



Date: Tuesday, 21 July 2026

Time: 2.00 pm

Venue: Council Chamber, The Guildhall, Frankwell Quay, Shrewsbury, SY3 8HQ

Contact: Emily Marshall, Committee Officer
Tel: 01743 257717
Email: emily.marshall@shropshire.gov.uk

NORTHERN PLANNING COMMITTEE

SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS

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

This page is intentionally left blank

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE		
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS		
Date: 21.07.2026		
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:
7	26/00772/FUL	SC Archaeology
There are no known heritage assets recorded within the site, but there are nearby heritage assets relating to post medieval industry and the River Morda, known primarily from historic mapping and records. The nearest is the site of the former Upper Weston Mill to the southeast of the site (HER PRN 15524), the mill race of which is recorded to run along the eastern boundary of the proposed development site. Two other mills are recorded to the west and northwest of the site (Morda Mill, HER PRN 15522; Brookside Mill, HER PRN 15523), and to the southeast (Weston/Weston Lower Mill, HER PRN 00516). In addition, fieldwork to the southwest of the site revealed archaeological remains in the form of an undated boundary (HER PRN 34200) and undated pits (HER PRN 34201) and work to the south revealed a well likely of the 19th century (HER PRN 30841), suggesting that as-yet unknown archaeological remains have the potential to survive in the area. Given the above, the site is considered to have some archaeological potential. Recommend the following condition: (a) No development approved by this permission shall commence until a written scheme of investigation for a programme of archaeological work has been submitted to and approved by the local Planning Authority in writing. (b) The approved programme of archaeological work set out in the written scheme of investigation shall be implemented in full and a report detailing the results of the archaeological work provided to the local planning authority prior to first use or occupancy of the development. Reason: The site is known to hold archaeological interest.		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
8	Application to Register the Glebelands Bayston Hill as a Village Green	Landowners Agent
I would comment as follows: 3.8 – Should read Alex Jackson not Alex Bruce 3.11 onwards – I fundamentally disagree that an oral hearing is required. Given that the key points that require consideration are legal points relating to the existence of the lease, and the statutory function of the Parish Council, I would urge you to recommend that these are considered as a preliminary matter by way of written representations to minimise further delays and costs in dealing with this. 3.14 – The principal of fairness applies to the Diocese just as much as the Applicant, and the substantial delays to date have considerably prejudiced the Diocese and the pursuit		

of its objectives as a charity. In the interests of fairness, the most expeditious way forward must be promoted, and further unnecessary delays avoided.

10.1 – It is entirely incorrect to suggest that the grant of Village Green Status would “secure the existing use of the site into the future”. The site is currently fenced off with no public access allowed, and this has been the case for some time. As drafted, the wording is at best misleading and unhelpful.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	25/02775/OUT	Mr Cartwright
I would like to make you aware of a factual error in the committee report for the outline application for 175 dwellings in Wem. At section 6.2.9 you state that Active Travel England has raised no objection to the proposal. This is incorrect. They recommended that their standing advice should be followed as part of the assessment of the application. They did not provide a recommendation of no objection. My concern over this error is due to footway provision. I highlight that ATE have not explicitly provided a recommendation on the details set out below, as their consultee response was provided before the submission of the Transport Assessment Addendum. Their standing advice is clear at section 1.6 and section 2.4 that relevant policy and guidance should be followed, including Inclusive Mobility. Inclusive Mobility provides clear guidance on footway widths at section 4.2: Footways and footpaths should be made as wide as is practicable, but under normal circumstances, a width of 2000mm is the minimum that should be provided, as this allows enough space for two wheelchair users to pass, even if they are using larger electric mobility scooters. If this is not feasible due to physical constraints, then a minimum width of 1500mm could be regarded as the minimum acceptable under most circumstances, as this should enable a wheelchair user and a walker to pass each other. Where there is an obstacle, such as lamp columns, sign posts or electric vehicle charging points, the absolute minimum width should be 1000mm, but the maximum length of such a restricted space should be 6 metres. This is highlighted in guidance from ATE on Critical safety issues for walking, wheeling and cycling, The relevant item is Issue 11. (Footway widths) It is clear from the photos and plans submitted by the applicant and local objectors that there are sections of footway along Aston Road that fail to achieve minimum footway requirements. Measurement extracted from applicants plan (Aston Road, Wem Design Package General Arrangement Sheet 1 of 1 211205-05 Rev A). There are pinchpoints that are narrower than 1m (below the absolute minimum), and sections below 1.5m for longer than 6m. ATE highlight that: ‘A critical safety issue is defined as a street layout or condition that is associated with an increased risk of collisions for people walking, wheeling or cycling.’		

In relation to Issue 11, This critical issue covers the risk of pedestrians moving into the carriageway and coming into conflict with motor vehicles due to:

- narrow footways
- physical obstructions within the pedestrian space – such as poorly positioned street furniture
- the need to navigate around other pedestrians

It is therefore considered that the proposals DO NOT meet requirements set out in Inclusive Mobility. The proposals therefore do not comply with ATE standing advice.

These footway widths are required to ensure the creation and maintenance of an accessible and inclusive built environment and public realm. The Inclusive Mobility document at section 1.5.2 notes 'It should be considered an essential document for those seeking to produce an inclusive environment and meeting the requirements of the Act, including the public sector Equality Duty, and other legislation.'

I would request that Active Travel England are consulted on this specific item prior to determination of the application at committee.

I would also request that this information is shared with your highway officers.

I note the comment in your report at section 6.2.10 that “ There is no substantive evidence that the proposal would result in unacceptable highway safety impacts...”

On the contrary – the evidence outlined above demonstrates that there is a critical safety issue for walking and wheeling.

I consider that NPPF Paragraph 116 is met and 'development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety'

Furthermore, should this application be approved, then I believe that the requirements of the The Equality Act 2010 would have not been met.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	25/02775/OUT	Helen Morgan MP

I am writing on behalf of a constituent, about the above planning application.

My constituent understands that the application may be approved this week despite more than 60 objections being submitted through the planning portal. They also note that a previous proposal for development on this site was refused and is concerned that residents' objections have not been given sufficient consideration.

Their concerns centre on the impact the development would have on already stretched local infrastructure, including roads, drainage, schools and GP services. They also highlight existing traffic problems at the Aston Road level crossing, where congestion is already significant, and believes additional vehicle movements would worsen highway safety.

My constituent is further concerned that the development would increase traffic through Barkers Green and Cordwell Park, creating dangerous rat runs on roads used by

Helen Morgan MP would be grateful if these concerns could be carefully considered before any decision is made. The constituent believes a full site visit would provide a more accurate understanding of the existing conditions and the likely impact of the proposal.

[illegible]

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

This page is intentionally left blank