

**Clerk to the Council/RFO: J Hodgkiss**  
**Chairman: Cllr R Ruscoe**

---

**Minutes of a Planning Committee Meeting held at 7:15pm on Monday 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2026 in Bayston Hill Memorial Hall.**

**Present:** E Markham (EM), T Osenton (TO), A Price (AP), R Ruscoe (RR),  
M Underwood (MU) – Chair

**In attendance:** J Hodgkiss (Clerk), approx. 40 MOPs

**P50.25/26 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES AND REASONS FOR ABSENCE**  
Apologies were received from Cllr Clode – personal commitment.

**P51.25/26 DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST**  
None

**P52.25/26 PUBLIC SPEAKING AT COUNCIL MEETINGS**  
3 MOPs spoke in objection to application 25/04875/OUT

**P53.25/26 MINUTES**  
RESOLVED: AP proposed to approve and sign off the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on Monday 5<sup>th</sup> January 2026, seconded by RR and agreed by all members present.

**P54.25/26 PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

**25/04875/OUT** Outline planning application with all matters reserved (except for principal means of access), for development of up to 210 residential dwellings (Use Class C3) with associated open space, landscaping and other associated works including infrastructure, earthworks and drainage.  
Proposed Residential Development To The North Of New Pulley Lane  
Bayston Hill Shrewsbury Shropshire

## **1. Procedural Issues**

The description of development confirms that the applicant is only seeking approval for the primary means of access. “Access” in the context of outline applications for planning permission is clearly defined in article 2(1) of the TCP (Development Management Procedure) Order 2015: ““access” means the accessibility to and within the site, for vehicles, cycles and pedestrians in terms of the positioning and treatment of access and circulation routes and how these fit into the surrounding network...”

The application should be invalidated until the description is amended and full and meaningful details of the proposed accessibility to **and within** the site, for vehicles, cycles and pedestrians in terms of the positioning and treatment of access and

---

Planning Committee Minutes

Signed \_\_\_\_\_ (Chair) \_\_\_\_\_ (Date)

circulation routes and how these fit into the surrounding network, has been submitted to the local planning authority. Only once this information has been received to the satisfaction of the local planning authority should the statutory public consultation period begin.

A Masterplan and Access and Movement Parameter Plan have been submitted, but the Masterplan is illustrative only and both plans state that in interpreting them only written dimensions should be used (there are none), and they should not be scaled. The Access and Movement Parameter Plan also only shows the approximate alignment of the accesses shown rather than the actual positioning. Therefore, it is impossible to determine with any certainty that, *inter alia*, the accesses and parking spaces will be compatible with highways standards and the needs of different users, houses will be adequately separated and private gardens adequately sized. Paragraph 136 of the NPPF states that planning decisions should ensure that new streets are tree-lined, but without having an accurately scaled drawing it cannot be assured that this will be deliverable. In any case, as stated above, the description of development seeks approval for only the primary means of access from the highway which is *ultra vires*.

If the outline planning application is granted the principle for the quantum of development applied for on the site will have been accepted and it cannot be revisited at reserved matters stage. However, insufficient detail has been provided with the application to demonstrate with certainty that this quantum of development can be achieved in a way that complies with adopted highway design standards, the Shropshire Core Strategy (2011) and Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan (2015), the Council's adopted SPDs and guidance, or the NPPF.

The Planning Statement outlines that details relating to types, tenures and layout of market and affordable housing is to be reserved for future consideration and it will secure 'up to' 20% of the dwellings as affordable housing. It does not specify what the mix of those houses will be, and the promise of 'up to' 20% affordable housing is insufficient. The Council's 2009 assessment of viability indicated an initial target for the negotiation of affordable housing provision of 20% on open market sites, and this is a minimum and not a maximum unless there is a proven viability issue. This approach is not acceptable because if the outline application is granted the broad parameters of the application for up to 210 dwellings and up to 20% affordable housing will have been accepted. At the reserved matters stage the local planning authority cannot re-test the proposal against all planning policy requirements afresh, and if it does not impose a condition or otherwise secure an appropriate housing mix at the outline stage it will be assumed that any reasonable mix of dwellings within that 210 limit is acceptable in principle. Housing mix at reserved matters stage could only be controlled by the local planning authority insofar as it affects design or layout, not to secure a housing mix that satisfies the varied needs of the Borough's residents.

No Design Code has been submitted with the application even though the local planning authority is being asked to approve a Parameter Plan with little detail. This must be requested to establish clear, illustrated parameters for appearance, massing, materials, and street hierarchy etc, to ensure future phases of the development (if granted) deliver a coherent and high-quality scheme that accords

---

Planning Committee Minutes

Signed \_\_\_\_\_ (Chair) \_\_\_\_\_ (Date)

with national and local design expectations.

Who will be responsible for maintaining the 10.38ha of 'public open space' in perpetuity? It is doubtful the Council will have the funds to adopt it, and a management plan imposed on the residents of the new housing estate would be unsustainable and unlikely to work in the long term if public access is permitted. They are likely to challenge an arrangement where they are expected to fund a public asset in perpetuity.

## **2. Previous Refusals and Dismissed Appeal – No Material Change**

This site has been refused planning permission on two previous occasions, applications SA/08/1535/O and 14/05655/OUT, the latter being dismissed at appeal. A further application for development nearby at Lower Pulley Cottages 15/01118/OUT was refused on similar grounds to the above two applications and was also dismissed at appeal. Both the Council and the Inspectorate have therefore already judged this site as being unsuitable for housing, and to approve this development would undermine consistency in decision-making and disregard established precedent.

In the case of application 14/05655/OUT, Shropshire Council and the Planning Inspector concluded that development on only a small parcel of this application site would be unsustainable, harmful to the open countryside and landscape character, and would erode the important gap between Bayston Hill and Shrewsbury. The reasons application 14/05655/OUT was refused continue to apply to this application, but the harmful impact will be even more severe because it proposes a much larger development on a much larger site. The site's location, physical constraints and relationship to surrounding settlements remain unchanged since the appeal was determined.

The development materially conflicts with SAMDev policies S16.2(ii) and MD12, and Core Strategy policies CS5 and CS6.

## **3. Not an allocated site**

This parcel of land was not an allocated site in the recently withdrawn Shropshire Development plan and is not an allocated site in the existing Shropshire Development Plan

The area of the proposed development site lies outside the existing settlement of Bayston Hill and does not relate well to the established pattern of development in the village.

Bayston Hill Has already exceeded the SAMDev housing guideline of 50-60 houses by circa 147 a 145% uplift on the upper limit of 60 Houses

Shropshire's policy MD3 "if a settlement is struggling to achieve its housing guideline within the plan period then a positive approach will be taken to development on sites that may lie outside the settlement development boundaries but are otherwise in accordance with the relevant settlement policy."

---

Planning Committee Minutes

Signed \_\_\_\_\_ (Chair) \_\_\_\_\_ (Date)

Clearly as shown in the previous statement Bayston Hill is not struggling to achieve its housing guideline.

The development materially conflicts with SAMDev policies MD1, MD3, MD7a, and Core Strategy policies CS1, CS3, CS4 and CS5.

#### **4. Unsustainable Location/ Poor Provision for Active Travel and Public Transport**

Paragraph 110 of the NPPF stipulates that significant development should be focused on locations which are or can be made sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes.

Paragraph 117 of the NPPF says, *inter alia*, that applications for development should:

- a) give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas; and second – so far as possible – to facilitating access to high quality public transport, with layouts that maximise the catchment area for bus or other public transport services, and appropriate facilities that encourage public transport use;
- b) address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport; and
- c) create places that are safe, secure and attractive – which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, avoid unnecessary street clutter, and respond to local character and design standards.

Pulley Lane itself is not served by a direct bus route, and residents would need to walk a considerable distance to reach bus services and access to GP and shops on surrounding roads.

Vehicles leaving the site turning left have no option but to turn left on to the busy dual carriage way and use the already overloaded island for Meole Brace Shopping Centre and subsequently Dobbies island to go South.

Walking and cycling routes from the site are indirect, fragmented, and constrained by major roads and junctions, making them unattractive and perceived as unsafe. As a result, the development would be car-dependent from the outset, with limited realistic opportunity to travel by sustainable means.

The development materially conflicts with Core Strategy Policy CS6.

#### **5. Harm to Landscape Character and the Gap between Settlements**

The development will significantly impinge on the recognised gap between Shrewsbury and Bayston Hill. Development would urbanise the open valley, permanently erode the settlement gap, and cause lasting harm to local landscape character. The retention of the gap of undeveloped land between Bayston Hill and

---

Planning Committee Minutes

Signed \_\_\_\_\_ (Chair) \_\_\_\_\_ (Date)

Meole Brace remains an important objective of the strategy for the village. These impacts were central to the above-mentioned planning applications being dismissed on appeal.

SAMDev Policy S16.2(ii) refers to Bayston Hill and in addition to setting out the guideline for new housing development within the settlement says “the retention of the gap of undeveloped land between Bayston Hill and Meole Brace, Shrewsbury remains an important objective of the strategy for the village.”

The site has a dark, rural characteristic. Introducing street and domestic lighting will cause sky glow and light spill, harming the visual amenity, tranquility, and nocturnal wildlife. Additional lighting and human activity will disturb the fragile flora and fauna environment of this important green corridor.

Paragraph 187 of the NPPF requires that planning decisions recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

The development materially conflicts with SAMDev policies S16.2(ii) and MD12, and Core Strategy policies CS5 and CS6.

## **6. Loss of Open Space**

Paragraph 103 of the NPPF confirms that access to a network of high-quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and physical activity is important for the health and well-being of communities, and can deliver wider benefits for nature and support efforts to address climate change. Paragraph 104 asserts that existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields and formal play spaces, should not be built on unless:

- a) an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or
- b) the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location; or
- c) the development is for alternative sports and recreational provision, the benefits of which clearly outweigh the loss of the current or former use. The open space that will be provided in the development is the land that is most prone to flooding.

The Rea Brook valley clearly functions as a river corridor, a continuous green network and a landscape and recreational asset. The development contravenes Core Strategy Policy CS17 ‘Environmental Networks’ that states: “Development will identify, protect, enhance, expand and connect Shropshire’s environmental assets, to create a multifunctional network of natural and historic resources. This will be achieved by ensuring that all development: “Protects and enhances the diversity, high quality and local character of Shropshire’s natural, built and historic environment, and does not adversely affect the visual, ecological, geological, heritage or recreational values and functions of these

assets, their immediate surroundings or their connecting corridors”; and “Does not have a significant adverse impact on Shropshire’s environmental assets”.

This development conflicts with all the above and will lead to a loss of open space. The open space is not surplus to requirements and the loss resulting from the development will not be replaced by equivalent or better open space provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location. The public already have unfettered open access to the land, the walk along the river already exists and the open space that will be left after the development is prone to flooding. The development will harm the visual and recreational function of the river corridor, an environmental asset and its immediate surroundings. The ‘Open Space’ to be provided by the development already exists and it will not be new.

The development materially conflicts with Core Strategy policy CS17.

## 7. Agricultural Land

The majority of the proposed development site contains Grade 2 agricultural land, making it best and most versatile (BMV) in accordance with the Agricultural Land Classification.

Paragraph 187 of the NPPF requires that planning decisions recognise the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and Core strategy policy CS6 requires that **all development makes the most effective use of land and safeguards natural resources including high quality agricultural land.**

This land should continue to be used to provide food and not for housing which is not needed by the settlement of Bayston Hill.

The development materially conflicts with Core Strategy policy CS6.

## 8. Flood Risk and Site Constraints

The site lies within an area known to experience surface water and significant localised flooding. Pictures below.





This is not just due to surface water but is also because of a rising water table which any SUDS scheme would not be able to cater for.

Given the lack of progress with reducing carbon emissions it is likely that there will be significant and more frequent flood situations. It should be also noted that when these occur the majority of the 'open' space proposed within this development would be underwater.

This development would make flooding worse. We are very concerned that safety would be a major concern for any new residents as a flooded Rea Brook could easily be attractive to local children putting them at risk. In the floods of 2024 the brook reached half a mile at its widest, how are developers going to develop recreational areas that can be guaranteed to be a safe environment for leisure?

Defra and the Environment Agency in Partnership with others including Shropshire Council are extremely worried about worsening flooding along the Rea Valley. In recent years flooding along the Rea Brook south of Meole village has got worse.

Although mitigation measures are proposed, they do not change the fact that this is a flood-sensitive location. Engineering solutions cannot remove the inherent risk or prevent flood impacts being displaced elsewhere.

The development materially conflicts with Core Strategy policies CS6 and CS18.

## **9. Impact on the Rea Brook Nature Corridor – Flooding, Water Quality and Ecology**

The proposed development site drains towards the Rea Brook, part of the wider River Severn catchment.

Development would increase the speed and volume of runoff entering the brook particularly at times of extreme weather conditions, raising concerns about downstream flooding, water quality and pollution, and harm to aquatic and riverside habitats.

Shropshire has a Local Nature Recovery Strategy (LNRS) and The Rea Brook functions as an important ecological corridor. While acknowledging that being part of the LNRS provides no legal protection we would hope that Shropshire Planning would

recognize that this development risks disturbance, loss of vegetation and environmental degradation particularly during periods of heavy rainfall.

The Rea Brook, although recovering, is still polluted from Agriculture and old mine workings upstream. It is a sensitive ecological corridor and needs to be given the highest protection possible.

SmartRivers a citizen science monitoring group run by Wildfish in its report of 2022 tells us that Rea Brook and Rea Bridge gets dredged periodically by the Internal Drainage Board and its banks are about 10ft high. The river is very sluggish at this site and has been reported to back up during flood flows. Land use around the site is agricultural, a combination of arable and sheep. In autumn the invertebrate community exhibited notable stress from excess fine sediment, organic enrichment and flow in comparison to other English sites. Without natural flow rivers are less able to move sediments or dilute polluting inputs.

The development materially conflicts with Core Strategy policy CS17.

## **10. Traffic Impact**

The additional traffic from this development will add significantly to the already severe congestion that occurs at the junction with Hereford Road at peak times, The Meole Brace roundabout, the Retail Park roundabout, the A5/A49 'Dobbies' roundabout, and all along the A49 Hereford Road and the surrounding roads, including the A5, Roman Road, Hazeldine way, and Oteley Road

Traffic on these already congested roads will get worse when new building on already allocated development land between Hanwood and Mytton Oak road and to the north of Mytton Oak road is completed. Some 2000 houses are proposed for these areas, coupled the new Retail development at Meole roundabout and the 112 houses granted permission in Bayston Hill recently, will significantly increase pressure on the already very congested road network.

If this application goes ahead both access routes to the north into Bayston Hill will be paralysed for years of construction, bringing chaos to an already overloaded local network.

Bayston Hill is constrained by having only two vehicular access points onto trunk roads, and the site itself would rely on a single vehicular access point. The lack of network resilience further increases the risk of congestion, queuing and highway safety issues if this development is approved.

In accordance with paragraph 116 of the NPPF, the development should be refused on highways grounds as there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety and the cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.

The development materially conflicts with Core Strategy policy CS6.

## **11. Single Point of Access and Emergency Resilience**

---

Planning Committee Minutes

Signed \_\_\_\_\_ (Chair) \_\_\_\_\_ (Date)

Reliance on a single access for a development of this scale raises concerns about emergency vehicle access, incident management and peak-time congestion.

This represents a fundamental constraint of the site that cannot easily be mitigated.

The development materially conflicts with Core Strategy policy CS6.

## **12. Pressure on Local Infrastructure – Schools and Healthcare**

If this development was permitted alongside the already recently permitted development on Lyth Hill, this would give rise to an increase in population for Bayston Hill of circ 15%.

Local infrastructure is already under significant pressure, particularly primary schools and GP surgeries serving Bayston Hill and the surrounding area.

Schools are operating at or close to capacity, and GP practices are experiencing increasing demand, with difficulties in registering new patients and securing timely appointments. Both Oak Meadow Primary School and Meole Brace Primary School are oversubscribed.

The application does not demonstrate how additional demand arising from the development would be met in a timely or deliverable way. Without transparent secured provision, the proposal risks placing further strain on already stretched services to the detriment of both existing and future residents.

Paragraph 100 of the NPPF requires local planning authorities to:

- a) give great weight to the need to create, expand or alter early years, schools and post-16 facilities through the preparation of plans and decisions on applications; and
- b) work with early years, school and post-16 promoters, delivery partners and statutory bodies to identify and resolve key planning issues before applications are submitted.

Paragraph 101 states that local planning authorities should also work proactively and positively with promoters, delivery partners and statutory bodies to plan for, *inter alia*, required health facilities and resolve key planning issues before applications are submitted. Significant weight should be placed on the importance of new, expanded or upgraded public service infrastructure when considering proposals for development.

The development materially conflicts with Core Strategy policy CS6.

## 13. Archaeological Sensitivity – Roman Road to Wroxeter

The site lies close to the trajectory of the Roman road leading to Wroxeter (Viroconium Cornoviorum). Because of the Roman road there is some evidence to suggest that the development site would have been attractive for Roman settlement.

The Bestune Way development adjacent to this site had to be reduced following the discovery of a significant Roman-period wooden structure, demonstrating proven archaeological sensitivity in this area.

There is a real risk of irreversible harm to undiscovered archaeology as a result of extensive ground disturbance.

Paragraph 207 of the NPPF stipulates that where a site on which development is proposed includes, or has the potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, local planning authorities should require developers to (where necessary) submit a field evaluation. An evaluation has not been carried out or submitted for the development site.

## 14. Coal Mining Risk

There are potential untreated mine entries that pose a risk to surface stability and public safety.

## 15. Overall Planning Harm

Taken together and including, *inter alia*, the dismissed appeals, unsustainable location, inadequate affordable housing, lack of public transport, harm to landscape character and settlement separation, loss of open space, flood risk, impacts on the Rea Brook, access constraints, unacceptable impact on highways safety and severe impacts on the road network, pressure on schools and healthcare services, and archaeological risk, the adverse impacts of granting the development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Council's adopted development plan and the NPPF taken as a whole. The application should be refused.

**RESOLVED:** AP proposed to object to the application, seconded by RR and agreed by all members present.

**26/00042/ FUL Erection of a garden shed and erection of summer house.  
The Corn House Little Lyth Shrewsbury Shropshire SY3 0AX NO  
OBJECTION**

## **P55.25/26      PLANNING DECISIONS**

**P56.25/26      PLANNING APPEALS**