



Telford & Wrekin  
C O U N C I L

Addenbrooke House Ironmasters Way Telford TF3 4NT

## CUSTOMER, COMMUNITY & PARTNERSHIP SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Date	Tuesday, 26 <sup>th</sup> April 2016	Time	6.00pm
Venue	Meeting Room G3/G4, Addenbrooke House, Ironmasters Way, Telford, TF3 4NT		

### Enquiries Regarding this Agenda:

Democratic Services	Jayne Clarke	01952 383205
Media Enquiries	Corporate Communications	01952 382407
Lead Officer	Stephanie Jones	01952 383114

Committee Membership: Councillors J C Ashford, G H Cook, N A M England (**Chair**), K R Guy, S J Reynolds, P J Scott, J M Seymour and B D Tillotson

## AGENDA

- 1. Apologies for Absence**
- 2. Declarations of Interest**
- 3. Minutes** Appendix A  
To confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Customer, Community & Partnership Scrutiny Committee held on 9 November 2015.
- 4. Customer Services**  
The Council is developing a strategy to make more Council services available or accessible online or via mobile phone apps. The Committee will consider:
  - a) How the technology will improve the quality of and access to Council services at the same time as saving money;
  - b) How the strategy takes into account the needs of residents who do not use technology;
  - c) How the technology will impact on waiting times at the contact centre and other measures being taken to improve response times.
- 5. Work Programme**  
To agree issues for the next meeting and any other matters arising.

**CUSTOMER, COMMUNITY & PARTNERSHIP SCRUTINY COMMITTEE****Minutes of a meeting of the Customer, Community & Partnership Scrutiny Committee held on Monday, 9 November 2015 at 6.00pm in Meeting Room G4, Addenbrook House, Ironmasters Way, Telford, TF3 4NT 7**

**PRESENT:** Councillors N England, J Ashford, G Cook, S J Reynolds, P Scott, J Seymour, B Tillotson.

**ALSO PRESENT:** Cllr. A McClements, Cabinet Member Communities, Regeneration & Transport; A Astley, Assistant Director Neighbourhood & Customer Services; M Barker, Assistant Director Planning Specialist; S Jones, Scrutiny Officer; K Harris, Transport & Highways Development Services Delivery Manager.

**CCP-07      APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Cllr. K Guy

**CCP-08      DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

None

**CCP-09      MINUTES**

**RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Customer, Community & Partnership Scrutiny Committee held on 30 June 2015 be confirmed and signed by the Chair.**

**CCP-10      TRAFFIC SIGNALS**

Cllr. A McClements, Cabinet Member Communities, Regeneration & Transport, A Astley, Assistant Director Neighbourhood & Customer Services and K Harris, Transport & Highways Development Services Delivery Manager were in attendance for this item.

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting and introduced the item saying that the purpose was for the committee to consider the issue of traffic signalling following calls from some members of the public to remove or operate part-time signals at key interchanges. He welcomed the request from the Cabinet member to bring this to scrutiny and invited opening remarks.

Cllr. McClements said there had been much heated debate about traffic signalling following concerns raised by a number of people which is why she felt it was important for scrutiny to look at the issues and the reasons for signals and would welcome scrutiny's views.

The Transport & Highways Manager then gave a presentation providing the following information:

- The purpose of the presentation was to inform the Committee of how the major interchanges in Telford and Wrekin are designed and managed, the actions that have been taken and are planned to improve traffic flows at key traffic signal interchanges and to provide information to enable the Committee to consider the issues and options of removing or operating part-time signals at key interchanges.

- Introduction

There is a good road network in the borough with good connectivity and free flowing roads. The network had been developed to serve and connect the New Town with other parts of the borough and had been designed to cope with growth. The challenge was to maintain the free flow of traffic as conditions changed with further growth and transformation - traffic was currently growing by 9% per year as a result of housing growth and an increase in the level of car ownership.

It was emphasised that the Council has a duty of care to all road users and traffic signals are not just about managing traffic but provide an essential means of allowing cyclists and pedestrians, including those with disabilities, to use the roads. To demonstrate this, Cllr Richard Overton had recently walked around the Box Road improvements with a blind person to appreciate the issues people with sight difficulties face. Overall it was felt that the right balance had been struck between the free flow of traffic and the regularity of crossing points for pedestrians including the partially sighted.

- Context

There had been a public meeting in February and there appeared to be a perception that the number of traffic lights had proliferated over recent years particularly on existing roundabouts. Information was presented which showed that of the 120 roundabouts in the borough only four had traffic signals (Hollinswood, Trench Lock, Ketley Brook and Malinslee), plus three M54 junction roundabouts where signals had been introduced and were managed by Highways England to prevent the back up of traffic onto the motorway. The Manager clarified for Cllr. Seymour that the Council did not have any authority over Highways England and they had insisted on the installation of traffic lights at the Forge roundabout (Junction 5) because of developments in Telford Town Centre. There were also around 45 traffic signals at non-roundabout junctions and a further 60 standalone pedestrian crossings. The figures showed that contrary to perception there were only a small number of roundabouts with traffic signals.

Managing the road network was a balance of keeping the roads maintained and flowing smoothly but also addressing road safety and access for all including cyclists and pedestrians. National studies, reported in the Shropshire Star, had shown that Telford and Wrekin had some of the least congested roads in the country (2014) and were amongst the safest roads in Britain (2012).

- Junction Design Considerations

Different types of junction controls could be used:

- Priority junction (e.g. crossroads or T-junction with a Give Way)
- Roundabout
- Signalised junction (e.g. cross-roads or T-junction where the predominant flow of traffic on one road causes queues on the minor roads)
- Signalised roundabout

The appropriate type of control was determined by guidance from the Department for Transport (DfT), computer modelling and a number of key factors:

- Traffic flow and turning movement. Where the volume of traffic on a predominant road at a T-junction or crossroad causes the smaller roads to become blocked, signals are considered as a way of balancing the flow of traffic. Roundabouts are considered in the same way but they work better where the flows on all roads are generally equal.
- Future capacity. Growth projections are fed into modelling to assess future capacity and the potential for queues and delays as traffic increases. Junctions need to be designed for the future to avoid the need for redesign at a later date. Traffic growth is currently 9% p.a.
- Access for all, including cyclists and pedestrians. People need access to education, employment, health services, leisure facilities etc. Roads need to cater for cyclists and pedestrians and signals create more flexibility for non-car users. Free flowing roundabouts can be difficult for cyclists and pedestrians to cross safely and if formal crossings are too far from the roundabout - the 'desire line' - pedestrians tend to ignore them. Providing for pedestrians and cyclists is also a function of the Council's healthy living and sustainability agendas.
- Land availability. Roundabouts can take up a significant amount of space and if land is not available a traffic signal layout can provide the same level of capacity in a smaller space. If land is available, there are cost implications for the Council or the developer particularly where the land could be used for other purposes. The Lawley interchange was a useful example where the land which would have been needed for a roundabout had been used for housing and the Morrisons supermarket.
- Cost and funding. Schemes can be costly, and the total cost of a scheme includes land costs which can be considerable for a large roundabout or prohibitive if land is not available. Efforts are always made to secure external funding such as from the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) Growth Point fund or through negotiated agreements with developers. Funding bids need to be cost efficient as the higher the cost, the higher the risk of the bid being refused and this can be a determining factor in the type of junction.

In summary, roundabouts remained the first choice of control at key junctions but in some circumstances traffic signals could provide increased capacity using a smaller land 'footprint', provide a better balance of queues, reduce vehicle speeds, improve safety (particularly for cyclists) and provide safer crossing points for pedestrians. The message was that 'one size does not fit all'.

- Traffic Signals: Actions

Up to date software had been introduced where necessary to make signalled junctions as efficient as possible. In the past, signals had worked on a time sequence based on historic traffic flows and were not flexible to respond to

fluctuations in flow or accidents. As technology moved on, the time sequence could be varied between peak and off-peak hours but still lacked flexibility to respond to deviations or accidents. Now, new adaptive technology had been developed - Split Cycle Offset Optimisation Technique (SCOOT) and Microprocessor Optimised Vehicle Actuation (MOVA) – whereby sensors embedded in the road detect where traffic is coming from and automatically adjust the signals to respond to traffic flows or accidents. The Council's approach had been to introduce the new technology when traffic flows reached a high enough level and this had now happened at some of the major interchanges.

New software had been introduced at Lawley and Hollinswood, was imminent at Trench Lock and was due to be implemented at Ketley Brook in Spring 2016. The impact of the technology would be monitored. Journey time monitoring had been carried out before the introduction of the software at Hollinswood and Lawley and the exercise had been repeated two weeks ago. A table of results was not available yet but early indications were positive and there was some positive individual feedback that the system had made a difference at Lawley. It would take some time to establish the full impact because the system is intelligent and adapts to traffic patterns over time.

Other improvements included the new road markings at Malinslee roundabout and the roll out of replacing signal bulbs with low energy LED bulbs.

There was further discussion about the improvements:

- Cllr. Seymour commented that she had come through Lawley and had been stopped by a red light coming onto West Centre Way but once the light changed she noticed that all the subsequent lights had been green. She knew there had been criticism from people about stopping at each set of lights and was encouraged that the new software may address this issue.
- It was clarified for Cllr. Scott that it is intended that the system in Trench Lock would be operational from this Wednesday, and Cllr. Tillotson hoped it would help with congestion around the BAe Systems entrance.
- As a snapshot of the impact of the new software, 40 journeys taking different routes around Hollinswood roundabout between 7-9pm had been timed in September (pre-installation) and again on 5 November (post-installation). The time was chosen because that was when people had asked for the lights to be turned off. There had been an overall saving of just under 11 minutes across all journeys equating to a 26% reduction in journey time or an average of 16 seconds per journey. 33 journeys had been shorter and of the 7 journeys that were longer the largest deficit was 11 seconds. One of the lessons learnt was that journey times on the route from the Town Centre to Stafford Park could be affected by buses and taxis and it was felt there was scope to look at the bus/taxi lane again in future.
- Signals had been installed on Malinslee roundabout in February 2014. At the time the lanes had been marked out in a simple format; the Box Road improvements were not complete and ASDA had only just opened so there was some uncertainty about how traffic flows would settle down. The markings have now been changed to a spiral pattern, with signs, directing people into the exit lanes which has addressed the issue of 'cutting up' and reduced driver frustration. There had been some positive comments from the

public. Cllr Seymour remarked that the markings seemed to have improved things.

- The installation of the software at Ketley Brook had been planned for Spring 2016 because funding had been secured from the LEP to make physical changes to the lane width and it made sense to minimise disruption for the public by making the changes at the same time.
- The programme to upgrade signals to low energy LED bulbs was about a third of the way through. This was an Invest to Save scheme to reduce energy costs over the longer term. Traffic lights were not very expensive to run but LED technology and better software would further improve efficiency and reliability.
- LEP Growth Point funding had been secured for improvements to 6 roundabouts as part of a 2 year programme. Randlay was the only roundabout where there were plans to introduce traffic signals and the other roundabouts would be improved by widening the approaches. Wider approaches at Randlay would not make a difference so it had been suggested that part-time signals could be introduced to operate at peak times.

- Risks and Challenges of Part-time Signals and Removing Signals

The DfT sets out national guidance and regulations governing traffic control including signalling. This was used as the starting point for highway engineers in planning traffic controls and other measures were then factored in. A risk assessment had been carried out which showed:

- The removal of signals and the operation of part time signals were not recommended as best practice by DfT and there was evidence from other authorities that where part-time signals had been introduced they had reverted back to full time.
- Part time signals should not be considered where there is pedestrian movement, and are particularly hazardous for the partially sighted. There was a reason that pedestrian crossings were standardized, which was to enable the partially sighted to use any crossing. It would send out the wrong message to pedestrians, and cyclists, if signals introduced for their benefit were switched off for part of the time.
- Confusion over the time of operation. There was evidence of an increase in accidents resulting from confusion when lights were out.
- Poorer conformity (ignoring signals) when they are on.
- Part time or removal of signals was not suitable at T junctions or crossroads.
- Circulatory speeds could increase as a result of the removal of signals. Hollinswood, Ketley Brook and Trench Lock are more gyratory systems than roundabouts. Removing the signals would exacerbate speeding and make it more difficult for drivers to join the system. Signals help maintain speeds at safe levels.
- Potential increase in accidents and/or insurance claims. The Council has a duty of care to all road users and there is a very real risk of litigation particularly in circumstances where a decision had been made which was contrary to national guidance or best practice – a conscious decision to do the opposite was a risky scenario.
- There were costs to making signals part time (e.g.road markings, traffic signs, alterations to the signal controllers) which would be around £15k each for

Hollinswood and Ketley Brook. This would be a relatively small cost if the benefit ratio were great enough but the cost of an accident to society (e.g. repair of the infrastructure, emergency services, treatment for injury, insurance claims etc.) and the risk of the cost of litigation would outweigh the cost of conversion.

- Summary and Next Steps

Roundabouts remained the default option and preferred choice. The remit of the highways engineers was that where a priority junction (e.g. Give Way) was not sufficient, then a roundabout was the starting point. However, traffic flows, pedestrian movement, future use, access and safety for all road users, the availability of space and funding requirements were all factored in and may lead to looking at a different type of control and traffic signals may be needed to maintain flows where other layouts could not cope.

New technology was being introduced at major intersections to further improve traffic flows and was starting to show benefits.

Part time operation and switching off signals was not recommended as best practice by DfT. Twenty other authorities had been written to of which 90% had not recommended part time signals. Some had introduced part time signals but reverted back. There were one or two examples of authorities using part time signals but only very small proportion of the overall number of facilities and not necessarily comparable to the circumstances and conditions of interchanges in the borough.

Part time operation could be appropriate where circumstances allow and having regard to the risks. Key interchanges had been assessed on a case by case basis and none of the existing signalled interchanges had been identified as suitable for the removal of signals or operation of part time lights. However, the Randlay interchange was starting to experience peak time vehicle delays and had been identified as suitable for the introduction of part time signals on a trial basis. The signals were expected to be introduced and funded through the LEP Growth Point package in 2016. The situation would be monitored and as traffic increased it may be necessary to review and adapt the signals. If part time signals were a solution at Randlay it would not imply that they would be suitable at other interchanges as conditions were not comparable and what worked at one junction would not work at another.

At the end of the presentation Cllr. McClements thanked the Manager and his team for their work. She had been open-minded about traffic signals and had spent a lot of time with the team looking at the issues. She emphasised that the Council had a duty of care to all road users including cyclists and pedestrians and although she understood that drivers may feel impatient when they are waiting at a red light they needed to recognise this duty. She remarked on the perception of the number of signalled roundabouts in the borough when in fact there were only four (other than the M54 roundabouts) and hoped that the MOVA and SCOOT technology would improve traffic flows and allay earlier frustration around the Box Road although it was early days. However she said it was important to listen to what people were saying, and the possibility of introducing part-time lights had been considered at Randlay

roundabout on a trial basis. She emphasised that this would not be a 'pilot' scheme because the conditions at Randlay were different to other roundabouts and one size did not fit all.

There then followed a number of questions and comments.

- Cllr. Seymour asked for clarification of how the new road sensors would work at interchanges like Ketley Brook or Lawley late at night when there was no traffic around and whether the sensors would favour one car and how long the delay would be before the lights changed to green. The Manager replied that it would depend on the size of the junction but after 8 p.m. the lights would revert to being vehicle activated so if there was only one car approaching the junction the software would check the colour of the lights and change them to green which may take a few seconds for safety reasons. Cllr. Seymour asked if this would happen regardless of pedestrians and how the sequence would take pedestrians into account. The Manager explained that the system responded in the same way when a pedestrian pushed the button but it also measures the time since the last pedestrian crossing and builds in some priority for cars.
- Cllr. Tillotson wanted to know the difference between the MOVA and SCOOT systems and the Manager said the systems work in a similar way but SCOOT was designed to work over a network of linked signals whereas MOVA was designed for one complex interchange.
- Cllr. Scott said he was pleased that the removal or switching to part-time signals had not been recommended because of the potential dangers and he would not like to see them introduced. The perception of drivers may be that they spend a long time waiting at red lights when in reality they don't. The numbers given tonight were heartening and he welcomed the fact that new systems were being tried and that they were not thinking about making signals part time.
- Cllr. Reynolds said he would be interested in seeing data from the Trench Lock roundabout over the longer term to see if things had improved.
- Cllr. Cook reflected on the report about Telford and Wrekin having some of the safest roads in the country and said that this was good and it was not worth making changes. Cllr. Scott asked which local authority area had been the safest and the Manager replied he believed it had been Rutland. The report had correlated the volume of traffic with the number of road accidents.
- Cllr. Scott commented that a lot of the issues seemed to be about perceptions of the number of signalled roundabouts but there were only four in the borough with signals maintained by the Council. Cllr. Reynolds said this showed the impact that the four roundabouts had in that they were on routes that were well used. The complaints could be down to people feeling impatient at being stopped by a red light but for him it was more important that all road users were safe. When part-time lights had been mooted by the public before Christmas it could have been down to a few people waiting at the Lawley lights. The Manager said that funding for the Lawley development had been taken in advance to put the

infrastructure in place for the future so that the interchange could cope with future use and would not need to be redesigned in future and the SCOOT software had now been introduced as the volume of traffic had increased.

- Cllr. Scott suggested that more information should be shared with the public to change perceptions and raise awareness about the improvements. The Assistant Director said that more information could be provided on the website or in response to Freedom of Information requests. Cllr Scott said he felt the team was doing a great job and better than perceived by the public. The Assistant Director said that the Shropshire Star had published articles about SCOOT and MOVA which had helped raise awareness. Cllr. Scott said it was important to dispel myths.
- Cllr. Tillotson asked if there would be any other changes made at Trench Lock and the Manager said there would be some changes to the geometry of the interchange. The Assistant Director informed members that funding had been identified from the LEP Growth Point package to make improvements to the layout at six of the borough's islands by widening the approach roads. There were plans to introduce signals at only one of the islands, on a part-time basis. There would be a consultation exercise with members of the public for each island and they could come back and consult with the Committee if Members wished. Cllr. McClements added that the relevant Ward Members and Town and Parish Councils would be consulted.
- Cllr. Tillotson said he felt Trench Lock was crying out for improvement - there were problems with cars cutting across to Hortonwood and with drivers who know the sequence well speeding up to beat the lights. The Manager said that with MOVA drivers would not be able to predict the sequence of lights and that may reduce the risks. The Assistant Director added that for the changes to the six islands in the Growth Point package, web pages were being developed and notifications of road closures would also be available via an App. She again offered to report back to the Committee on the impact of the current improvements and the Growth Point package proposals.
- Cllr. Seymour commented that the lights at Ketley had caused most problems when the work was first done and there had been irritation with major waits at quiet times but now after eight years the traffic levels have gone up. Cllr. McClements replied that it was important to predict and design for future needs.
- The Chair asked whether the predicted 9% growth included growth projections in the Local Plan. The Manager said 9% was the rate of growth being experienced now but predictions were made using known data and the Local Plan. The impact of growth predicted from the Local Plan had been fed into flow models which had identified the six roundabouts in the Growth Point package. There were no immediate plans for the roundabout at PRH but traffic would be monitored and this could be one which may need improvement in the future. Cllr. McClements said that the changes would be planned with the least disruption and local residents would be consulted and notified.

- Cllr. Tillotson asked whether the modelling had predicted the need for a western by-pass or dual carriageway as traffic was backed up from Furrows. The Manager said that they had not predicted a by-pass scenario but would need to make some future difficult decisions and make realistic proposals now for what could be funded. As the local authority they may need to consider dual carriageways and other improvements in the future but there was no funding for schemes now. The Assistant Director said that the team were very good at securing external funding, for example EU and LEP funding had been secured for the Box Road and roundabout improvements. The challenge is to seek funding and have a robust business case in place for when the money comes in. Telford & Wrekin had a good reputation for delivering projects within budget and on time. Cllr. Tillotson remarked that the borough's forefathers had a vision of building for the future when they built the bridge.
- Cllr. McClements said that traffic signals had been a hot potato and it was good to get a view from scrutiny. Cllr. Tillotson said that the discussion had changed his view.
- The Chair expressed his concern about introducing part-time signals at Randlay roundabout although acknowledged that there were no pedestrians and that the island was very busy at peak times and then very quiet. The Manager said it was felt that it would help by having part-time signals from day one and the Chair said it was an opportunity to see how it worked or did not work.

At the end of the discussion, Members expressed their support for the current approaches to traffic signals as discussed at the meeting. It was agreed that reports on the impact of the MOVA and SCOOT technology, the part-time signals at Randlay and the proposed changes to the six roundabouts in the Growth Point package would be considered at a future meeting.

Cllr. McClements then updated Members on the subsidised bus routes and discussions with Arriva since the meeting in June giving the following information:

- The consultation on the subsidised bus routes had closed. The consultation had included an online survey, public events, consultation with bus user groups and on-bus passenger surveys. There had been good feedback with over 800 responses. An analysis of the feedback had been published online and would be sent to bus user groups and partners.
- Tenders had gone live on the website with the deadline for bids of 12 December. All current subsidised routes had been put out to tender with some variation of evening options and the Lawley evening and Sunday service.
- Decisions would be made on what to award within the budget allocated and following the Bus Subsidy Policy supported by the Committee. Awards would be made early February 2016 and contracts would come into effect on 11 April 2016.
- There had been further communication with Arriva on the commercial routes. Some of the new routes had been tweaked and Arriva had agreed to take on the 519 cross-border service as a commercial route. It was important to keep communicating with Arriva and Cllr. McClements would be happy to report back to the Committee on any future developments.

The Chair thanked Cllr. McClements and officers for their attendance and they left the meeting.

## **CCP-11      ENGAGEMENT IN THE LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION**

The Chair invited the Assistant Director Planning Specialist to provide an update on the engagement activity on the Local Plan over the summer and how the suggestions made by the Committee in June had been taken on board.

The Assistant Director provided the following information:

- Consultation on the Local Plan had taken place over the summer and autumn following the previous meeting with the Committee in June. Feedback from the meeting had been that the Committee supported the proposed activities but had made a number of recommendations which had enabled the team to focus on those areas. For example;
  - The recommendation that Town and Parish Council Clerks should be informed about the consultation as early as possible had been addressed through the extended consultation period to 25 September and Clerks had been contacted in July with the offer of meetings
  - The recommendation to hold more open sessions for people who do not engage with Town and Parish Councils had been addressed by four public sessions at Oakengates Theatre
  - The recommendation that the consultation documents should be easy to access and read had been addressed by clear navigation on the website and an easy to read summary document. There had also been a list of events on the website for people to cross-reference with events in their own area. These recommendations had been adopted in the consultation.
- The documentation had been made as simple as possible but the issues in the Local Plan were wide ranging and needed to meet legal requirements. The consultation document was sent to the Local Government Association's Planning Advisory Service (PAS), which supports all local authorities, to read prior to publication. Feedback from PAS was that the document met all the requirements, it was comprehensive but not too long, it was direct and covered all the issues and they endorsed it as a good plan. Their feedback gave added assurance that the document was on the right lines.
- A key aim was to meet Town and Parish Councils. An information session was held for Ward Members which included details of how Town and Parish Councils could be supported. A similar consultation event was organised for Town and Parish Councils in August and they were also given the option of individual meetings.
- The 2788 consultees who had registered on the database during the previous consultation and had said they wanted to be kept in touch were contacted.

- The consultation was advertised on Radio Shropshire, in the press, on Twitter and Facebook, on posters in Council buildings (including First Point, libraries and community centres) and post offices and the consultation portal on the website was kept up to date. A further 297 consultees were added to the database.
- 385 individual responses were received which was fewer than received during the previous consultation stage in 2014 and was believed to be one of the lowest response rates around the country at this stage of Local Plan development. The low response rate could mean that people simply did not feel the need to reply or that they were broadly supportive of the Plan.
- Looking at the numbers, 23% objected, 17% supported and 58% neither objected nor supported the Plan but made some general comments. It was felt that this was a pretty positive overall result for this stage of the plan because although more people had objected than supported the plan overall the majority of consultees had not criticised the plan.
- 55% of respondents had commented via the web portal, 29% by email and 15% by post showing most people had used the electronic approaches.
- 24 Ward Members had attended the information seminar on 30 July and 19 people had attended the Town and Parish consultation meeting on 4 August.
- Officers had attended a series of Town and Parish Council meetings and public meetings organised by Town and Parish Councils as requested throughout August and September to present the plan and answer questions. Meetings were held with Newport, Wellington, Madeley, Oakengates and Dawley Town Councils; Ercall Magna, Waters Upton, Lawley & Overdale, Church Aston, Donnington & Muxton, Wrockwardine Wood & Trench, The Gorge, Edgmond, St. Georges & Priorslee, Dawley Hamlets and Chetwynd Aston & Woodcote Parish Councils. The best attended events were Edgmond (53), The Gorge (47), Lilleshall (35), Waters Upton (31) and Tibberton (22) with between 8 and 11 people attending the other events.
- There had been four public consultation meetings over two days on 8 and 11 August in the mornings and evenings. A limited number of people had turned up, 11 at the most. The theatre in Oakengates was used as a venue because of accessibility and car parking but the events had not drawn people in and were the least well attended of the consultation events.
- Officers had taken scrutiny's advice and overall the consultation had gone well although some meetings had not been well attended. A report and analysis of the feedback would be prepared and officers were looking at how to revise the plan to address the objections which had been made strongly.
- The plan would move to a more final form by the end of the year and would be presented to Full Council on 21 January 2016. There would then be a further 6 weeks of consultation specifically to allow people to come forward to say whether the plan was 'sound' or not as defined by government regulations. The

development of the Local Plan must follow regulations set out by government in Town and Country Planning regulations. The last round of consultation over the summer was the 'Regulation 18' consultation stage requiring authorities to consult widely on the options. The next stage in the new year would be the 'Regulation 19' publication period which was specifically for people to comment on the 'soundness' of the plan and was more likely to be of interest to developers. The final Plan would be submitted to the independent Planning Inspector in April 2016 with an Examination in Public during the summer, leading to adoption in December 2016.

- Officers felt that the Plan was based on good evidence and demonstrated a five year housing land supply. They were confident that the Plan was strong although it had not yet been tested.

The Chair thanked the Assistant Director for the update and for taking up the Committee's recommendations he left the meeting.

## **CCP-12      WORK PROGRAMME**

A copy of the Committee's work programme was tabled and members considered items for the next meeting.

The Chair noted that Cllr. Kuldip Sahota had attended the Scrutiny Management Board meeting on 4 November to answer questions about the LEP and Combined Authority.

At the meeting in June the Committee had referred issues relating to Section 106 back to the Scrutiny Management Board as a cross-cutting issue and the Chair informed members that the Board had agreed that Cllr. Richard Overton would be invited to the May Scrutiny Management Board meeting for a Holding to Account Session to address questions about Section 106.

It was agreed that the items for the next meeting would be Customer Services and First Point for Business and a date would be arranged for late February / early March.

It was agreed that the issues discussed at the meeting relating to traffic management would be added to the work programme.

The Chair and other members felt performance of the waste services contract was still a matter of great interest and it was agreed that the Scrutiny Officer would contact Audit to clarify the timetable for the audit report.

The Chair informed Members that four applications had been received for co-optee positions on the Committee and that shortlisting and interviews were underway. The Chair's recommendations would be put to the Committee for agreement and due to the timing of the next meeting this would be done by email to avoid unnecessary

delay but the appointments would need to be formally endorsed at the next Committee meeting.

The meeting ended at 7.40pm

**Chairman:** .....

**Date:** .....