





Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	21/03090/FUL - Buildwas	Agent

This application was deferred at the February planning committee meeting due to concerns over the access and gradient of the access road to the site, particularly with regard to vehicles towing touring caravans, and also the impact of the development upon the proposed highway improvements that will take place as part of the approved Ironbridge redevelopment 19/05560/OUT. We consider we have dealt with all outstanding matters and the scheme can be supported from a highway safety perspective.

For clarity we have undertaken further traffic surveys and have provided updated highways plans that clearly show how the proposed leisure site will interact with the approved highways alterations in association with Ironbridge power station redevelopment. We must make it clear that neither scheme is dependant upon the other one and our proposal will not have negative impact upon the Ironbridge power station redevelopment. Should this application be refused we will proceed to appeal.

Furthermore, we have widened the access into the site and provided more passing places along the access road. The gradient of the access is within the Shropshire Council requirement of a maximum gradient of 1 in 10 for private accesses, with a maximum gradient achieved of 1 in 13. On this we would also like to point out that only 32 of the 156 pitches are proposed for touring caravans, so they will make up a relatively small number of the total traffic movements, with the majority of movements by light traffic. Senior Highways Officer Gemma Lawley has been in full consultation with us and does not raise any objection.

Please find attached a letter from Evolution Homes and Leisure who are interested in purchasing the site. They are a local firm and employ local people, manufacturing park homes, lodges and static caravans. The scheme would generate a significant amount of local employment and input into the local economy, whilst enhancing the choice of holiday accommodation within this popular tourist destination.

The proposed use is an improvement to the 4x4 track that has operated from the site for many years and has often drawn large numbers of spectators to the site for events – over 200 vehicles some days.

This proposal would satisfy all three overarching objectives for sustainable development set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF paragraph 8). It would fulfil the economic objective by contributing to the rural economy and providing high quality visitor accommodation and leisure facilities as sought by the Development Plan and sustainable rural tourism and leisure developments sought by paragraph 84 of the NPPF.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
8	22/00279/FUL	Diddlebury Parish Council Chair
1	My apologies for not attending in person as I usually do. Diddlebury Parish Council (DPC) supported this application: they've worked closely with the developer throughout the site's development stages and are very pleased that the site merges into the landscape and has preserved its heritage landscape value. Councillors visited the site to discuss options once the residents didn't want the Dutch barn as storage areas and a new use for the barn was needed. These options included: - do nothing (deterioration of the barns as before), possible work-shops/holiday lets (increased traffic, noise for residents) or convert to rental housing (much needed in the area).	
2.	DPC has worked closely with Corfton's residents over planning issues and except	

for 1 objection (not 2 as recorded in the report) there were no negative comments from local residents. Any visit to the site would amply show that it would not be over development of a very thoughtfully laid out development which would have gardens extended behind the barn.

3. We dispute the conservation comments re MD7a SAMDev- the barn fits in with the heritage and landscape of the site and reflects its farming heritage as do the other retained buildings and are of merit regarding heritage landscape value. There will be minimal alterations regarding new work with the overall retention of the cladding and barn roof with only doors and windows inserted and overall the barn will retain its original form and appearance.
4. Regarding AONB, the barn is mainly hidden from the road but along with the rest of the site blends perfectly into the rural landscape and looks part of it.
5. It certainly would not be detrimental to the rural amenities of the area as the parish desperately needs more rental units - all the original units are rented and occupied.
6. This is a sustainable development which has seen a derelict farming site reborn and providing life to the community. One new resident is seeking to become a school governor at Corvedale Primary School for example.
7. For the above reasons DPC believe that this application should be supported.

Cllr. David Hedgley, Chair of DPC.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
10	22/00742/FUL	Neighbour (Pam Davies)

Please note that this planning application has an incorrect map outline showing a large portion of land belonging to 25, Snailbeach. The land in question actually follows the thin sliver adjacent to and shown clearly as a black outline on the map, containing the footprint of the shipping container shown as a long rectangle also in black. This issue was brought to the attention of the land owner as soon as the application was submitted but has not been rectified on the map.

Also, as a separate issue, there is no, 'overspill parking' at the village hall as it is private land.

I have no objection to the application per se but it should pass on correct information.

Officer comments

*It is suggested that if Members are minded to approve the application this is subject to officers first securing an amended location plan with the red site outline adjusted to exclude any neighbouring land not owned by the applicant.*

*Officers understood that unrestricted car parking was available at the nearby village hall subject to a suggested donation into an 'honesty box'. Be that as it may, the proposed on-site parking provision should be sufficient for two small holiday lets.*

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
11	22/01875/VAR – Shipley Quarry	Claverley Parish Council

The Parish Council has expressed concern that the application is being considered 6 days before expiry of the 31-day period indicated in the consultation letter sent by Shropshire Council.

The statutory maximum period for Parish Councils to respond to planning consultations is set out in Article 25 of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015 as 21 days. However, Shropshire Council has recently added an additional discretionary period of 10 days to allow a further opportunity for Town and Parish Councils to respond to planning consultations.

Unfortunately, there was a delay of 19 days with validation of the application and the applicant requires the application to be considered at the current committee. Officer availability considerations mean that it would not be possible to report the application to the next committee on 28<sup>th</sup> June. Accordingly, it is necessary to report the application to the current committee to ensure a timely decision. The officer has advised the Parish Council in this respect that that the following provisions will apply:

If the Parish Council is not able to finalise its consultation response by the time of the committee, including through the representation on the day of the committee by the parish Chair, then any resolution made by the current committee would be subject to the following provisions:

That if the Parish Council raises any new highway issues which have not already been considered and are assessed to be ‘material’ by the Chair and Vice-Chair of the committee in consultation with the Interim Planning and Development Services Manager and the Highway Authority then the application will not be determined and will instead be reported back to a subsequent meeting of the committee.

That if no new material highway issues are deemed to have been identified by the Parish Council by 6<sup>th</sup> June 2022, and the committee is minded to accept the officer resolution then the committee is asked to give delegated authority to the Interim Planning and Development Services Manager to determine the application after this date.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
11	22/01875/VAR – Shipley Quarry	Applicant

Addendum: The applicant has pointed out that the start date for the development is referred to incorrectly in the report as 1<sup>st</sup> June 2020. Whilst the applicant initially notified the Council on 15<sup>th</sup> May 2020 that this was the intended start date the operations were subsequently delayed and the actual commencement date was on 19<sup>th</sup> August 2020 as reported again by e-mail on 20<sup>th</sup> August 2020.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
11	22/01875/VAR – Shipley Quarry	Neighbour, Mr Kyle

I am not objecting to the ghost island not being implemented. What I am very concerned about and object to is the speed limit 60 mph which we were led to believe would be dropped to 50 mph which has not been implemented. Double white lines should also be implemented to stop overtaking. Could you please take into account these two issues.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
11	22/01875/VAR – Shipley Quarry	Neighbour, Mr Dick

Objection for the following reasons:

#### Planning process:

Little or no local consultation has taken place. Worfield & Rudge PC has not been consulted and nor have residence either side of the site entrance. Even the property that shares its entrance with the development has not been informed of this application. However, the officer report (which had already been written before anybody knew about the application) references the fact that 'no comments have been received' as support of the conclusion that this change is acceptable, it is not. The recent planned Quarry Liaison Committee meeting, which could have discussed the proposed changes with members of the community was also postponed. I therefore believe that the consultation should be allowed to continue, and that this application should not be determined until it has been. If this doesn't happen it should be refused.

#### Road Safety Audits

The Road Safety Audit submitted in support of this application seems totally inadequate for making this decision. The scope of the report appears very limited and only considers the 'safety implications for road users of the scheme' (whatever that means), and this without even seeing any accident data for the existing road network. By contrast the initial highways assessment also considered Effects of Severance, Driver Delay, Pedestrians, Fear and Intimidation, Accidents and Safety and Residual/Cumulative Effects (NPPF para 109). The proposed changes will alter these assessments and therefore need revisiting, especially as these issues will have implications for the wider area, which is known as an accident black spot.

Following the original Highways Report Shropshire Council Highways did have concerns with the right-hand turn lane that was proposed. They concluded that a reduction in the speed limit and over taking restrictions would be more effective than the right-hand turn at mitigating the potential issues. However, neither of these recommendations have been included in this latest proposal. Further to this a Stage 1 Road Safety Audit was completed in March 2018. This report also concluded that additional signage and overtaking restrictions were included. The extract below from this report clearly shows that simply removing the right-hand turn lane would not resolve this problem.

#### Road Safety Audit Stage 1 (13-3-2018)

'We considered the Highway Advice Note provided by Andy Savage and are of the opinion that the provision of a right turn lane does not have a detrimental impact on road safety at this location. Our Road Safety Audit highlights the risk of overtaking eastbound vehicles failing to return to the correct side of the carriageway in advance of the right turn facility. The risk of head on type collisions is equally as likely if no right turn lane was provided and is more related to the crest in the carriageway and the lack of junction conspicuity.'

The Stage 3 Road Safety Audit submitted with this application does not address either the overtaking restrictions or the speed limit. With this limited scope in mind, you might like to consider the change in wording from the original Condition 16 to the currently proposed...

#### Condition 16 (May 2019)

Reason: To ensure that the development should not prejudice the free flow of traffic and conditions of safety on the highway nor cause inconvenience to other highway users.

#### Condition 16 (proposed May 2022)

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory means of access to the highway

There seems to me to be marked difference between the two! Why?

### Speed Limit

For some reason all references to reducing the speed limit on this road seem to have disappeared. The Officer Report and presentation when this went to committee in 2018 all included a reduction in the speed limit along this road. (From the OR 'The applicant has also agreed to enter into a planning legal agreement providing amongst other matters funding for extension of a speed limit at Shipley'). This was again reiterated by the officer in his opening comments to the Planning Committee where he said the following . 'Finally the legal agreement would also include measures to extend the speed limit westward from Staffordshire towards the site access (looking at map), existing speed limit comes in about here and the proposal would be to extend it across, funding would be provided.'

The following quotes are from the discussion that followed and show the concerns of the Councillors.

#### *Robert Tindal*

*'as Tina Woodward said, I am very concerned about the access on to the A454 and I agree with her suggestions that there should be a 50 mph limit quite considerably beyond the entry point to the west and there is one already starts, anyway that whole stretch should be 50 mph'*

#### *Gwylim Butler*

*'I would also want further conditions and funding to be put forward for signage and 50mph signs probably right back towards Bridgnorth, prior to where it turns to Bridgnorth after the straight stretch....it needs to be well back so they have time to slow down, and then when they start on that stretch they have the flashing signs saying HGV. Whatever we can do to mitigate that junction but it should be at the cost of the developer'*

#### *Simon Harris*

*'.....and Councillor Butler has raised that and I shared his concerns about the A454'*

#### *Madge Shineton*

*'I agree with Councillor Butler about speed cameras etc. and anything we can do to reduce that sort of danger, I absolutely go for because that's what I'm looking for in my own patch so I support this'*

*The Officers response:*

#### *Grahame French*

*'in terms of highways I think that there is a wider concern regarding the safety of the highway either side of the site access where as the site access will only take account, be considered under section 278 with a payment to facilitate migration of the speed limit to 50mph limit, I think that it would not be at all unprecedented that we should seek, the committee should seek a further payment to provide wider improvement works on the local highways stretching 3km either side of the highway, I think that would be appropriate to the relationship to the site access and would meet relevant legal tests. I think this would recognise the fact that there are concerns about the safety of the highway and would allow potentially further improvements to be made along that sort of wider stretch'*

While the wording of the S106 agreement is quite vague on this and only refers to 'Highway Speed Limit contribution' the plan attached does quite clearly show the area where the 50MPH speed limit should be extended to. I believe that the Councillors



<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Originator:</b>
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Originator:</b>
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Originator:</b>
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Originator:</b>