

CABINET
5 MARCH 2025
RESPONSE TO PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Mike Streetly

Highways Magazine published an article about the NWRR on 24 Jan in which it said "Cllr Morris said the council had met with key stakeholders to 'dispel some of the myths around the impact of the NWRR' and that 'these stakeholders have been shown excerpts from the traffic, collision, and journey-time modelling that has been undertaken as part of the FBC [Full Business case]'.

In a question to council on 27 Feb by David Vasmer about what information from the FBC was shared with third parties in advance of release to councillors Dan Morris said "The data recently discussed with stakeholders around traffic modelling, was based on the original information supporting the NWRR full planning application. This information has been in the public domain since 2021"

These two statements contradict each other. Could councillor Morris explain which is correct?

The council's 2021 transport assessment shows that 15 years after building the NWRR, queues on the junctions along Mytton Oak Road past the hospital will be made worse by building the road. Did councillor Morris highlight all the places, including roads near Shrewsbury's hospital, that the NWRR would actually make traffic worse?

The Councils base traffic model, in the public domain, and as submitted as part of the Planning Application in 2021, has been externally verified and endorsed by National Highways, Department for Transport and Shropshire Council Highways. Further post covid verification of this has also been undertaken and again verified by Department for Transport. This remains the base traffic model that has been updated further to the present day for the published draft Full Business Case. It continues to show overall appreciable improvements in cross town journey time, and it is this information, originating from the published base model, that was communicated to stakeholders recently.

As would be expected with blue light services in particular, their coverage is town and county wide, and as such, improvements delivered by the NWRR in this context are those that were cited as reasons for their support for the construction of the road.

Graham Betts

At the Cabinet meeting dated 17 July 2024, the Council apologised for not providing information I had requested on 16 January 2024 (Ref: RF#6141). I still have not received that information which the Council is legally obliged to provide within 40 working days. This is despite several reminders and only a partial provision given. The request asked for full details of CIL and other payments made to the Council for local provision when compared section 6.9.1 of the planning application 13/03285/FUL. Can the Council tell me: 1. Why it is unable or unwilling to provide this information relating to clause 6.9.1 of application 13/03285/FUL? 2. Why the Council is prepared act unlawfully and ignore the Freedom of

Information Act, even after being sanctioned by the Information Commissioner as the worst performing Council in the Country? 3. Why none of the £151,000 is available for road signage and speed control measures on the development covered by 6.9.1 in 13/03285/FUL? 4. Why is there no bus service provided, specifically covered by the £519,480 stated in accordance with 6.9.1, 6.6.2 and 6.6.8 of 13/03285/FUL? 5. Why has none of the £1,184,574 been spent on play facilities in accordance with 6.4.1 and 6.9.1 of 13/03285/FUL? 6. Concerned about delays, what are the critical dates for the use of each sum before they are lost?

The Council responded to RF#6141 on 13th February 2024. Subsequently, further information was provided to Mr Betts by way of a response to a Cabinet question on 17th July 2024.

The response to the Cabinet question on 17th July 2024 clarified what was meant by Paragraph 6.9.1 of the Planning Committee report into 13/03285/FUL. It is therefore considered the Council has provided a response to the customer query. This response, provided in July 2024, set out the expected quantum of developer contributions expected from the combined schemes of 13/03285/FUL and 13/03534/OUT, and its subsequent reserved matters approval.

Cllr Phil Gillam

Frustrated dog walkers living in the Oteley Road area of Shrewsbury find it absolutely incredible that Shropshire Council cannot provide just one dog waste bin on a popular walking route. Yet this is what they are being told. The council receives large amounts of Council Tax from the Maxfield Drive area and provides minimal services in return that are specific to the area. An extra litter bin placed on the junction of Maxfield Drive and the popular walking route to Sharpstones Quarry is clearly needed to address a local littering issue. It's unacceptable to refuse to consider such a minor request. If Shropshire Council is so strapped for cash that it can no longer supply and service litter bins where they are very much needed they need to level with Salopians right now... Please, please reconsider and provide this one dog waste bin. It will make a lot of people very happy. Will the council reconsider?

To address the concerns of dog walkers living in Oteley Road Street Scene services can advise that they embarked on a fundamental redesign project to address deficiencies across street cleansing service currently being provided which historical have not changed for many years. This has resulted in built in costly inefficiencies through the adding of a waste bin here and there for example. The aim of the project has been to define the service requirements that align to the environment, use of the space, and understand the available resource, capacity, and the infrastructure we are trying to service. We are in the position of finalising the information which will allow us to make informed decisions in the future and create a service and culture that is agile, and intelligence led, and these will be the parameters we will work to going forward. The concept that a bin prevents dog fouling or littering is fundamental not sound and what we need to encourage is the right behaviours from dog owners that they should be taking their dog bag with them instead of the relying on the convenience of having a waste bin provided for them by the council.

David Macey

Could the portfolio holder for Highways explain please why residents parking was not implemented for Listley Street in Bridgnorth following a Traffic Regulation Order with scheme proposals that was issued for public consultation between 30th March and 27th April 2023. The TRO was supported by the public, by local councillors and there was no referral to Cabinet for any objections/comments therefore meeting the Council's criteria for approval. To get to this stage extensive strategic work was undertaken, with resource by Shropshire Council including workshops with residents, all completed ahead of the March 2023 Consultation. So, taking this as an individual consultation/TRO for Listley Street only:

1. Why was this not implemented?

This was not implemented as an internal decision making process had not been undertaken correctly and the scheme was placed on hold by the Director with discussion with the Portfolio Holder at that time.

2. When can it be implemented as it met your approval requirements?

No programme is currently available, and resources will need to be assigned to this project. It is agreed that a lot of good work was undertaken through the workshops and Traffic Regulation Consultation and this will help support a future project to deliver a re-worked resident parking scheme for Listley Street and other streets. It should be noted that some of the resource that the changes agreed to car parking charges was going to be allocated to looking at a wider parking strategy. As we are aware due to delays caused by a call in and consultations, those changes have not yet been implemented. The necessary resource has not been available to effect the changes necessary.