern submission for Highley**

- 4.1. For Highley, a community led concern was logged under the Road Safety Policy in May 2015 for a 20mph speed limit on Redstone Drive. However, in July, Shropshire Council attended a road safety presentation by Highley Primary school which highlighted a wider spectrum of road safety concerns on Redstone Drive in relation to indiscriminate parking and pedestrian movements. As a result, the local engineer has allowed for a wider remit to the original request. The submission now allows for a whole traffic management approach. This will be reviewed later this month as part of the annual prioritisation process for schemes to be considered for funding for design in 2016/17.

### **5. Prioritisation**

- 5.1. Where the necessary support is evident, potential schemes are subject to a county wide prioritisation process to secure the necessary funding to undertake preliminary design and investigation work. On an annual basis, area teams across the county review the recommendations for schemes put forward and score them against a range of indicators that are embedded within the objectives of Shropshire Council's Community Strategy and Local Transport Plan. These are briefly outlined as follows:

**Table 1: Prioritisation themes and indicators**

<b>Theme</b>	<b>Indicators</b>
<b>Accessibility</b>	Degree of benefit for vulnerable road users
	Is the scheme part of a wider network plan?
<b>Network management and modal shift</b>	Will a scheme have strategic traffic benefits?
	Potential to reduce the impact of transport on the local environment and communities
	Potential for modal shift
<b>Economy and environment</b>	Will the scheme support economic growth?
	Potential to reduce carbon emissions or have other environmental benefits
<b>Local support</b>	Is the concern identified in the Parish / Town's Place Plan?
	Does the scheme relate to a concern highlight through a recent school travel plan or directly from a school?
<b>Deliverability</b>	Known factors that may limit the potential for a scheme to be delivered (i.e. land acquisition)
	Potential for other necessary highways work to be carried out as part of the scheme
<b>Safety</b>	Separate scoring framework relating to network hierarchy and the number and severity of reported injury accidents in the last three years
<b>Cost (additional score)</b>	If external funding is available (i.e. developer contributions, CIL etc.)
	If future maintenance burden is low

5.2. A weighting factor is assigned to each of the six assessment criteria themes to allow for differentiation between those criteria that are more significant in achieving the aims of the Local Transport Plan. The following weightings are listed in priority order (highest first) and have been approved by the Portfolio Holder for Highways and Transport:

5.3. A weighting factor is assigned to each of the six assessment criteria themes to allow for differentiation between those criteria that are more significant in achieving the aims of the Local Transport Plan. The following weightings are listed in priority order (highest first) and have been approved by the Portfolio Holder for Highways and Transport:

- Safety
- Deliverability
- Local support
- Network management and modal shift
- Accessibility

5.4. The submission of this petition will strengthen the local support element that forms part of the prioritisation process.

## **6. Defining an appropriate scheme**

- 6.1. The Road Safety Policy framework enables Shropshire Council traffic engineers to consider what traffic management measures will best address a defined problem taking account of road function, existing traffic and accident data and community led concerns. Further liaison is typically undertaken with key stakeholders as part of this process.
- 6.2. The Road Safety Policy is based upon a 'toolkit' of measures available for use by Shropshire Council's traffic engineers, enabling individual sites of concern to be looked at and the most appropriate traffic management intervention for that site determined. The use of speed restrictions is only one measure within the toolkit that can be used to address road safety.
- 6.3. Where a speed restriction is considered, the DfT Circular 01/2013 "Setting Local Speed Limits", is used to aid decision making. It states that speed limits should:
- be evidence-led and self-explaining;
  - seek to reinforce people's assessment of what is a safe speed to travel, and
  - encourage self-compliance.
- 6.4. Shropshire Council's approved technical guidance note on 20mph speed restrictions recommends that 20mph speed restrictions must be implemented with clear objectives and an understanding of potential future liabilities. There are a number of key considerations that need to be taken into account if such schemes are to be progressed:
- Is a 20mph speed restriction the most suitable measure to implement to address a defined problem?
  - Is it likely to have a measurable and positive speed reducing effect?
  - Is there something that would better address the community's concerns?
  - Is implementation of a 20mph speed restriction going to need additional physical measures to promote self-compliance and is this suitable in this location?

## **7. Risk Assessment and Opportunities Appraisal**

### **7.1. Risks**

- Lack of a transparent process and inconsistencies across the county could pose a risk to the reputation of the authority.
- Pursuit of less appropriate highway measures could raise expectations at other locations. Shropshire has a diverse highway network and schemes need to be appropriate to highway function and user needs.

## **7.2. Opportunities**

- The Road Safety Policy and associated prioritisation process supports the appropriate allocation of capital funds and the delivery of the right outcomes:
- The prioritisation process gives Community Led Concerns and officer led proposals a ranked position allowing funds to be targeted to the highest scoring schemes first.
- The ethos of Policy is to use the expertise that Shropshire Council has access to designing the most appropriate intervention for a given concern; on this basis overall scheme cost is not taken into account until after preliminary design work has taken place.

## **7.3. Consultation**

- Shropshire Council's Road Safety Policy that was approved by Shropshire Council's Cabinet on 20th February 2013, following consultation with all Shropshire Council Members and town and parish councils. Community led concerns are submitted by town and parish Councils in line with this policy.
- Once a design programme has been approved, local traffic engineers will respond to those Town and Parish Councils that have made submissions to inform them of whether a scheme will be progressed or not. If prioritised for funding, Shropshire Council will liaise with Highley Parish Council and Highley Primary School to further understand and gauge the main issues on Redstone Drive.

## **8. Financial Implications**

8.1. This report refers to a potential scheme funded through the Integrated Transport Block element of the Department for Transport's annual grant settlement. In particular, the prioritisation approach is to inform a programme of design work that will be commissioned to Mouchel under the Term Engineering Contract. Once initial design and investigation work has taken place, a further decision will be taken on what schemes are to be taken forward to construction and form the next year's work programme for Shropshire Council's term contractor, Ringway.

## **9. Conclusions**

- 9.1. Shropshire Council has set a robust framework in place to handle and consider road safety concerns from its residents. This framework is based upon demonstrable local support for the concern and the development of appropriate levels and type of intervention, where possible.
- 9.2. The concern raised about road safety on Redstone Drive in Highley will be dealt with in accordance with this framework.

**List of Background Papers (This MUST be completed for all reports, but does not include items containing exempt or confidential information)**

- Shropshire Council's Road Safety Policy. Access via:  
<http://www.shropshire.gov.uk/highways-and-traffic/road-safety-in-shropshire/shropshire-council-road-safety-policy/>
- Decision Making Session by Portfolio Holder for Highways and Transport Friday, 20th December, 2013: Proposed Approach for the 20mph speed restrictions to be incorporated into Shropshire Councils Road Safety Policy. Accessed via: <http://shropshire.gov.uk/committee-services/CeListDocuments.aspx?Committeeld=292&MeetingId=2608&DF=20%2f12%2f2013&Ver=2>

**Cabinet Member (Portfolio Holder)**

Simon Jones - Portfolio Holder for Highways and Transport

**Local Member**

Dave Tremellen – Shropshire Council Local Member for Highley

**Appendices**





<u>Committee and Date</u>	<u>Item</u>
Environment and Services Scrutiny Committee Monday 28 <sup>th</sup> September 2015	<b>8</b> <u>Public</u>

## WASTE MANAGEMENT SERVICE UPDATE

**Responsible Officer** Paul Beard – Waste Contracts Manager  
e-mail: paul.beard@shropshire.gov.uk Tel: 01743 255996

### 1. Summary

- 1.1 This report provides an update on progress regarding the construction and commissioning of the Battlefield Energy Recovery Facility (ERF) and collection service re-design work following on from the Shropshire Energy and Growth Solutions (SEGS) project.
- 1.2 The background information on the ERF compliments the information that will be provided by Veolia and Shropshire Council staff on the Scrutiny Committee's visit to the plant on 28<sup>th</sup> September.

### 2. Recommendations

Members of Environment and Services Scrutiny Committee are asked to:

- 2.1 Note progress of the ERF to its adoption as a contract facility.
- 2.2 Comment on the work done to date on waste collection service redesign following the verbal update at the meeting.
- 2.3 Receive a further report on the waste collection service redesign in early 2016.

## REPORT

### **Battlefield Energy Recovery Facility**

The most significant recent development for waste management services in Shropshire has been the successful commissioning of the Energy Recovery Facility (ERF) at Battlefield, Shrewsbury. The construction of the ERF is a landmark project for Shropshire Council and will be key to the treatment of Shropshire's household waste throughout the life of the council's waste PFI contract and beyond. The project has also included improvement works to the adjoining household recycling centre and exit road. The plant became a PFI contract facility on 10<sup>th</sup> September 2015.

The commissioning process began on 23<sup>rd</sup> December 2014, when the first load of waste was loaded into the chamber. The various stages of the process were then tested and refined over the following months, including the export of energy to the national grid which began in March 2015. All commissioning tests were completed and the facility handed over from construction contractors CNIM/Clugston to Veolia on 14<sup>th</sup> May. The facility has also been issued with a Certificate of Construction Completion by an independent certifier. Waste input is now around 270 tonnes per day, and by August 26.7m kilowatt hours of electricity had been exported to the national grid, enough to power around 6,500 homes.

A community liaison group was formed shortly after the facility received planning permission. The group comprises of local stakeholders and has met quarterly on site throughout the build phase. On 16<sup>th</sup> July the ERF was able to host a meeting of this group, the first visit by non-construction/Veolia staff. All present agreed positively upon the professional way in which the project had been undertaken by Veolia and their contractors.

Nearly 1 million 'man' hours have been deployed during the build phase with no major and just two minor health and safety incidents occurring despite at peak times there being up to 200 staff on site at a time. Despite the constrained size of site and its adjacency to the household waste recycling centre, impacts to the public using the HWRC, neighbouring businesses and passing traffic has been minimal.

Subject to planning approval, the ERF will be complemented by an art installation on the adjacent roundabout. The proposed installation is currently the subject of a planning consultation process, it is hoped the installation will take place later this year. Preparation is being made by Veolia for the official opening of the ERF, the opening ceremony will be fitting to the significance of the facility and likely to be held Spring 2016.

### **3. Risk Assessment and Opportunities Appraisal**

3.1 This report has been provided for information only and therefore no risk assessment or opportunities appraisal has been carried out. However, the ERF was developed by Veolia as part of the PFI contract and, as such, subject to a detailed Risk Management programme. The construction of the ERF took place under CDM regulations and was carried out by experienced contractors CNIM/Clugston.

### **4. Financial Implications**

4.1 As a PFI project facility, the ERF is integral to Shropshire Council's contract with Veolia, and the cost of design, building and operation of the facility is included within the contract's unitary charge. During the commissioning period of the facility, one-off savings have been achieved through treating tens of thousands of tonnes of waste that would otherwise have been sent to landfill, according to the specification of the contract. The total saving achieved during the commissioning period is likely to be approximately £1m.

4.2 Savings that may be made as a result of service redesign are currently being determined as part of the wider contract review.

### **5. Background**

5.1 The core waste collection and disposal responsibilities of Shropshire Council are delivered through a 27-year Integrated Waste PFI contract awarded to Veolia Environmental Services (VES) on September 29th 2007.

5.2 The key piece of infrastructure for waste treatment under this contract is an Energy Recovery Facility capable of processing up to 95,000 tonnes of household waste per year.

**List of Background Papers (This MUST be completed for all reports, but does not include items containing exempt or confidential information)**

Report of the Waste Rapid Action Group, Environment & Services Scrutiny Committee 24<sup>th</sup> March 2014

Update on Waste Collection Service Redesign, Environment & Services Scrutiny Committee 21<sup>st</sup> July 2014

Updates on the Energy Recovery Facility and Shropshire Energy & Growth Solutions (SEGS) project, Environment & Services Scrutiny Committee 8<sup>th</sup> September 2014

**Cabinet Member (Portfolio Holder)**

Steve Charmley, Portfolio Holder for Business, ip&e, Culture and Commissioning (North)

**Local Member**

All Members

**Appendices**

None