

**Telford & Wrekin Local Plan
Examination in Public**

Matter 3, Question 3.5 EiP Ref K11a

1. Can the Council confirm that the scale of growth proposed in the Local Plan has been subject to adequate traffic modelling? Specifically, have the potential traffic effects of bringing all of the 148 ha (approximate) of employment land allocated in the Plan been modelled? Page 2-1 of document C4a-ii suggests that only 110 ha of this land has been considered, while later references (such as pages 4-2 and 4-4) refer to employment floorspace rather than land area. I would be grateful if this could be clarified.

1.1 The Council can confirm that the full 148.52 hectares of employment land has been modelled as set out in Table 3.3 of 'Telford Local Plan – Supporting Modelling & Highways Infrastructure Plan' report¹. The 110 hectare figure refers to the Council's Regulation 18 (Consultation version) draft of the Local Plan which at the time suggested a minimum of 110 hectares of employment land being delivered. The inspector will have received further evidence on Matter 4 of the actual likely yield of all the employment sites².

1.2 The reference to employment floorspace relates to plot ratios (gross floor space to site area) in Table 3-9³ of the document which is then used to generate trip rates for the listed employment uses. The reference on page 4-4 of the document relates to the total completed and committed employment land over the plan period as well as the Council's original expectation of minimum of 110 hectares of land as mentioned above. The figures are expressed in square metres rather than in hectares.

2. What is the up to date position with regard to the stated need for Highways England (HE) to carry out further investigations about strategic improvements to the M54 between junctions 3 and 4 (see document C4a-ii – executive summary section 1.5 (2nd para)). Is HE satisfied that this matter does not represent a potential constraint to future development?

¹ C4a - ii

² K14

³ C4a - ii Telford Local Plan – Supporting Modelling & Highway Infrastructure Plan,

- 2.1 Highways England confirmed in a letter of 26th January 2016⁴ that all references to the strategic improvements to the M54 between junctions 3 and 4 be removed from the IDP document. Highways England confirmed that:

“on review of the evidence presented for this proposal, the need for such a scheme is not conclusively made out for a major intervention of this nature within the plan period”.

3. Policy C2 (i) seeks to safeguard land for the implementation of priority transport projects. Where is the extent and location of this land defined? Is this a matter that should be addressed on the Policies Map?

- 3.1 The former Telford Development Corporation purchased large amounts of land in order to facilitate an expanded highway network. This includes routes, junctions and roundabouts where additional capacity is, or will be required to support development. At this stage in the highway design process, it is likely that the land required for the identified priority transport schemes (highway schemes within the IDP⁵) will be within highway land and public ownership and as such under Council control. However, this will not be known until detailed design work has been completed.
- 3.2 In addition, there are a small number of schemes profiled for delivery towards the latter two thirds of the Local Plan period that may have some implications for third party land. The Council will provide a map within the IDP which will set out the indicative location of these schemes that applicants can refer to when reading Policy C2 (the policy references the IDP). At the point of pre-application discussion, the Council will discuss any potential issues regarding the need to safeguard land.
- 3.3 The Council, therefore, does not propose to include safeguard land on the Policies Map.

⁴ A6 Telford & Wrekin Local Plan – Duty to Cooperate Statement, page 115.

⁵ E3 TWC Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2016 – 2031, pages 64 – 67.