

Allscott Development

Mr. Chairman your officers rightly make the observation that there is considerable local opposition to this proposal; this opposition vastly outweighs any support. Section 8:1 of your report immediately outlines the difficulty your committee faces in that historically consideration of any development of this site has been considered to be contrary to any existing policy. This fact was recognised by the Inspectorate at the Public Examination of the Core Strategy.

Nevertheless, you have also been reminded by your officers of the golden thread of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Note the words “Sustainable Development”. Wrockwardine Parish Council believes that the applicant has substantially failed to demonstrate that any residential development of this site could ever be sustainable.

It is the view of Wrockwardine Parish Council that to be truly sustainable the site should be sustainable as far as possible within its own environs: it should have little effect on its surrounding area, limit CO2 emissions and provide an environment where people can work and play and if travel is necessary then this should be by public transport.

You will have heard representations setting out the perceived adverse effects that traffic generated by such a development would have on the quality of life of existing residents of the villages and hamlets of the rural area. You may be of the view that as Telford is practically the size of a city there will always be consequences when traffic is increased and that this is why you have in place an integrated traffic policy which does all it can to encourage the use of public transport. Mr. Chairman, your Committee is experienced enough to know that the populous urban boundary of Telford comes to an end at the Admaston railway bridge. The Village of Wrockwardine is some small distance from this urban boundary but it has practically no public transport system. The proposed site is way out into the rural countryside and the reality is that despite a promise of funding there will never be a sustainable public transport system and no commercial firm will continue to subsidise busses to this area. It will not be sustainable.

A section 106 agreement may bring in funds to partially mitigate against traffic speeds and improve safety but it will never alleviate traffic volumes and an increase of several hundred, if not thousands, of traffic movements a day through the quiet rural village of Wrockwardine (and the other hamlets) will have an impact which no amount of mitigation will alleviate.

Your Education department has done all it can to point out to you that a school with as small an intake of 23 pupils each year will never have enough per capita funding to be sustainable; it is far too small to be so. Every year, your budget committee will be faced with the fact that the Borough Tax payer is massively subsidising this school and will have to make a decision whether to keep the school open and spend many thousands in subsidies or close it and face the cost of subsidised transport provision. You have already been told that the provision of transport for secondary school children from the proposed development will cost the tax payer of this Borough £46'000 a year. Closure of an uneconomical primary school would double this burden on the tax payer but keeping it open would be a far greater burden. The closure of a school is not one that any politician wishes to face. This proposal is not sustainable. Refuse this application and encourage the building of 450 homes anywhere else

WROCKWARDINE PARISH COUNCIL

in Telford and there will already be existing school and transport provision which would not provide an unnecessary extra unpopular burden on the tax payer.

The proposal makes provision for a doctor's surgery. The Association of Family Practitioners state that one doctor can manage a maximum of 1750 patients on his panel. 450 houses would likely provide a population of 2025 souls. Too many for one doctor but not enough for two. The Association discourages one doctor practices. They are uneconomical, unviable, and would be limited in what they could provide because they do not have the combined funding to provide nursing triage care or other ancillary support. Without a doctor there will be no pharmacy. Not sustainable.

There is provision for a community shop. The Daily Mail reported recently that 25 corner shops are closing each week with competition from supermarkets and their home deliveries. Mr. Chairman you know that I have sufficient experience in this area to be able to categorically assure your committee that a community of 450 homes will never support a village shop. It is not sustainable.

Mr. Chairman I could prove a lack of sustainability on almost all of the points put forward by the developer but three minutes is insufficient to do so.

There is considerable local opposition to this application which would, if successful, create a village outside the present boundary of the built up area of the Borough; effectively extending the present urban development of Telford well into the rural countryside. Because of the extent of the opposition to this plan along with the likely adverse consequences on the Conservation Area of Wrockwardine Village and other hamlets within the Parish of Wrockwardine we urge that you do not grant permission for this application.

We ask you to turn the golden thread on its head. In this instance there **MUST** be a presumption of refusal because the applicant has **FAILED** to demonstrate to you that the development is sustainable.