

Transport Assessment for Snatchfield submitted by Northern Trust

The proposal for Snatchfield should be seen in the critical context of the ‘one way in, one way out’ nature of both the proposed site access itself and the access roads from Watling Street South to Chelwick Drive.

In Table 5.5 Northern Trust estimate the vehicle ‘movements’ in and out of the site in their suggested ‘peak’ periods AM (08.00 to 09.00) and PM (17.00 to 18.00) to be 46 and 44 respectively. However, the Northern Trust numbers only cover 2 hours out of a 24 day and no daily vehicle movement estimation is made. In addition, as the majority of any homes built on Snatchfield are likely to be occupied by retirees, suggesting employment related peaks seems odd. The Community Conducted Traffic Survey of Clive Avenue in 2019 demonstrated vehicle movements from existing homes on the route to be spread reasonably evenly across the 12-hour periods studied (7AM to 7PM) and with the highest numbers recorded being in several of the hourly periods outside the peaks suggested by Northern Trust.

However, taking Northern Trusts figures as a starting point (90 vehicle movements over 2 hours) it is safe to assume that there will be at least 500 vehicle movements over a 24-hour day (185,000 per annum). 500 is considered the absolute minimum figure due to Snatchfield’s characteristics (walking distance from Town Centre, lack of direct public transport, steep nature of approach, lack of pavements at Clive Avenue etc). We can be certain that at least 500 is a robust figure as Shropshire Council’s Highways Officer recently (Northern Planning Committee, 18 November 2025) estimated likely vehicle movements on a site of Snatchfield’s size (but not with Snatchfield’s unique characteristics) to be 6.5 vehicle movements per dwelling per day. Other historic Snatchfield specific transport studies (including those previously undertaken for one of the Snatchfield site owners and Shropshire Council) produce very similar estimates.

To gain vehicle access to the proposed site the future occupiers of all bar 3 homes would have to drive over the existing bridleway (the Jack Mytton Way) running through the site at least once, as demonstrated by Northern Trust’s indicative site layout. Given that the bridleway is designated for horse riding, walking and cycling, 500 vehicle movements per day crossing it would mean it would cease to fulfil its designated purpose, never mind the obvious safety implications. As Northern Trust have indicated on the Redacted Application Form that they will “not require any diversions/extinguishments and/or creation of rights of way” the conflict between vehicle movements and priority users of the Jack Mytton Way would seem an insurmountable impediment to a successful planning application. Of course, the situation during any construction phase would be even more severe.

An additional 500 vehicle movements per day at the Clive Avenue Conflict Area is also of serious concern. Northern Trust estimate (Table 2.1) that there is already a weekday average of 551 vehicle movements per day from existing homes. Adding a minimum of an extra 500 vehicle movements would increase this to well over 1,000 vehicle movements per day (385,000 per annum). It should be stressed that the Clive Avenue Conflict Area has no pavements, is poorly lit, twisting and with poor visibility lines.

Local Residents have long argued that Clive Avenue is already unsafe. Residents undertook 4 traffic surveys (4 separate days, 12-hour periods) in 2019 and noted 102 ‘incidents of concern’ at the Clive Avenue Conflict Area, including several ‘near misses’. A detailed report was submitted to Shropshire Council.

Shropshire Council has also previously expressed a view of the Clive Avenue Conflict Area. The conflict between pedestrians and vehicles was noted in 2014 by Andy Savage, then Shropshire Developing Highways Manager. Mr Savage felt that traffic volumes resulting from development at Snatchfield would be “very significant”. As such, he could not support the allocation of Snatchfield in Local Plan discussions and his concerns led to removal of the site from what is now the Adopted Local Plan.

Finally, can Snatchfield be considered a ‘sustainable’ site in planning terms? Northern Trust’s own evidence suggests not.

Public Transport use is one key indicator of sustainability. Yet Northern Trust estimate (Table 5.5) that only 2.7% of trips to and from any Snatchfield development would involve Public Transport use as part of the overall trip. Snatchfield clearly fails this sustainability test.

Another key indicator of sustainability is walking distance to Church Stretton Town Centre. Northern Trust (Table 4.1) quote the Chartered Institution for Highways and Transportation (CIHT) document entitled Guidelines for Providing for Journeys on Foot.’ This document suggests maximum walking distances relevant for new developments. In terms of walking distances to ‘Town Centres’ CIHT suggest the following: Desirable = within 200m, Acceptable = within 400m, Maximum = within 800m. Snatchfield clearly fails this sustainability test as well.