

**SOUTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS**

Date: 22/5/26

NOTE: This schedule reports only additional letters received before 3pm on Friday 22Nd May, 2026. Any items received on the day of Committee will be reported verbally to the meeting

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	25/04301/FUL	Ward Member – Cllr Roger Evans

Cllr Evans previously submitted a comment objecting to the proposal, in advance of the Committee Report being published; however, this was inadvertently omitted from the Report:

I have a number of issues with the submitted plans and all the associated documents. I ask that should it be considered granting this large planning application it is referred to the Southern Planning Committee for consideration.

Also to be noted are the 73 various objections plus the over 400 objections put in by others and which at present are not shown on the portal.

For reference as well as being the Shropshire Councillor for the area I am chairman of the Trinity School Governors, but these are my own personal comments.

First the added danger children will face when attending Trinity Primary School if the development take place.

As of today there are 157 pupils on the school role and so attend the school. It is a single form entry school and at most has therefor only room for a maximum of 7 more children. If a new parent did wish their child to attend Trinity School, then whether it was possible would depend on the age of the child as the maximum size of some classes are governed by statute are full.

At present there are also 40 children whose parents have filled in appropriate application forms stating they wish their child in the future to attend Trinity School. 27 parents have listed it as their first preference. The children of parents who are likely to live in the proposed new housing could not therefore be accommodated at this popular well-respected school.

The parking issue and the clogging up of both nearby streets and plus Butt Lane by parents from its wide catchment area when bringing and collecting their children to and from the school are well known. Police have at times attended plus traffic enforcement officers from SC. The provision of just 20 parking places for a school with around 160 children attending it is totally unacceptable, is derisory as is its position which is shown on the latest planning application, especially considering the ages of the children attending this school. Removal of the traffic calming island and associated layby will add even more to the increased road danger children will face when entering and leaving the school premises. Traffic speed is also, at times, likely to increase along this section of road. The parking of buses, both the school bus and public transport bus, when it runs, will also pose more difficulties and potential danger.

Shropshire Council are introducing traffic free streets outside schools yet here if this application is granted. the number of extra vehicles using the reduced number of parking places in the area immediately outside the school will be increased.
Butt Land and the A458.

Again it is well known and documented the dangers posed to vehicles using Butt Lane by vehicles and wanting access onto the A458. Even worse dangers are experienced by those wanting to leave the main highway and enter Butt Lane. Videos and photographs have already been submitted as evidence of this. Serious road accidents are feared. As we again approach spring and summer this danger will increase as the number of tourists using this road to visit Wales increases. Also adding to this danger are those HGV's which are waiting to turn at the cross roads onto the narrow local roads.

Accessing local amenities

The only limited local amenities which are accessible for those living in Ford lie across the very busy main road (A485) from the main village. The recently updated National Planning Framework, recently updated, makes many mentions of sustainability and the need to ensure this is considered together with local amenities when deciding whether to grant planning application. Access to amenities by residents, including work is very limited. The bus service is largely paid for by the Welsh Government with only a limited contribution from Shropshire Council. Hence the frequency and when it both runs and the times when it passes through Ford is very limited. The operator has recently changed as has its frequency, when it runs is not controlled by SC. I note the public material enclosed with the application showing previous developments and the donations made by the developers. Previously that has been welcomed and has in some case been generous but here, not even a bus shelter is offered where likely passengers could shelter whilst waiting for the very limited bus.

As the housing will all be affordable there will be no contribution from the developers towards any improvement in local amenities. This includes play area facilities for the substantial number of differently aged children that would be living in the new houses. The play area referred to in the application was built and is of size to serve just the 48 houses in Quail Ridge.

Again the NPPF refers about recognising the social effect of any new housing project on an area and this must be taken into consideration when granting or not granting permission. The building of 102 densely built houses in this small village on this small area of land will affect the area. It is overdevelopment and much larger than was listed as being suitable for this area in the now withdrawn local plan. The designation of Ford as a hub was and is still disputed. And an appeal was in progress when the Planning Inspectors decided the original revised local plan was not fit for purpose. Some think and argue the methodology used in assessing whether Ford should have been designated as a hub is and was wrong. The local plan was of course withdrawn before a decision by the Inspectors on this was made. Again the social effect on the area in building this large number of densely packed houses is made many times in a number of submissions already made and listed on the portal.

Ford is a small rural village with, as already noted, a very limited small number of facilities. Shropshire needs a large number of affordable housing, but Ford and its rurality is not suitable for construction of the houses as shown in the application. The long time taken in find tenants wishing to live in houses on the nearby Cross-Gates site is an example.

Finally I note the references contained in the applicants submission about Ford and its history. Little recognition of this is made though in the actual application, nor the Conservation order which covers much of the village. Some residents have mentioned this and also the heritage value of the field that it is proposed to build the houses on. This land also often has water lying on it and some houses on gardens of houses in Quail

Ridge are often flooded with some houses coming very close to flood water entering their houses. I also note the recent condemnation by Suds regarding the applicants submission concerning the size of the attenuation pond.

The proposed development is the wrong kind of development and in the wrong location. It is contrary to several significant Shropshire Council policies outlined in both the current SAMDEV document and the now withdrawn local plan. These I will refer to if needed at a meeting of the planning committee.

I again ask that should it be considered to grant this large planning application it is referred to the southern planning committee for consideration.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	25/04301/FUL	Ford Parish Council

A further objection has been received by the Parish Council and made for the attention of the Committee Members. The letter is made in response to the Committee Report and can be summarised as follows:

- **Strong community opposition:** A total of 466 residents objected, with over 90 providing detailed concerns, particularly about risks to children at Trinity Primary School.
- **Road safety issues:** Butt Lane is narrow with heavy traffic and inadequate pavements, causing daily safety risks exacerbated by the proposed development's access opposite the school.
- **Unsafe school vicinity:** The school entrance is near a busy crossroads on the A458, where congestion, poor visibility, and hazardous vehicle manoeuvres are common, and professional assessments underestimate these dangers.
- **Lack of coordinated highway responsibility:** Neither the Council's Highway Officer nor National Highways fully accept responsibility for ensuring safety at the proposed entrance, and minor mitigation is deemed insufficient.
- **Disproportionate development scale:** The planned development would increase Ford's population and housing stock by over 30%, far exceeding the average 5% increase seen in comparable rural schemes, resulting in 50% affordable housing compared to the national 17%.
- **Questionable local housing need:** No recent local housing needs survey exists; a 2020 survey showed low demand, and justifications based on adjoining parishes or Shrewsbury's needs are challenged as inappropriate.
- **Environmental and heritage concerns:** The site contains rare species-rich lowland meadow classified as UK Priority Habitat and a well-preserved medieval ridge and furrow earthwork, with habitat value underestimated in official assessments.
- **Criticism of officer report and lack of community benefits:** The report's reliance on withdrawn draft plans and optimistic traffic assessments is disputed,

and contributions offered do not provide real benefits to Ford, with no Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) expected.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	25/04301/FUL	Shropshire Wildlife Trust

The Shropshire Wildlife Trust object to the proposal for the following summarised reasons:

- Other objectors have suggested discrepancies in the ecology survey findings, with the site having potential for containing unimproved neutral grassland. It is therefore requested that SC Ecology give further consideration and ensure all biodiversity considerations are fully taken into account.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	25/04301/FUL	Campaign to Protect Rural England (CPRE)

The CPRE object to the proposal for the following summarised reasons:

- **Biodiversity concerns:** The site supports more diverse plant species than reported, requiring a full Ecological Impact Assessment (EIA). The loss of species-rich grasslands, which are rapidly disappearing in Shropshire, would be significant without proper evaluation.
- **Climate change impact:** The absence of an EIA prevents assessment of climate change effects. Preserving habitats like hedgerows and hay meadows is vital for carbon storage and meeting Net Zero targets by 2050.
- **Ecological network value:** Nearly half the site lies within a Network Enhancement Zone designated by Natural England, which would lose its potential ecological benefits if the development proceeds.
- **Heritage and community impact:** The development's proximity to Ford Village Conservation Area and a nearby school raises concerns about heritage setting and air quality due to increased traffic.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	25/04301/FUL	Members of the public

An objection has been received from a member of the public, with their comments summarised as follows:

- Application site is an ancient meadow, with irreplaceable habitat and identified in the Local Nature Recovery Strategy.
- Other site more suitable locally and to better meet the local needs of future residents, whereby new development should be focussed to brownfield land.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
----------	-----------------	-------------

6	25/04301/FUL	Middle Marches Community Land Trust (MMCLT)
<p>The MMCLT have objected to the proposal for the following summarised reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The need for a full Ecological Impact Assessment, misclassification of the meadow's ecological value, reassessment of the Biodiversity Net Gain baseline, and the site's status as an irreplaceable habitat under the National Planning Policy Framework. • Concerns raised about the site's historical agricultural features, the importance of protecting species-rich grassland as outlined in the Shropshire Plan and Local Nature Recovery Strategy, and the ecosystem services provided by such habitats. 		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	25/04301/FUL	Member of the public
<p>A member of the public (Adam Shantry) has submitted an objection letter supported by a series of photographs in relation to the highway congestion, conditions and arrangement of site access with the trunk road (A458) and access to the primary school.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7	25/02645/VAR	Members of the public
<p>Three further public representations have been received since the drafting of the committee report which are summarised below. Full copies can be found on the planning register.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concern about the nature of the proposed additional conditions and the manner in which the application is being handled. • Highlighted the need for changes to other conditions imposed on 10/03881/MAW that would be necessary if the changes to conditions 3, 9 and 10a were to be accepted. • Concern regarding the lack of enforcement by the Planning Authority of the conditions that have been imposed on planning consents from 2010 onwards. • Highlighted that emissions have proved to be a problem at times in the past. • Noted a past flooding event linked to maize production associated with the operation. • Ongoing acrid odours reported, restricting outdoor activity. • Concerns that emissions could worsen respiratory health conditions. • Strong objection to any increase in odour or feedstock due to further harm to residential amenity. <p>The recommendation set out in the committee report remains as stated but officers offer the following clarifications on the matters raised.</p> <p><u>Scope of application</u></p> <p>A Section 73 application allows for the variation or removal of conditions attached to an existing, unexpired planning permission. The grant of such an application results in a new, standalone planning permission with altered terms. Case law has established that there is no statutory limit on how substantially the conditions can change the scheme,</p>		

provided the fundamental description of the development remains untouched. The planning authority may grant the application and vary or remove the conditions, grant permission subject to different conditions or reject the application entirely. In response to the comments made within the representations, officers are confident that a section 73 application is an acceptable means through which the requested changes can be made and it is well within the scope of the application to have a full review of the conditions previously imposed, as has been suggested within the recommendation.

The description of development has been altered from first submission to provide greater clarity for interested parties and has received the necessary consultation including the display of a new site notice.

Planning enforcement

The representations indicate that complaints have been raised in relation to the existing operation with the Local Planning Authority, the Environment Agency and the Council's Environmental Health Department. These complaints have been received following the submission of the current application. The Local Planning Authority acknowledges these concerns and will be investigating any matters falling within its statutory remit accordingly.

Roles of regulatory bodies

For clarity, the regulation of development that is also subject to an Environmental Permit is undertaken through distinct but interrelated regimes. The Local Planning Authority is responsible for determining whether the proposed development represents an acceptable use of land, having regard to planning policy and material considerations, including impacts on residential amenity such as noise, odour and traffic. Planning controls are concerned with land use and the suitability of the location and design of development, rather than the detailed regulation of operational processes.

The Environment Agency operates a separate regulatory regime under the Environmental Permitting Regulations. Its role is to control pollution and protect human health and the environment by issuing environmental permits for relevant activities, such as waste processing or emissions to air, land or water. These permits impose detailed operational conditions, including emission limits, monitoring requirements and best available techniques, and the EA is responsible for enforcing compliance with these requirements.

The Council's Environmental Health function has a distinct role in safeguarding public health and amenity, primarily through the Environmental Protection Act 1990. Environmental Health Officers investigate complaints and can take action where impacts such as odour, noise or fumes amount to a statutory nuisance, serving abatement notices where necessary. This regime focuses on the actual effects of a development once operational, rather than the principle of development.

Accordingly, whilst there is some overlap in the matters considered, particularly in relation to amenity and emissions, the regimes are intended to be complementary. The planning system addresses whether development is acceptable in principle, the permitting regime regulates how it operates to control pollution, and Environmental Health addresses nuisance impacts arising from its operation.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:

