

**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> March 2026  
in Christ Church.**

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

**In  
attendance:** J Hodgkiss (Clerk), approx. 10 MOPs

**P57.25/26 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES AND REASONS FOR ABSENCE**  
None

**P58.25/26 DISCLOSURE OF PECUNIARY INTEREST**  
None

**P59.25/26 PUBLIC SPEAKING AT COUNCIL MEETINGS**  
None

**P60.25/26 MINUTES**  
**RESOLVED:** RR proposed to approve and sign off the minutes of the  
Planning Committee meeting held on Monday 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2026, seconded  
by AP and agreed by all members present.

**P61.25/26 PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

- 1. 26/00321/OUT** Outline Application for residential development to include  
access (all other matters reserved) Land South Of Jarvis Drive Bayston  
Hill Shropshire

**1. Introduction**

Bayston Hill Parish Council object to this proposed development for the following reasons.

**2. Conflict with the Adopted Development Plan**

**2.1 Core Strategy (2011)**

**CS1 – Strategic Approach**

- Bayston Hill is a “Community Hub”, expected to accommodate only proportionate growth. Bayston Hill has already provided 179 Homes, 198% above the target of 50-60 set in the current local plan
- This proposal represents unplanned, edge-of-settlement expansion, contrary to CS1.

---

Planning Committee Minutes

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

### **CS3 – Shrewsbury**

- Approving further peripheral development in Bayston Hill undermines this spatial strategy. This proposal also takes the village boundary nearer to Hook-a-gate. The layout indicates further development in future which would exacerbate this problem.

### **CS4 – Community Hubs and Clusters**

- Development must be sustainable, appropriate in scale, and within the settlement boundary.
- The site lies outside the settlement boundary and is not allocated, therefore conflicting with CS4.

### **CS5 – Countryside and Green Belt**

- Residential development is only supported in specific circumstances (e.g., conversions, rural worker dwellings).
- This proposal does not meet any of the CS5 exceptions.

### **CS6 – Sustainable Design and Development Principles**

The proposal fails to demonstrate:

- Safe access. Jarvis Drive is an unadopted road and is narrow in places. Construction work would make conditions unbearable for residents.
- Adequate infrastructure. Roads leading to Jarvis Drive are in poor condition, footpaths are poor or non-existent.
- Protection of environmental assets. Wildlife such as barn owls, newts and muntjak have been seen and heard by residents in the vicinity.
- Compatibility with local character

### **CS17 – Environmental Networks**

- Requires protection of landscape, biodiversity, and ecological networks.
- The site contains hedgerows, trees, and habitat features at risk from development. There are mature, established and protected trees in this area, not least of which the oak tree at the entrance to this site. Can access be achieved without impact to this TPO'd tree?
- There was considerable flooding issues just to the south of this site in October 2024, the neighbouring Parrs Pool regularly reaches capacity with the increasing wet weather. With additional building, more existing properties will be under threat.

## **3. Conflict with SAMDev Plan (2015)**

### **MD1 – Scale and Distribution of Development**

- Reinforces the settlement hierarchy and the need for plan-led growth.
- The site is not allocated and lies outside the development boundary.

---

Planning Committee Minutes

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

### **MD3 – Delivery of Housing Development**

- Windfall sites must be sustainable, appropriate, and consistent with settlement character.
- This proposal fails all three tests.

### **MD7a – Managing Housing Development in the Countryside**

- The proposal does not fall within any of the permitted categories (e.g., rural worker dwellings, conversions).

### **MD12 – Natural Environment**

- Requires protection of ecological networks, priority habitats, and species.
- The application does not demonstrate that biodiversity net gain is deliverable or secured.

### **MD13 – Historic Environment**

- While not directly affecting heritage assets, the policy requires landscape settings to be respected.
- The proposal erodes the rural setting of Bayston Hill.

## **4. Highways and Access – Policy Conflicts**

### **Core Strategy CS6**

Requires safe access and sustainable transport. The proposal fails to demonstrate:

- Safe pedestrian routes. The application claims that there is a bus stop within 300m, it is actually more than twice that at 640m, meaning residents living here with by heavily car journey reliant.
- Residents would also have a walking distance of 653m to the school, 923m to the doctors and 1038 m to shops well in excess of the 10 minutes walking time recommended.
- Adequate visibility splays. Does the applicant have the legal requirements to access this site at the point shown?
- Cumulative traffic impact assessment. Pulley Lane has been the scene of 3 bad accidents in the last 15 months and countless near misses. Speeding is an issue here and it is the main route used by school pupils heading to Meole Brace, putting extra cars on this route would increase the dangers.

### **SAMDev MD2 – Sustainable Transport**

Requires development to minimise car dependency and ensure safe movement for all users. The Transport Statement does not address cumulative impacts from:

- 112 dwellings at Lyth Hill
- Up to 210 dwellings at New Pulley Lane if this was to proceed

## **NPPF Paragraphs 110–112**

The proposal does not demonstrate:

- Safe and suitable access
- Priority for pedestrians and cyclists
- Mitigation of cumulative impacts

## **6. Landscape and Visual Impact – Policy Conflicts**

### **Core Strategy CS17**

Requires protection of landscape character. The proposal extends built form into open countryside.

### **Emerging Plan DP12**

Requires avoidance of urbanising effects on rural edges. This proposal directly conflicts with that requirement.

## **7. Ecology, Trees and Biodiversity Net Gain – Policy Conflicts**

### **Core Strategy CS17**

Requires protection of ecological networks.

### **SAMDev MD12**

Requires avoidance of harm to priority habitats and species.

### **Emerging Plan DP13**

Requires measurable, secured biodiversity net gain. The outline application does not secure this.

## **8. Infrastructure Capacity – Policy Conflicts**

### **Core Strategy CS8 – Facilities, Services and Infrastructure Provision**

Requires development to be supported by adequate infrastructure. Bayston Hill's schools, GP services, and community facilities are already under severe pressure.

### **SAMDev MD8 – Infrastructure Provision**

Requires clear evidence of capacity and mitigation. The application does not provide this.

## **9. NPPF Non-Compliance**

The proposal conflicts with:

---

Planning Committee Minutes

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

- **Paragraph 15** – plan-led development
- **Paragraph 105–110** – sustainable transport and safe access
- **Paragraph 174** – protection of valued landscapes
- **Paragraph 180** – biodiversity protection
- **Paragraph 11(d)** – adverse impacts significantly and demonstrably outweigh benefits

## 10. Conclusion

The proposal is **in clear conflict** with:

- The **Core Strategy** (CS1, CS3, CS4, CS5, CS6, CS8, CS17)
- The **SAMDev Plan** (MD1, MD2, MD3, MD7a, MD8, MD12, MD13)
- Multiple provisions of the **NPPF**

It represents an unsustainable, unplanned, and harmful extension of Bayston Hill into open countryside.

The pre-application (page 6) the Shropshire Council officer recommends further pre-application work which gives more specific details regarding the amount of development and overall layout of the proposal. Therefore we would question why this application was validated in this state.

There was no consultation with the Parish Council.

For these reasons, Shropshire Council is respectfully requested to **REFUSE planning application 26/00321/OUT**.

While we do not support the proposal, we believe Shropshire Council, in the event that it is granted, should secure the following enhancements to ensure the development achieves the highest standards of sustainability, design quality, and community benefit should it go ahead.

Recommended Improvements and Conditions

### Highways and Pedestrian Improvements

- Traffic calming measures on Jarvis Drive
- A Construction Traffic Management Plan
- A full Travel Plan at reserved matters stage

### Landscape and Boundary Treatments

- A robust landscape buffer along the eastern edge
- Retention and enhancement of existing hedgerows and mature trees
- A detailed Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment at reserved matters
- Removal of any opportunities to expand this site in the future.

---

Planning Committee Minutes

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

## **Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)**

- A minimum 10% BNG requirement
- A long-term habitat management plan
- On-site habitat creation to be a priority

## **Sustainable Drainage**

- Detailed SuDS design at reserved matters
- Confirmation of downstream drainage capacity
- Long-term SuDS maintenance arrangements

## **Design Quality**

- A design code to ensure high-quality architecture and materials
- Integration of energy-efficient measures such as, air source heating, EV charging and solar readiness
- A layout prioritising walkability, natural surveillance, and green space

## **Infrastructure**

- Appropriate contributions toward education, healthcare, and community facilities
- On-site open space provision, including play areas and informal recreation space

2. **26/00218/FUL** Conversion and extension of existing detached garage to create facility for dog-grooming business to include change of use. 75 Hollies Drive Bayston Hill Shrewsbury Shropshire SY3 0NP **NO OBJECTION**

3. **26/00476/FUL** Side and rear two storey extension 3 Newbrook Drive Bayston Hill Shrewsbury Shropshire SY3 0QG **NO OBJECTION**

4. **26/00535/TPO** Fell 1no. Black Pine protected by the Shrewsbury & Atcham Borough Council (Lyth Hill Road) Tree Preservation Order 1977 (SA/78) 95 Lyth Hill Road Bayston Hill Shrewsbury Shropshire SY3 0AT **NO OBJECTION**

5. **26/00600/FUL** Demolition of garage and erection of two storey side and single storey rear extensions and associated landscape works 10 Poolside Bayston Hill Shrewsbury Shropshire SY3 0JW **NO OBJECTION**

6. *To consider any planning applications validated since the publication of the agenda*

7. 26/00712/FUL Erection of a single storey side extension to dwelling  
(following removal of existing garden room/conservatory)| 2 Sunfield  
Gardens Bayston Hill Shrewsbury Shropshire SY3 0LA **NO OBJECTION**

**P62.25/26**      **PLANNING DECISIONS**  
NOTED

**P63.25/26**      **PLANNING APPEALS**  
NONE