

**LITTLE WENLOCK PARISH COUNCIL****MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PARISH COUNCIL HELD ON MONDAY  
16<sup>th</sup> APRIL, 2012 AT 7.30 p.m. IN THE VILLAGE HALL, LITTLE WENLOCK.**

- 4/12/01      Members present;**  
Councillors Mrs. S. Hutchison (Chairman), Mr. A. Lees, Miss. J. Esp, Mr. E. Roberts and Mr. S. Holding.  
Mr. J.F. Marcham – Clerk to Little Wenlock Parish Council.
- Members of the Public.**  
5 member of the public were present.
- 4/12/02      Apologies:**  
Apologies were received from T&W Cllrs. Jacqui Seymour and Terry Kiernan.
- 4/12/03      Declarations of interest:**  
None were made.
- 4/12/04      Members of the Public Address the Parish Council:**  
Mr. E. Dixon handed to the Parish Council a written statement objecting to the proposed development at 6 Crofters View. He addressed the Parish Council on the planning application relating to 6 Crofters View. He made the following points:
- That the proposed development of a balcony and patio door windows would have a direct view into his main family bedroom and double bedroom window. It would have a direct view into his front main living room windows and views through the stairwell window into parts of the hall and dining area. That it would make his family on view in their every movement due to the invasive overlooking of the proposed balcony and patio door windows.
  - The result of the above would give an excessive loss of privacy and an infringement on their private lives.
  - The properties in Crofters View were constructed in such a way as not to deliberately overlook neighbouring properties at close range. He stated that regulations indicate that any extension with windows and balconies should not be invasive and not look directly into neighbouring windows.
- Mrs. Smith stated that the above also applied to her property and that she objected to the planning application on the same grounds.
- 4/12/05      To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> March 2012.**  
The minutes of the meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> March 2012 were **approved** and signed by the Chairman.
- 4/12/06      Highways:**
- a. Cllr. Lees reported on the meeting that he and Cllrs. Esp and Hutchison had with Lee Barnard from T&W Highway Department.
    - a. White Lines to be re instated between Cluddley and Forest Glen junction.
    - b. Parking prohibition lines to be introduced alongside highway on both sides of the Wrekin Pathway entrance. These double lines to be primrose in colour, signifying a conservation order. Would be enforceable by law. Could be introduced in a period of 3 months.
    - c. Pedestrian warning – Slow Signs, to be installed on 3 highways prior to Forest Glen junction.
    - d. Vehicle weight restriction (Max 7.5 Tonne) to be installed prior to Forest Glen junction. Location to be determined, but would be appropriate at Cluddley, Ercall Lane and bottom of Malthouse Bank.

- e. Redesign road layout at Forest Glen junction. Raised mini roundabout considered not to be effective. Kerbing to be installed to reshape and narrow highways at junction. Objective is to prevent vehicles speeding across junction.
  - f. Speed limits. 20 mph through Little Wenlock and New Works would not be enforceable, and has been discounted in favour of alternative measures. Position of 30 mph sign cannot be re-sited on west side of Wellington Rd due to DfT criteria stating that there has to be housing within the 30 mph boundary. Possibility of re classifying open limits from Cluddley to Little Wenlock as 40 mph in agreed locations, in accordance with DfT guidance. 40 mph signs would be enforceable by law by roadside and mobile cameras.
  - g. Village entry "Gateways" New Village entry signs to be installed during May / June 2012. Location of signs in Wellington Rd (East of village) can be moved away from village, subject to being within LW village boundary, but no greater than 50/100 metres from 30 mph sign. Adjacent to village entry signs, new and more effective rumble strips to be installed on most appropriate roads i.e. Wellington Rd, Malthouse Bank and Coalmoor Rd. Painted white "Pinch" areas not considered as effective as rumble strips, and would not be offered in addition.
  - h. Cyclist's safety. Phil Lorenz (T & W Senior road safety officer) to be introduced to members of LWPC and have the opportunity to discuss concerns.
- b. Lee Barnard subsequently made the following responses:
- i. White lines: There is concern from us and TWS about the poor quality of road surface at the Forest Glen junction and on the Cluddley approach for approx 200m. Further investigation is necessary before we are confident that the lining will be of a sufficient quality or does not compromise the safety of vulnerable road users due to a raised centre line. The remainder of the route can be accommodated within the next monthly lining programme.
  - ii. Parking: The poor road surface and lack of identifiable edge makes the installation of the lines difficult and they are likely to become obscured by leaves or mud in a short space of time. If the junction improvement is undertaken (See Par 5) on an experimental or permanent basis, this will reduce the opportunity for vehicles to park close to the junction or the pathway entrance and will eliminate the need to install waiting restrictions.
  - iii. Pedestrian warning: Due to the environmental sensitive nature of the area, a possible alternative would be to install pairs of wooden bollards either side of the road on the approach to the parking areas with the word 'SLOW' routed into the bollard. These have been used elsewhere in the UK within Quiet Lane schemes.
  - iv. Weight Restriction: Comment from Stephen Scanlon 5<sup>th</sup> April 2012:  
Following a site visit to the stretch of highway that you have highlighted as a potential site for a weight restriction order, I have concluded that I would not advise that an order is imposed along this route for the following reasons:
    - There are only a few property frontages along the route
      - Access appears to be required for agricultural purposes
      - LGV's / HGV's will be funneled through one other alternative route
      - Carriageway widths are acceptable for vehicles to pass
      - There doesn't appear to be a structural reason for implementing a TRO.
  - v. Speed limits: An investigation into the country lanes surrounding Little Wenlock was conducted in June/July of 2008. The aim of the investigation was to determine whether or not these lanes fell within the criteria to be classified as Quiet Lanes, an initiative brought in to make minor rural links better for road users, including walkers and cyclists. As part of this investigation traffic speed surveys were conducted along the Wellington Road (between the M54 Cluddley Junction and the 30mph section through Little Wenlock) in both northbound and

southbound directions.

The survey gave back an 85th percentile speed of 40.8 mph and a mean speed of 34.8 mph in the northbound direction and an 85th percentile speed of 39.0 mph and a mean speed of 33.7 mph in the southbound direction. These results indicate that the traffic travelling along this stretch of road is travelling at a much lower speed than the national speed limit that is currently in place, and are in fact driving at suitable speeds in relation to the roads layout. Reducing the speed limit on this stretch of road would not be deemed as necessary due to the information that was gained, proving vehicles are already driving at a suitable speed along this stretch of highway.

I spoke with my colleague Nick Kitchen who informs me that the Quiet Lanes review of Little Wenlock and the surrounding roads is still taking place and a decision is yet to be made whether or not these particular roads leading into Little Wenlock fall within the criteria. There is obviously a possibility that this could be implemented at some point in the future, but as stated above, due to the evidence gained from the surveys conducted in 2008, the traffic team believe it would be of no benefit to reduce the speed limit between the M54 Cluddley Junction and the entrance into the 30mph section through Little Wenlock due to the evidence showing no speeding issues along that section of road.

- c. The Parish Council will be making the following responses when all comments from T&W Highways Department have been received:
- i. White lines: The fact that the road surface is not suitable for white lining is not acceptable to the Parish Council. The road should be repaired so that white lining can take place.
  - ii. The same applies to the installation of no parking double primrose lines.
  - iii. Pedestrians: The proposal is acceptable.
  - iv. Re-designed junction: The plan was acceptable and it assumed at this point in time that T&W will go ahead with the proposal within a very short time span.
  - v. Weight limit: Cllr. Esp stated that the correct route had not been surveyed and that the position will be reviewed again by Stephen Scanlon. It was felt that the carriage way from The Forest Glen to Little Wenlock was in places too narrow for lorries to pass each other and that generally speaking the carriage was not wide enough for HGV and other vehicles to pass safely.
  - vi. Speed limit: It was felt that the speed limit survey should be carried out again as there has been a marked increase in the amount and speed of traffic in the last 4 years and that an average speed does not mean a thing if you get hit by a speeding vehicle.
  - vii. Cycle safety: Phil Lorenz, T&W Senior Road safety Officer, will attend the Parish Annual Open meeting on 30<sup>th</sup> April.

Cllrs. Roberts and Holding both felt that a specific weight limit would be restrictive in relation to agricultural vehicles. An "Access Only" sign might resolve this.

It was pointed out that these matters had been on-going for 8 years and that no real progress had been made with T&W Highway Department.

It was **agreed** that Lee Barnard needs to coordinate all the issues that LWPC has raised. It was **resolved** that an action plan would be drawn up by the 3 parish councillors involved in the original meeting.

- d. SIDS Extra programme:

A letter had been received from T&W offering the opportunity for parish councils to apply for additional SIDs installations. The proposal was that Parish Councils could pay £276 for one unit at one location per two week period.

It was **resolved** not to accept the offer as it is far too expensive for a small parish council with limited funds.

It was noted that the normal SIDs rota was not operating as it was a long time ago since there has been one in the village. It was **resolved** to write to T&W to ascertain what had happened to the rota.

**4/12/7**

**Affordable Housing:**

Cllr. Lees outlined the recent history of the issue and that a formal response had been given to the report on the survey. Fiona Stewart had responded to the Parish Council recommendations and had stated in an email on 3<sup>rd</sup> April that: I have discussed these with Matthew and we are largely in agreement with the proposed changes, however we do have some reservations about entirely deleting the second paragraph of the recommendations...

It was **resolved** that the PC would now like to bring the matter to rapid conclusion and not participate in it any further. It was **resolved** that a revisiting of the issues in 4 to 5 years was more than adequate. It was also **resolved** that the 12 full-time employment vacancies within the parish needed clarification.

**4/12/8**

**Update on the Village Signs and Finger Post:**

Cllr. Lees reported that their manufacture was nearly complete and installation should take place in May.

**4/12/9**

**Street Lighting:**

Cllr. Lees said that the original application to the HLSMCL for new lights cost £39,000 and the application was withdrawn. New Victorian lamps had now become available but the cost would now be £72,000. It was **resolved** not to make a further application for funding of the lighting to HLSMCLC.

It was noted that this meant that LWPC would not be in a position to take over the lights on Crofters View.

**4/12/10**

**Swan Farm footpaths:**

It was reported that the stone that had already been put down was doing a good job. It was suggested that another 25 tons was needed to complete the project. Cllrs. Lees and Holding would liaise over suitable dates to complete the project.

**4/12/11**

**Annual Open parish Meeting:**

The Clerk presented a draft agenda. It was **resolved** to add "Highways" as item 2 and to include Phil Lorenz after West Mercia Police.

**4/12/12**

**Flooding on Coalbrookdale Road:**

Cllr. Lees reported that Julia Owen had been in contact with Jim Barber from T&W Council and that LWPC was not directly involved in the issue. She was still awaiting a response from Jim Barber. It was suggested that the Environmental Agency had become involved.

**4/12/13**

**Fly-Tipping:**

There seems to have been an increase in fly-tipping within the parish. It was **resolved** to include an article in the next Community Newsletter and ask residents to report it to the Clerk and when possible note the registration number of the vehicle.

**4/12/14**

**Super Fast Broadband Survey:**

The Clerk reported that the result of the survey was as follows:

There was the possibility of returns from 130 properties in Little Wenlock.

The returns were as follows:

Total returns = 84. (65%)

In favour of super fast broadband = 79 (94%)

Not in favour of super fast broadband = 1; 1 no computer, 3 did not specify.

Would use it = 65 (77%);

1 would not, 1 had no computer, 3 would not use it, 14 did not specify.

It was **resolved** to proceed with the project and to include VAT in the bid to the HLSMCLC.

#### 4/12/15 **New Works Bus Shelter:**

The Clerk reported that a firm estimate for the project had been provided by SevernOak which include the planning application, site preparation, construction and erection of the bus shelter plus ancillary equipment. The Clerk reported that he had sought estimates from other companies but that not other company could do the whole job and that a "one-off" similar shelter would cost over £8,000 but planning permission and all the other work would have to be sub contracted out.

It was **resolved** that once HLSMCLC had approved the grant the Clerk was to instruct SevernOak to draw up the design and site plans. It was **resolved** that these would be submitted to Veolia for approval before any further progress was agreed.

#### 4/12/16 **Clerk's Report:**

- a. The Clerk reported on his attendance at the NHW meeting at Wellington Police Station in March.
- b. The correspondence from Mark Pritchard MP was noted.
- c. The Clerk outlined the benefits of Smartwater as a deterrent to burglars etc and that as LWPC had a properly constituted NHW Scheme he could obtain the package for residents at a cost of £15 + VAT + PP. It was **resolved** to raise the issue at the Parish Open Meeting and to include a leaflet in the next Community Newsletter. It was **resolved** that the purchase of Smartwater could be made via LWPC.
- d. The Clerk reported that the annual inspection of the play area had been booked.

#### 4/12/17 **Planning:**

##### a. **Planning application TWC/2012/0255: Proposed Loft conversion, 3no. dormer windows and balcony 6 Crofters View, Little Wenlock, Telford, Shropshire, TF6 5AU:**

The Parish Council unanimously **objected** to the proposal on the grounds that the balcony and patio door windows would result in an excessive loss of privacy and would present an unacceptable level of intrusion to the two adjacent properties of 5 and 4 Crofters View.

##### b. **Planning application TWC/2012/0261: Construction of a new car park with 40 spaces and hard standing to site a mobile cafe Land off, Wrekin Course, Wellington Road, Wellington, Telford, Shropshire.**

The Parish Council **objected** to the planning application for the following reasons:

- i. That this is a green field site in a rural area being turned into a tarmac car park.
- ii. The proposed site is in an environmentally sensitive area.
- iii. There would be the loss of valuable flora and fauna.
- iv. The site is close to an AONB and triple SSI site.
- v. The pressure on parking only exists at weekends and Bank Holidays etc.
- vi. There are two possible former car parks that could be used at peak times: one on Wrekin Straight and another on Ercall Lane which could be opened at peak times.

- vii. A park and ride system at peak times running from car parks in Wellington would be a better way to solve the parking problem.
- viii. We should be encouraging less traffic at the foot of the Wrekin.
- ix. It is clear that there would be future planning creep with proposed further parking, allotments and toilets as stated in the application.
- x. Many car owners already do not park in the free Forest Glen car park but park on the road, they are not likely to park in a car park further away.
- xi. There is no guarantee that they will be able to secure the site at night.
- xii. There is no guarantee that they will find a caterer who is willing to remain on the site all day and to carry out the opening and closing of the site.
- xiii. The more people going up The Wrekin the more environmental damage there will be and further erosion to the site of the hill fort.

#### **Restricted Byway 40 & Bridleway 39, Little Wenlock – Diversion Order.**

The Parish Council does not object to this proposal but would recommend that if there is livestock in the field that some form of fencing be installed for the safety of disabled users.

**4/12/18**

#### **Borough Liaison:**

No T&W Borough Councillors were present.

**4/12/19**

#### **Reports and Updates from Parish Councillors:**

Cllr. Lees reported on the last meeting of the HLSM Community Fund Committee and stated that there had been a discussion on VAT. The Coalmoor Road footpath was awaiting two Quotations from T&W approved contractors. Concern had been expressed about the progress of the Trundle project. There were 8 new grant applications which he outlined. He reported that so far £300,000 had been allocated but past and present bids exceeded that total and as a result only grants of up to a total of £82,000 could be approved and therefore some form of prioritising the bids would have to take place.

**4/12/20**

#### **Accounts for the year ending 31<sup>st</sup> March 2012.**

The Clerk presented the accounts.

It was **resolved** that the Statement of Accounts for the Year 1<sup>st</sup> April 2011 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2012 was **approved** and signed by the Chairman and the Clerk.

The bank reconciliation for the year ending 31<sup>st</sup> March 2012 was **approved** and signed by the Chairman and the Clerk.

**4/12/21**

#### **Section 1 of the Annual Audit Return (Audit Commission):**

It was **resolved** that the document was **approved** and signed by the Chairman and the Clerk.

**4/12/22**

#### **Finance:**

- a. Grass cutting and open spaces contract: It was **resolved** that the quotation submitted by Ken Smith Contracting be accepted for the next 12 months.
- b. Affiliation fee to ALC and NALC: It was **resolved** to renew the annual subscription.
- c. It was **resolved** to purchase a grit bin in the autumn for Coalmoor Lane.
- d. It was **resolved** to accept the Asset Register submitted by the Clerk.
- e. It was **resolved** to renew the council's insurance with Came & Company.
- f. It was **resolved** that the payment made for the Jubilee Mugs (Cheque no. 101563 for the sum of £337.40) be approved.
- g. It was **resolved** to pay the following accounts as submitted by the Clerk:
 

Broker network (came & Company)	Insurance	£458.25
K. Smith Contracting	Road salting	£210.00
Madeley Print Shop	160 x A4 printing	£11.20

---

Madeley Print Shop	250 Newsletters	£25.00
John F. Marcham	salary	£242.33
HMRC	PAYE	£60.58
ALC	ALC & NALC Affiliation Fees	£198.14
CPRE	Annual Membership	£29.00
Npower	Energy Consumption	£79.31
Npower	Energy Consumption	£98.52
Npower	Energy Consumption	£33.01.
E.On	Light replacement	£138.06

**4/12/23****DATE OF THE NEXT MEETINGS:**30<sup>th</sup> April, Annual Open Parish Meeting at 7.30. and 14<sup>th</sup> May PC AGM at 7.30 pm.