

MINUTES OF THE TETTENHALL COMMUNITY FORUM

Parish Rooms, Tettenhall

3rd March 2025

at 6.30 pm

APOLOGIES

Neal Kelshaw, Colin Whittingham

There were 11 residents in attendance.

There being no specific items for discussion the agenda was restricted to Matters Arising.

MATTERS ARISING

910 AD BATTLES

A conversation has been opened regarding the possibility of using part of the Severn Trent site on Regis Road for a museum and to consolidate into that site opportunities for further community involvement. John Green (JG), Becky Cresswell (RC) and Neal Kelshaw (NK) have been engaged with Severn Trent and after several attempts to secure a meeting they attended a walk around at the site with the director responsible for managing Severn Trent estates who appeared keen to take the discussions further. There is substantial car parking potential, a range of currently unoccupied buildings and the main tower, which is Grade II listed and has sufficient space for a range of facilities in addition to a museum. JG showed some pictures taken through the main doorway revealing the beautiful tiled interior and illustrating the scale of the available space. It is not yet clear what arrangements could be made with Severn Trent but a project of this scale would need substantial financial support from businesses and local residents and organisations. Underlying Severn Trent's interest is their need to keep their depot open to service the aquifers and as a regional depot for service teams and plant. There would need to be substantial changes to the entrance arrangements to allow segregation of the business and community sections and the costs of bringing a listed building into use and maintaining it would be very high.

Post meeting the Trust has also been approached by Tettenhall College who are keen to make the college and its facilities more open and available to local residents. NK and RH attended a meeting on 6th March also attended by staff, Historic England, WCC Listed Buildings Department and received a presentation from the architect who had been responsible for restoring substantial parts of the college buildings, particularly their roofs with their famous water collection system. Repairs and developments had been taking place for a number of years and further work is planned over the next 3 years. The college is seeking to defray some of its costs by increasing access from the community which already enjoys access to the swimming pool and occasional events at the famous internal theatre and these and other facilities of the college could be available to further use from community groups. The indications are that the college will need to make substantial changes to the old main entrance and immediate surroundings which

have been divided into a number of small and difficult to use rooms which are currently unoccupied. NK and RH had a tour of the building which again clearly suffers from the potential requirements of a Listed building but it was noted that the history/drama teacher who showed us round the building was very supportive of the 910 AD Battles project. She explained that she taught it and re-enacted the battles with her students in the Tettenhall College grounds which were believed to be the site of some of the battles and skirmishes which took place. She pointed out that the school badge has an emblem reflecting the battles at the point of the shield. She was already actively in discussion with RC and this connection is clearly an opportunity for the construction of educational material celebrating the 910 AD Battles.

ROCK JUNCTION

Robin Hacking (RH) has replied to the email sent to himself and NK dated 23rd December 2024 which did nothing to add to the Council's position as stated in early November 2024. RH has once again requested a meeting to achieve better understanding of the residents' and Council's positions. He has also asked for a meeting with the consultants engaged by the Council on the basis that the November communication from the Council indicated that a very inaccurate and misleading summary of residents' concerns, as officially raised and registered with the Council throughout 2024, had been supplied to the consultants. The purpose of the meeting with the consultants would ensure that they had an accurate understanding of the views and concerns as expressed by over 300 residents. He also sought clarification that if the consultants were also to consider the residents' petition regarding alternative proposals for the Rock Junction, which has not yet been responded to by the Council, then he was seeking confirmation that the entirety of the petition would be considered rather than a cursory analysis which was indicated by the Council's November 2024 communications.

The 23rd December 2024 letter from the Council to NK and RH had referred them to the Council's plans for the junction as identified in the December 2023 TTRO via the council's website on that proposal. RH has further reviewed that public information and in his reply asked for further clarification on traffic volumes and comment on whether the traffic volumes should be reassessed to be more up to date.

At the time of the meeting no response had been received to the further queries being raised and the Council's position appears to be that they will say nothing until the consultants have reported. The Council refused to tell us when the consultants are due to report. RH will seek support from the Tettenhall Councillors attending the Steering Group in trying to establish when the consultants will report.

Noted, we understand that there is an allocation in the Council's 2025 budget for changes to the Rock Junction at the level of several tens of thousands of pounds. It has also become clearer that the cost allocated to the consultants' exercise is very conservative and unlikely to be sufficient to cover all the issues which the Council say the consultants have been charged to cover.

The residents attending the meeting were increasingly frustrated and angry about the Council's lack of response on this important issue and asked the Chairman to write again to the Council demanding a better response. Residents were

concerned that the letters to RH and NK were marked *restricted* preventing them from circulating the Council's position to residents and resident groups and the Chairman was encouraged to put his next response into the public domain and he agreed that he would attach his subsequent correspondence to the minutes.

PLANNING

Notwithstanding the disappointing decision of the Council to retrospectively approve the roof railings on the Lower Green Health Centre RH has been assisting a lady who lives in one of the cottages opposite where her neighbour is extensively modifying the adjacent cottage without applying for Planning Consent and Listed Building Consent. She has written frequently to the Council asking them to require retrospective applications but until recently the only action the Council had taken was to advise the developer to stop work. However recently there has been a further complaint from another property owner further down the terrace. It appears they may have been seeking approval from the Council for similar modifications with the Council now demanding in this instance appropriate applications. Having pointed out the unfairness of this the Council has now required the initial developer to stop work pending an inspection.

STEERING GROUP UPDATE

The previous Steering Group meeting having been cancelled there is no report.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

NOTICE BOARDS

It was felt that we could make more use of local notice boards.

Nicola Rudge (NR) informed the meeting that she was stepping back from the Social Media group and that her responsibilities will be taken over by NK.

There being no other business the meeting closed at 20.30.

Outline agenda for next meeting:

- APOLOGIES
- MATTERS ARISING
- STEERING GROUP UPDATE
- SMESTOW VALLEY NATURE RESERVE UPDATE
- ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Re: The Rock

5 messages

Robin Hacking <
To: John Charles <
Cc: Neal Kelshaw <

Sohail.khan@

Bob.Maddox@

Councillor Udey Singh <

18 March 2025 at 16:28

I refer to your letters of 5/11/2024, 23/12/2024, and 27/2/2025.

The purpose of this letter is to make very clear to you that I do not consider that your letters provide meaningful responses to the very many serious issues and questions I have raised in my correspondence and formal complaints to yourself in particular and to the council in general.

What is so serious is your and the council's cavalier and egregious responses to matters concerning health and safety, road safety, and council due process as defined in the council's own, and the national, regulatory framework which informs the council's day to day operations.

I have set out some examples below in a final effort to encourage the council to engage meaningfully with residents, residents representative bodies and jointly with Ward Councillors.

With regard to your letter of 15/11/2024:-

The list of questions and issues sent to your consultants and as attached to this letter egregiously misrepresents the views, concerns and complaints of residents documented to the council since it announced the TTRO in November/December 2023.

For example no mention of how bins will be emptied in large tracts of Malthouse Lane and Lothians Road which would be inaccessible to the bin lorry.

Ditto no response to queries as to how emergency services especially Fire and Rescue Services could access these same properties which includes one care home and one specialist care centre for disabled people.

No analysis of or mitigation for reduced road safety for pedestrians and cyclists in 180m of narrow (2.8m wide) single carriage way with no footpath on either side and running in part between 15 feet high walls and hedges and with a 90 degree blind corner in the middle.

With regard to your letter of 23/12/2024:-

The opening paragraph of this letter is disingenuous and is misrepresentative of the facts at the date of the letter and facts that must have been known to you at the time of writing.

For example you say that no decision has been taken on this matter but it is now a matter of public record that the council has included substantial sums in its 2025 budget for work at this junction.

You say that "the council will fairly consider all views and concerns" and yet your previous letter of 5/11/2024 makes clear that the council has egregiously misrepresented the views of residents, registered with the council through what the council describe as a consultation process, to the consultants who are engaged to review the council's proposals.

You say that the residents petition of completely different and separate proposals for The Rock Junction will be considered by the consultants who have been engaged by the council to review the council's proposals.

This proposal is implacably opposed by the petitioners who have repeatedly made clear to the council that their petition stands alone and demands a formal response in line with regulations governing the response of citizens' petitions in relation to the scale of support the petition received and the timescale laid down for response.

Additionally, the budgetary indications now apparent for the council's proposed consultancy exercise to review their own plans for this junction as indicated by the TTRO appear to be completely inadequate to achieve a meaningful critique of the council's own plans let alone have the capacity to adequately consider the petition's separate distinct and wide ranging proposals for improving the junction.

In relation to the issue of malfeasance and failure of process I note that you regret the time taken to deal with these matters but take this opportunity to remind you that petitioners were originally promised a response to their petition by Democratic services by 15/5/2024. The various excuses for failing to meet this promise (I acknowledge you would describe them as reasons) range from local elections through national elections and changes of cabinet responsibility and finally come to rest on the timetable for your consultants review which is conveniently undeclared and therefore open ended. Will there be further delays during this year's council elections?

With regard to your letter of 27/2/2025:-

You have completely ignored my reasonable request for you to clarify details of the information on the council's web site which you yourself referred me to in your previous letter as a source of information for me or ask a member of your team to respond on your behalf.

You have declined to comment on the council's failure to respond to my formal complaints ref. 5697866, 6260845, and 7510557 stretching back over a 12 month period which are all related to this issue and which the council have declined to raise to level 2 in spite of a nil response to date so by copy of this email I am asking my Ward Councillors to investigate this for me.

You have also failed to respond to my request for a meeting with you to improve understanding of our respective positions hopefully attended by Ward Councillors and failed to respond to a request for a meeting with your appointed consultants so that residents views can be accurately conveyed to them which is currently not the case.

Will you now please either arrange these meetings or confirm you are unwilling to do so.

To be clear I am writing this email as a resident but also on behalf of all the residents of the Teitenhall Community Forum who routinely express their concerns at our regular meetings and who have asked me to register their similar views with you.

I confirm that I have respected the "restricted" classification of your letters which remain private to me but wish to inform you that this email will form part of the minutes of the next meeting of the Forum and will therefore be in the public domain.

Robin M Hacking
Chair Teitenhall Community Forum



Teitenhall Community Forum is a working group formed under the
National Council Community Trust (Planning Group).
The Forum is registered with WCC Local Planning under
Neighbourhood Plan, Localism Act and SCL statutes.

Re: The Rock

Robin Hacking <
To: John Charles
Cc: Neal Keshaw >

Councillor Sohail Khan <
John Roseblade

Councillor Bob Maddox

Councillor Udey Singh

19 March 2025 at 13:12

Thank you for your prompt response to my email of yesterday.

I note that you have included John Roseblade in your response and I welcome that fact.

Notwithstanding my respect for your own position, it is now clear that the current situation has now been brought to the direct attention of more senior management.

It is particularly appropriate for John Roseblade to be aware since he was the officer who promised to residents at the PACT meeting in January 2024 that public meetings would be held to allow residents to discuss the councils proposals and that all issues complaints and suggestions made by residents would receive an answer from the council none of which has yet happened even though 14 months have now elapsed.

The council's repeated position, that nothing can be said about the Rock Junction until the Council's consultants report on the Councils TTRO from November/ December 2023 is completely illogical and unjustifiable and we continue to challenge that decision.

The council would not and could not refuse to consider a planning application for a public house to be converted into a dwelling because it was awaiting the decision of the licensing committee to renew the drinks licence. Nor should it refuse to consider a petition for 6 improvements to the Rock Junction, which are entirely separate and distinct from any and all of the proposals in their TTRO in its own right. The petition was delivered to the Council in April 2024 long before their consultants were appointed and arguably should have received a response before the consultants were even appointed; indeed petitioners were originally promised a response by the 23/5/2024.

I repeat, as I will do in every communication with the council on this matter, for the avoidance of doubt, that the petitioners are implacably opposed to their petition being subsumed into the council consultancy exercise and note that their concerns are increasingly becoming a reality.

1 there is no timetable for completion in contradiction of the regulations on petitions.

2 there is increasing evidence (council budgets) that the resources being allocated to the consultancy exercise are inadequate to properly consider even the TTRO proposals and will leave no realistic chance of a fair and reasonable consideration of the petition.

I repeat my offer of a meeting with you and/or John Roseblade with Ward Councillors and my request for a meeting with your consultants and ask you on this occasion to do me the respect of saying yes or no rather than ignoring my request.

With regard to the other issues that have been documented by myself and Neal:

1 raising my 3 unanswered complaints outstanding a response from early 2024 from level 1 to level 2 which I understand has been rejected by the Scrutiny Board.

2 failure to follow documented procedures regarding a question raised by a member of the public at meeting of full council.

3 failure to appoint an independent reviewer to consider whether these matters and those above have been properly dealt with by the council.

Baring in mind these issues of governance may not be strictly in your TOR I am copying this to David Pattinson for information.

Regards Robin M Hacking

Chair Tettenhall Community Forum



Tettenhall Community Forum is a working group formed under the
Tettenhall District Community Trust (Steering Group).
The Forum is registered with WCC Local Planning under
Neighbourhood Plan, Local Act and SGI Statute.