

PLANNING COMMITTEE		
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS		
Date:		
NOTE: This schedule reports only additional letters received before 5pm on the day before committee. Any items received on the day of Committee will be reported verbally to the meeting		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	24/02108/OUT	Integrated Care Board (ICB)
<p>This is a significant development and will greatly impact the GP surgery in the town which is already over capacity in terms of available space and there are discussions ongoing for an extension to the current premises to accommodate this need for additional space. This development has not been factored into the current discussions and so will necessitate revisiting the current proposals with a view to increasing the size of the planned extension.</p> <p>Using our standard calculator against the proposed housing numbers (800x) and care home beds (80x) gives a figure for a healthcare contribution from this development of £ 717,256 for the housing element and an additional £ 59,771 for the care home element – so £777,027 in total.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	24/02108/OUT	Irwin Mitchell on behalf of ADAG
<p>Our Client, ADAG maintains its position with regards to points previously raised noting that due to the Withdrawal of the Draft Local Plan, the adopted planning policy referred to in previous letters remains a material consideration for the Application. The main purpose of this letter is to address Green Belt/grey belt updates and confirm that our Client's clear view is that the Site could not be considered grey belt land and the proposed development would fundamentally undermine the purposes of the Green Belt meaning it would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. The letter includes an assessment by ET Planning of whether or not the Site strongly contributes to the purposes of the Green Belt to support ADAG's view: Green Belt Review (Stage 1) (ET Planning, 4 December 2025) for Albrighton Development Action Group.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5.	24/02108/OUT	ADAG
<p>The Albrighton Development Action Group summarise their objections against the proposals. They agree with the case officer's Committee Report in recommending Refusal for Policy and Green Belt reasons, however comment that these grounds for Refusal do not tell the whole story. They feel it is vital to highlight the following objections raised by the Albrighton community, the ADAG's legal council, Irwin Mitchell LLP and their Chartered Planning Consultants ET Planning Ltd and Cerda Planning Limited:</p> <p>Overdevelopment – Boningale Homes proposal is unsustainable overdevelopment of the wrong scale, in the wrong location, resulting in significant additional Green Belt destruction, and is strongly opposed by the community.</p> <p>Wrong Scale – The proposals, when combined with the adjacent safeguarded site, would increase Albrighton's size by c. 62%, and raise the population by around 40%.</p>		

Wrong Place – The Site is on the wrong side of Albrighton to access the M54 corridor, Albrighton Train Station and the cycle access would fall short of ATE's standards for walking and cyclin infrastructure. The inappropriate location would create a split centre town, undermining community cohesion, and making it difficult for new residents to integrate.

Local Highways Safety Concerns – The proposals will permanently close three existing historic roads, introduce over 1,000 cars, and severely exacerbate traffic congestion on the already narrow lanes and roads (particularly through Albrighton to the M54). Large farm vehicles would be forced to drive through the housing estate to access surrounding farmland.

Not Grey Belt – Our legal council and planning consultants have undertaken an independent Green Belt review which confirms the site is not grey belt on three counts.

Heritage Harm – The proposals would diminish the historic character and context of the Grade II Listed Lea Hall and Barns and the Boningale Conservation Area which are significant for their physical fabric, historic setting and spatial relationship with the surrounding countryside.

Destruction of Award Winning High-Quality Farmland – The site currently supports high quality farmland used for wheat cultivation and has won awards for sustainable farming, nutrient levels, organic matter, thriving bird life etc.

Detrimental Impact on Idsall School – There is no identified need for a new secondary school in Albrighton or the surrounding area (Shifnal). With the falling birth rates, the proposals would create insufficient pupils to fill a new free school. Furthermore, the proposed school would be detrimental to the local catchment Idsall School, whose Headteacher has submitted an objection to the application.

Unviable Promised Amenities – Proposed amenities appear to be incentives aimed at securing public support, however there is insufficient local need and the amenities are unviable.

Impact on Existing Amenities and Infrastructure – The proposals are disproportionately large for Albrighton, and the town would not be able to support such rapid expansion on top of the existing house building plans. Existing amenities are already under pressure and cannot accommodate the additional demand.

Flooding and Drainage Concerns – The proposed site and surrounding areas are prone to flooding, with local roads increasingly subject to closure due to surface water and drainage issues. The Site cannot support soakaways and would require pumped drainage outfalls into the head of the existing drainage system.

Insufficient Drinking Water Supply Capacity – The drinking water supply for Albrighton comes from a ground water aquifer and is therefore limited before it will start to degrade water quality.

Impact on Neighbouring Homes – The impact on homes on Cross Road, Patshull Road and New House Lane, including The Sheiling and The Barns would be severe: loss of privacy, noise and disturbance, overbearing scale and destruction of long standing openness and rural character.

Ecology – Significant ecology matters remain unresolved by the Applicant.

<p>Track Record of Not Delivering – Boningale Homes promised the people of Albrighton that the Millfield development would include a new car park for station users, sports provision including two new football pitches and a Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play (NEAP). These have not been delivered.</p> <p>The ADAG have previously shared a survey undertaken of Millfields residents in May 2024 which showed that 18% felt the development did not meet expectations.</p> <p>This representation includes enclosures of all ADAG (previously AVAG) representations submitted on this application.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5.	24/02108/OUT	Public Representation
<p>The Shropshire Playing Fields Association objects to the Albrighton South development proposal, citing insufficient evidence of sustainability. The application lacks an open space needs assessment, clear plans for sports and play facilities, and details on funding, management, and delivery timelines. The Association recommends deferral until robust evidence, community access agreements, and specific commitments—such as a Developer 106 agreement and CIL contributions—are provided to ensure the proposed educational and recreational amenities are delivered.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5.	24/02108/OUT	Public Representations
<p>Two representations received highlighting additional serious ecological concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Habitats Regulations process is incomplete without a countersigned IACPC for Great Crested Newts; 2. Bat survey results have not been submitted or assessed; 3. Breeding bird surveys have not been undertaken; 4. No Ecological Impact Assessment has been produced for wintering birds; 5. Independent evidence of nocturnal bird activity has not been considered; and 6. Biodiversity mitigation remains unsecured pending completion of a Section 106 agreement. 		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5.	24/02108/OUT	Public Representation
<p>Many objections have been raised on this application and I do not feel it necessary to repeat the many valid and highly pertinent comments regarding the Local Development Plan and other issues. The developers have tried to indicate that there is a demand for a secondary school - this is not proven. More significantly it does not appear that there is any evidence of funding for a secondary school. Without a genuine funding commitment on the table this aspect of the application is pure fiction. This argument also applies to the GP surgery - local GPs have previously stated that there is a lack of funding for a new surgery. There are multiple reasons for the Planning Committee to refuse this application and I am pleased to read their report recommending refusal.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5.	24/02108/OUT	Public Representation
<p>Objects to the proposed development :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wrong location for the M54 and railway station. Congestion issues for existing 		

roads.

- Too far to walk to the station where there is no adequate parking.
- 40% increase is a large scale increase for Albrighton and unsustainable.
- Permanent loss of Green Belt and productive farming land.
- Widespread buyer complaints regarding houses built by Boningale Homes.
- Unfulfilled promises, previous commitments to deliver a new GP practice and two football pitches have not been met.
- Considered growth please. Residents are not opposed to growth of the 770 homes already approved but this proposal goes far beyond gradual, considered development.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5.	24/02108/OUT	Boningale Developments
Boningale Developments Committee Briefing document sent to all Committee Members on 12 th December 2025. On behalf of the Applicant, the Briefing presents what are considered to be the key benefits of the proposed development including new homes to contribute to the Council's Five Year Housing Land Supply, new infrastructure and local services, new jobs and investment in the local economy.		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5.	24/02108/OUT	SC Planning Policy

Shropshire Council Five Year Housing Land Supply Position Update

1. Context

- 1.1. On the 9th December, the Inspector that heard the appeal regarding a proposal for 70 dwellings on land to the east of Tilstock Road, Tilstock (Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/W/25/3362414) issued his decision, allowing the appeal.
- 1.2. In reaching his decision, the Inspector of the Tilstock appeal undertook consideration of Shropshire's Five Year Housing Land Supply at 31st March 2024.
- 1.3. To inform this consideration, the Council re-evaluated the deliverability of existing sites in the Five Year Housing Land Supply, identifying deductions considered necessary given latest information regarding deliverability since publication - recognising the dynamic nature of housing land supply. For the avoidance of doubt, case law has established that this exercise does not provide the opportunity to introduce additional sites.
- 1.4. This exercise resulted in the Council concluding a 4.46 year housing land supply existed in Shropshire at 31st March 2024.
- 1.5. In summary, whilst the Inspector of the Tilstock appeal did not disagree with the Council's updated position regarding the deliverability of the majority of sites, there were a number - primarily consisting of proposed allocations within the now withdrawn Local Plan, which he considered lacked sufficient certainty to be considered deliverable over the relevant five year period.
- 1.6. The Inspector of the Tilstock appeal also concluded that it was appropriate to update the Local Housing Need figure against which the housing land supply was measured at the point of his decision.

- 1.7. In combination, these conclusions result in a reduction of the housing land supply considered deliverable over the relevant five year period (by 1,235 dwellings compared to the Council's updated position) and an increase to the amount of housing land supply required (by 162 dwellings).
- 1.8. This culminated in the Inspector of the Tilstock appeal concluding that a **3.81 year housing land supply** existed in Shropshire at 31st March 2024.

2. Housing Land Supply Position Update – 31st March 2024

- 2.1. Having given consideration to the conclusions of the Inspector of the Tilstock appeal, it is considered that in applying a precautionary approach it is sensible to proceed on the basis that at 31st March 2024 a **3.81 year housing land supply** existed in Shropshire.
- 2.2. This reduction to the Council housing land supply, at 31st March 2024, should be considered within the planning balance when reaching decisions on a planning application.

3. Updating the Housing Land Supply – 31st March 2025

- 3.1. Whilst the Council considers a precautionary approach is appropriate to the housing land supply position at 31st March 2024, it retains concerns with the Inspector of the Tilstock appeals approach to the evidential threshold required to demonstrate deliverability.
- 3.2. Furthermore, the conclusions of the Inspector of the Tilstock appeal are a 'moment in time' whilst housing land supply is dynamic, with further information on site deliverability regularly arising.
- 3.3. Additional information of particular relevance, given the Inspector of the Tilstock appeals conclusions regarding proposed allocations within the now withdrawn Local Plan, is the Council's approach to the determination of planning applications on such sites.
- 3.4. For these reasons, in undertaking the next assessment of the Five Year Housing Land Supply (31st March 2025 base date), the Council will re-evaluate the deliverability of all sites. In undertaking this assessment, the Council will continue to apply Government's definition of deliverability as defined within Annex 2: Glossary of the NPPF, supported by NPPG (ID68).

4. Five Year Housing Land Supply - 31st March 2025

- 4.1. Shropshire Council is currently undertaking the next Five Year Housing Land Supply Assessment (31st March 2025 base date). It is intended that this assessment will be published in quarter 1 of 2026.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	24/02108/OUT	Principal Planning Officer

24/02108/OUT – Committee Report Revision

Paragraph 6.4.6 of the Committee Report attributes **considerable weight** in the planning balance to the proposal's benefits put forward by the Applicant including policy compliant

affordable housing and built environment gains (a care facility, Local Centre, Secondary School, BNG, highway improvements and Active Travel Routes). This weight was applied taking into account the Council's lack of five year housing land supply at 4.46 years and the contribution of the proposed development to the Government's aims of boosting the supply of housing as set out in the NPPF.

Following the Tilstock Appeal Decision and the conclusions of the Inspector that at 31st March 2024 there was a 3.81 year housing land supply existing in Shropshire, it is considered sensible to apply a precautionary approach when considering planning balance and factor in this lower figure.

Therefore **significant weight** is now given to the benefits in favour of the proposed development. However, as noted in paragraph 6.4.6, the increase in the weight afforded as a result of this change would not alter the overall planning balance.

In conclusion, there remains one benefit of the proposed development which has now been ascribed significant rather than considerable weight. This is not considered to outweigh the substantial weight assigned to the two harms resulting from the proposed development and which are reflected in the recommended reasons for Refusal. As stated in the Committee Report at paragraph 6.4.9, for the proposed development, the negative impacts arising from its unsuitable location conflict both with Development Plan policies and with the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole resulting in harms which significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, and do not meet the requirements of the tilted balance at Paragraph 11d) of the NPPF. Therefore, the overall planning balance still lies significantly with refusing the scheme, as the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply and the principle of the proposed development is unacceptable.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	24/02108/OUT	Principal Planning Officer
Just to bring attention to the Petition that was submitted on 19 th July 2024 containing 2128 signatures objecting to the proposed development as this was not included in the published Committee Report. The Petition is in addition to the 1157 public representations figure stated in the Committee Report.		