



Date: Tuesday, 20 October 2026

Time: 2.00 pm

Venue: The 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: 20.10.2026		
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:
6	25/03560/FUL	Objectors (2)
The full representations, received after publication of the committee reports can be found in the planning file. The points raised in the objection to the development are summarised as follows: Previous appeal: The dismissed appeal APP/L3245/W/15/3067596 identified landscape and visual harm arising from development of this site. Consider those findings remain directly relevant. Principle of development: The site remains countryside outside the settlement boundary, the proposal conflicts with the adopted spatial strategy, particularly Policies CS5 and MD7a. 2026 NPPF and housing supply: The former tilted balance has been removed. Consider that the absence of a five-year housing land supply no longer renders relevant development plan policies out of date or engages the former paragraph 11(d) balance. Proposal has not been shown to satisfy the August 2026 NPPF requirements for development outside settlements. Housing need and benefits: No up-to-date Housing Need Assessment has been submitted. Do not consider that housing need or the provision of four affordable homes outweighs the identified policy conflict. Landscape and settlement relationship: Although the site adjoins existing development, it retains a rural character. The proposal would extend development into open countryside, causing loss of openness and adverse views from surrounding properties, roads and public footpaths. Would urbanise undeveloped land through housing, roads, parking, lighting and domestic activity. Effects on public footpath users, the elevated relationship with properties in Heron Close and the effectiveness of landscaping in creating an acceptable settlement edge. Transport and sustainability: Limited bus services, recent service reductions and the distance to railway stations mean that future residents would be reliant on private cars. Therefore, do not consider the site to be sustainably located. Infrastructure: The development would add to cumulative pressure on local infrastructure, including schools and GP provision. Question whether Ellesmere has the capacity to accommodate further growth of this scale. Heritage: The proposal would affect the setting of the Grade II listed The Grange, including the loss of a long-standing view towards Ellesmere Church. The listed grounds adjoin the application site, which should be reflected in the assessment of heritage impact.		

Ecology: Dispute the account concerning access to The Grange for great crested newt surveys. District Level Licensing Certificate does not address statutory tests. Insufficient information about owls and other ecology.

Flooding: Consider that flooding concerns associated with Diksmund Dyke have not been adequately addressed. Defects in the downstream drainage system, including a blocked outfall. Insufficient attenuation storage. Use of the site's lowest and wettest area for drainage pond. Need for condition to require repairs or verification of downstream capacity.

Foul drainage: Possibility of pumping station failure and Severn Trent's request for further drainage details not been addressed.

Concerns about traffic on Grange Road. Opposite an industrial site which now has smaller units increasing traffic. 30mph zone ignored. Transport Statement and Travel Plan inadequate.

Difficulty selling houses on existing sites.

Numbers of retired people moving into the town meaning a need for more doctors services. Inability of existing services to cope with additional residents.

Agricultural land: Uncertainty over agricultural land classification.

Overall planning balance: Consider that housing delivery does not outweigh the identified policy, landscape, sustainability, infrastructure and heritage concerns. We therefore request that planning permission be refused.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	25/03560/FUL	Case Officer
Following the late representation above, further comments were sought from the Conservation Officer with regards to the views between The Grange and the church. The Conservation Officer considers that her original comments remain applicable and agrees with the submitted Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA), which identifies filtered winter views from the site towards The Grange. Neither the HIA nor the objector provides evidence of an association between the church and The Grange, or that, given the distance between them, either contributes to the significance of the other. The submitted HIA identifies a designed view from The Grange towards the Mere and views of the church tower from the southern part of the proposed site. However, these views do not demonstrate that the development would harm The Grange through association. The site is unlikely to contribute to the significance of the church, as the HIA identifies no clear association between them. Given the distance and intervening landscape and built form, any association with the site, or contribution it may make to significance, would be negligible, as clearly explained in paragraph 6.2 of the HIA. The HIA does not assess views from The Grange towards the church. However, as it identifies the designed view towards the Mere, it is reasonable to expect that any designed view towards the church would also have been recorded and assessed. On the		

submitted evidence, any contribution the church and The Grange make to each other's significance is considered incidental.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	25/03560/FUL	Objector

The full representation, received after publication of the committee reports can be found in the planning file. The points raised in the objection to the development are summarised as follows:

Great Crested Newts and Habitats Regulations: Habitats Regulations tests have not been met and that Natural England's certificate addresses favourable conservation status only. Questions reliance on the "No-Survey" route and modelled assumptions. Raises inconsistencies between District Level Licensing, the proposed EPS licence condition and the recommended lighting condition.

Flood Risk and Drainage: CCTV surveys identified serious downstream defects, including an approximately 80% blocked outfall. Hydraulic modelling identifies flood risk, including approximately 750m³, while proposed storage is said to be 61m³ below requirements. Questions why the LLFA's earlier objection was withdrawn and notes that repairs and capacity checks are not secured before occupation.

Heron Close – Levels and Flooding: Raises concern over raised site levels and retaining structures of up to 1.8m adjoining Heron Close. States that boundary levels, retaining details and effects from regrading and exceedance flows have not been adequately assessed.

Highways and Sustainable Transport: Considers that highway and pedestrian safety, including Grange Road and nearby commercial traffic, has not been adequately assessed. Questions whether the Transport Statement relates to the current 40-dwelling scheme. Limited public transport evidence and likely car dependency conflict with policy S5(1)(j).

Other Matters Raised: No survey confirms whether the Grade 3 land is subgrade 3a or 3b. Reported owl sightings and the need for survey work are not addressed. Raises inconsistencies concerning the nearby watercourse and reliance on conditions for contaminated land.

Requested Outcome: Requests refusal on Habitats Regulations, drainage, highways, sustainability, residential impact and evidential grounds. Considers that the concerns cannot be resolved through conditions or a section 106 agreement.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	25/03560/FUL	Case Officer

The matters raised by the objector above have been considered in detail by the Council's Highways, Drainage and Ecology Officers. During the consideration of the application, further technical information and supporting evidence were prepared by suitably qualified professionals and submitted in response to the concerns raised. This additional information was reviewed by the relevant specialist officers, who are satisfied that the matters within their respective areas of expertise have been adequately addressed. As a result, the earlier technical objections were withdrawn and no outstanding objections remain from those consultees, subject to the recommended conditions.

Item No.	Application No.	Page 3	Originator:
----------	-----------------	--------	-------------

6	25/03560/FUL	Case Officer
---	--------------	--------------

An updated EPS 'Three Tests' is set out below and should be read in place of the version in Appendix A appended to the committee report.

EUROPEAN PROTECTED SPECIES: The 'three tests'

Application reference number, site name and description:

25/03560/FUL
 Proposed Residential Development Land East Of, Teal Drive, Ellesmere, Shropshire
 Erection of 40 No dwellings together with associated infrastructure and landscaping

Date:

5th October 2026

Officer:

Sophie Milburn
 Planning Ecologist
 sophie.milburn@shropshire.gov.uk
 Tel.: 01743 254765

Test 1:
 Is the development '**in the interests of public health and public safety**, or for other imperative reasons of **overriding public interest**, including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment'?

The development is not in the interests of public health or public safety but the development will provide 40 dwellings, including the provision of affordable dwellings which are social and economic benefits at a time when the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing land. The provision of extra housing would contribute towards meeting an identified public need. These are public benefits of sufficient importance to constitute imperative reasons of overriding public interest.

Test 2:
 Is there '**no satisfactory alternative**'?

The development is proposed on a defined site and its housing benefits, at a time when a five year supply cannot be demonstrated, cannot be delivered through a materially different layout or construction method that would avoid all potential effects on great crested newts while maintaining the nature and scale of the scheme.

Test 3:
 Is the proposed activity '**not detrimental to the maintenance of the populations of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status** in their natural range'?

‘There is a large pond approximately 180 m to the north-west of the site. ... Permission was not granted to undertake GCN surveys of off-site ponds which were all located on private land.’

EPS offences under Article 12 are likely to be committed by the development proposal, i.e. damage or destruction of an EPS breeding site or resting place and killing or injury of an EPS.

A Great Crested Newt District Level Licensing Impact Assessment & Conservation Payment Certificate (Enquiry no. DLL-ENQ-SHRP-00113) has been submitted which confirms that the project is eligible to enter the District Level Licensing scheme and that the developer intends to do so.

With the submission of the IACPC, and provided that works are carried out under the District Level Licensing scheme, SC Ecology are satisfied that the impacts of the development on GCN are capable of being fully addressed in a manner which complies with the requirements of the Habitats Regulations. As stated in the IACPC, ‘[I]n signing this Certificate Natural England has considered the matters it believes to be necessary to satisfy regulation 55 (9) (b) of the 2017 Regulations (“that the action authorized will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range”) and has concluded that the payment by the Applicant of the Conservation Payment will suffice to allow the impacts on great crested newts of the Applicant’s proposals on the Site to be adequately compensated, and therefore that these proposals will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of great crested newts at a favourable conservation status in their natural range.’

I am satisfied that the proposed development will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of great crested newts at favourable conservation status within their natural range, provided that the ‘District Level Licence condition for GCNs’ condition included in the response from Sophie Milburn to Mark Perry (dated 5th October 2026) is included on the decision notice and is appropriately enforced.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	25/03560/FUL	Planning Officer
If Members resolve to grant planning permission for the proposed development, it is recommended that this is subject to the following additional condition, in order to address the comments of Severn Trent Water: <i>No development hereby approved shall take place until a foul water drainage scheme has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. No dwelling shall be occupied until the approved scheme has been completed.</i> <i>Reason: To ensure satisfactory arrangements for foul water.</i>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	25/03560/FUL	Planning Officer
Officers advise that the recommendation to Members is changed to the following, in order to ensure that Natural England has been given the opportunity to comment on the Council’s Habitat Regulation Assessment: Recommendation: Grant planning permission subject to: - <i>no objections being received from Natural England in relation to the Appropriate Assessment within the consultation period</i>		

- the conditions set out in Appendix 1, subject to any amendments considered necessary by the Interim Head of Planning & Building Control
- the completion of a Section 106 legal agreement

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	25/02916/FUL	Public Comments (20)
20 representations in support of the application have been received after publication of the committee report. The full representations, received after publication of the committee reports can be found in the planning file. The points raised in support of the development are summarised as follows: The Lidl will provide a supermarket which meets the needs of those living in the immediate area where there is limited choice of foodstore and the area is dominated by Co-op. The Lidl will ensure those living in the immediate area do not need to travel by car or travel across Shrewsbury and further afield to reach a supermarket. The proposal will introduce much-needed competition giving residents greater choice and opportunity to benefit from competitive prices and more affordable groceries.		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	25/02916/FUL	Public Comment
The full representation, received after publication of the committee reports can be found in the planning file. The representation supports the new Lidl store however, raises concern that exiting Little Oxon Lane, turning right onto Welshpool Road will be problematic with the increase in traffic as a result of development and that a new min-roundabout should be included to manage the traffic.		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	25/02916/FUL	Objector (2)
2 letters of objection have been received following the publication of the committee report, these are summarised into the following material planning considerations: • A comprehensive traffic risk assessment has not been carried out for the Welshpool Road T Junction. This junction should be redesigned with consideration given to the introduction of traffic calming measures such as mini roundabout, traffic lights or reduced speed limit. • The traffic modelling assessment underestimates queuing levels of traffic with no heavy vehicle modelling. • Concern relating to noise disturbance and pollution issues with particular reference to delivery vehicles. • Footpaths along Welshpool Road are too narrow and dangerous with no action taken to remedy the situation. • The access to the residential development parcel is in a hazardous position on a blind bend. • Lidl illegally removed the native hedgerow during annual nesting season with replacement planting inadequate to mitigate the impact. • No evidence for consideration of local infrastructure improvements such as doctors, dentists, schools and recreational space. • Design is bland with no consideration towards local needs or requirements.		

- The Lidl will draw traffic from the wider network including the A5, Welshpool Rd, Churncote Island and Shelton Road.
- Highways safety concerns relating to increased traffic and inadequate access points off Little Oxon Lane and Welshpool Road.
- Design of the Lidl store is overbearing and not in keeping with the designated local centre of Bicton Heath.

All material planning considerations as highlighted within the letter(s) of objection as summarised above are addressed within the Committee Report.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	25/02916/FUL	Applicant

The applicant has raised a number of concerns with the committee report following its publication which are summarised as follows:

- The wording of the conditions is required to be more precise
- The assessment of heritage is insufficient and further detail in the assessment of the heritage impacts of the proposal is required in view of s.66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
- The conclusion that the site does not meet the thresholds to be screened under the Environmental Impact Assessment regulations is unclear.
- The report is missing S106 Heads of Terms
- Acknowledgement that Shropshire Council formally commenced preparation of a new local plan on 30th September 2026

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	25/02916/FUL	Case Officer

Following the late representation above where the applicant outlined a number of concerns with the committee report, the case officer has provided further comments as follows:

The recommendation includes any minor changes to conditions to be delegated to Officers.

The Conservation Officer has raised no objection to the proposal. There are no designated heritage assets within the application site itself and no particular heritage concerns have been identified in relation to the Lidl retail development. The principal heritage consideration relates to the relationship between the future residential development proposed within Plot 2 and the setting of the Grade II listed Rose Villa, which lies immediately adjacent to the southern site boundary.

The Conservation Officer has not raised any objection in principle to residential development within Plot 2 but has advised that appropriate separation distances, setbacks, scale, layout and landscape treatment will be important considerations at reserved matters stage to ensure that the setting of Rose Villa is appropriately respected.

Whilst no detailed Heritage Impact Assessment has been submitted at this stage, and matters of layout, scale, appearance and landscaping remain reserved for subsequent approval, officers have had regard to the statutory duty under Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 and have considered the potential impact of the proposal on nearby heritage assets based on the information

currently available. The Conservation Officer has identified the principal heritage considerations and has raised no objection in principle to the outline proposals.

The EIA Screening Opinion request submitted by the agent and uploaded to the planning register on 7th August 2025 sets out that the proposal would fall under category 10 'Infrastructure Projects' (b) Urban development projects. It concludes that the proposal is not considered to be EIA development as the overall development area does not exceed 5 hectares and the non-dwelling house development does not exceed 1 hectare. Nevertheless, the request sets out the agents view on the environmental impacts of the development, concluding that the development is unlikely to result in 'significant environmental effects' and does not constitute EIA development.

It is agreed that the nature of the proposal is described in column 1 under Schedule 2, paragraph 10(b) (Urban Development Projects) of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. The applicable thresholds and criteria for this category as set out in column 2 are:

- i. The development includes more than 1 hectare of urban development which is not dwellinghouse development; or
- ii. the development includes more than 150 dwellings; or
- iii. the overall area of the development exceeds 5 hectares.

In accordance with Paragraph 017 of the Environmental Impact Assessment Planning Practice Guidance (PPG), *"Projects which are described in the first column of Schedule 2 but which do not exceed the relevant thresholds or meet the criteria in the second column of the Schedule, are not Schedule 2 development"*.

The proposed development, whilst described in column 1 of Schedule 2, does not exceed any of these thresholds or meet the criteria set out in column 2 of Schedule 2 and therefore, the proposal is not Schedule 2 development and is not required to be screened in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017.

The Section 106 contributions are subject to further negotiation and it is requested that the recommendation is altered to allow the details of the S106 contributions to be dealt with under delegated powers. The S106 will include the following items:

- *A biodiversity net gain habitat management and monitoring plan monitoring fee for on-site provision;*
- *Affordable housing (20% provision on site with financial contribution for any remaining fraction) for the Use Class C3 residential element of the scheme;*
- *Travel plan monitoring fee for the Use Class E Foodstore and Use Class C2 Care Home; and*
- *Passenger transport contributions for the Use Class E Foodstore and Use Class C2 Care Home, including contributions towards;*
 - i. *Bus stop allocation;*
 - ii. *Bus shelter allocation; and*
 - iii. *Real time information.*

The precise details of the contributions and the associated costs are still to be formally agreed.

It is noted that Shropshire Council formally commenced the process of preparing the new Shropshire Local Plan on 30th September 2026. Due to the early stage of this process, the new local plan is not a material consideration in the determination of this planning application.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	25/02916/FUL	Agent/Applicant
The agent has submitted a response to the letter of objection received by The Midcounties Co-operative (“the Co-op”) on 3rd October 2025 on behalf of the applicant. This response was received following the publication of the committee report. The full response can be found in the planning file and is summarised as follows: • The scheme has been materially amended since Co-op submitted its objection with the separate retail unit and drive-thru coffee shop removed and replaced with a care home which reduces the overall scale of commercial development and addresses an important element of concern about the role and scale of the expanded local centre. • The proposed Lidl will broaden the convenience retail offer, complement the existing provision and provide the opportunity for linked shopping trips as part of an expanded local centre which is intended to serve both existing residents and the substantial additional residential development planned for Shrewsbury West. • Lidl stores serve a relatively compact catchment area and is intended to provide a local shopping facility and owing to its limited officer, people tend not to travel long distances. Therefore, the catchment area of a five-minute drive time is appropriate with regard to the nature of the settlement and surrounding area, location of existing food retail provision within the catchment and consumer travel patterns.		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7	25/03814/OUT	Member of the Public (Clive Matters)
A late representation has been received from Clive Matters following publication of the committee report, summarised into the following material planning considerations and requested actions: • Transport evidence: Concerns regarding alleged outstanding errors and inconsistencies within the Transport Statement Addendum and traffic survey/TRICS data. It is requested that Members are made aware that Clive Matters considers that unresolved errors remain within the evidence relied upon by the Highway Authority. • Surface water drainage: Concern that a continuous positive gravity fall has not yet been demonstrated over the full proposed outfall route, together with concerns regarding gradient, potential silting/blockage and reliance upon a condition to resolve the detailed design. It is requested that determination be deferred until a continuous positive fall has been demonstrated. • Drainage maintenance: Concerns regarding the long-term management, maintenance, funding and access arrangements for the attenuation pond and off-site outfall. It is requested that the Section 106 Agreement expressly covers the full outfall route as well as the on-site pond, including responsibility, funding and rights of access. • Water supply and foul sewerage: Concerns regarding existing water supply interruptions/low pressure and foul sewerage capacity, the absence of a response from Severn Trent Water, and whether development of the proposed scale can be accommodated having regard to infrastructure in accordance with NPPF Policy S5(1)(j)(i). It is requested that Severn Trent's assessment of water supply and sewerage capacity be obtained before determination and, if permission is granted,		

that occupation be prevented until capacity or necessary reinforcement has been confirmed.

- **Healthcare:** Concern that the £15,546 healthcare contribution requested by the Integrated Care Board is not proposed to be secured through the Section 106 Agreement and that reliance is instead placed upon CIL. It is requested that Members are advised whether the ICB was consulted on this change and that the contribution be reinstated within the Section 106 Agreement.
- **Biodiversity Net Gain:** Concerns regarding delivery of the statutory 10% BNG, including the identified habitat-unit deficit and availability of suitable off-site provision. It is requested that Members are advised whether the statutory biodiversity gain condition is capable of being discharged and where any necessary off-site units would be provided.
- **Affordable housing:** Concern that the indicative dwelling mix does not reflect the identified affordable housing need. It is requested that the Section 106 Agreement specifies affordable rented one- and two-bedroom bungalows.
- **Cumulative development:** Concern regarding the cumulative scale and infrastructure implications of this proposal and other current residential proposals within Clive. It is requested that Members consider their cumulative effect upon the role, character and infrastructure of the village.
- **Potential further development:** Concern that the proposed access arrangement could facilitate further development on land to the south. It is requested that Members take this potential into account.
- **Pedestrian access:** Concerns regarding pedestrian accessibility and whether adequate pedestrian provision at the site access is secured. It is requested that the access condition requires a continuous footway connection, including across the bellmouth.
- **Landscape and archaeology:** Concern regarding the acknowledged landscape and visual harm, including effects from the public right of way, and that intrusive archaeological evaluation has not been undertaken prior to determination. It is requested that full weight be given to the acknowledged landscape harm in the planning balance.
- **Overall planning balance:** Clive Matters considers that the identified adverse effects, together with conflict with the adopted settlement strategy, cumulatively outweigh the benefits. Refusal is requested or, alternatively, deferral until the drainage outfall and water/sewerage capacity are demonstrated with further evidence.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7	25/03814/OUT	Case Officer

Officer response to Clive Matters late representation:

- **Transport evidence:** The Local Highway Authority's final response demonstrates that it was aware of and took account of concerns raised through representations regarding the transport evidence, including the ATC data, applicable visibility standards, pedestrian provision, traffic generation and cumulative impacts, before reaching its final conclusion of no objection.
- **Surface water drainage:** The LLFA reviewed the Flood Risk Assessment Addendum, outline drainage drawings and further information submitted by the applicant and concluded that a surface water drainage strategy could be achieved in principle. The LLFA expressly identified the discrepancy between the invert levels at chambers S5 and S6 and that a continuous positive gravity fall had not

yet been demonstrated throughout the outfall route, but considered this capable of resolution through detailed design given the outline nature of the application. The recommended condition requires a continuous positive gravity fall throughout the drainage network and outfall route together with detailed designs, modelling and calculations prior to or in conjunction with Reserved Matters. The additional concerns regarding gradient, flow and potential silting are noted but do not alter the LLFA's technical conclusion. The applicant has confirmed through the drainage consultation process that the outfall can be delivered within land under its control, and the LLFA subsequently concluded that the drainage strategy could be achieved in principle.

- **Long-term drainage maintenance:** The Section 106 Agreement will secure the long-term management and maintenance of all privately managed sustainable drainage infrastructure forming part of the final approved surface water drainage scheme, including any associated off-site infrastructure and necessary rights of access where applicable. The precise drainage scheme and outfall arrangements remain subject to approval under the drainage condition.
- **Water supply and foul sewerage:** In response to the additional representation, the water supply and foul sewerage matters considered at paragraphs 6.3.14-6.3.21 are assessed further below specifically against Policy S5(1)(j)(i).
- **Foul sewerage:** The evidence base supporting the withdrawn Local Plan included the Water Cycle Study, prepared with input from Severn Trent Water, with its findings subsequently reflected in a Statement of Common Ground between the Council and Severn Trent Water. The Study identified the foul sewer network serving Clive as Green for the growth assessed. Clive Wastewater Treatment Works, which serves Clive, Grinshill and Yorton, was also assessed as Green for hydraulic capacity against a combined growth scenario of 43 additional dwellings. This represented the growth scenario tested rather than a capacity ceiling.

Importantly, Policy S5(1)(j)(i) requires consideration of both the existing and proposed availability of infrastructure. Under the statutory sewerage regime, a developer has a right to connect to the public foul network and Severn Trent Water, as sewerage undertaker, has responsibility for providing any necessary network reinforcement to accommodate new development.

Taking account of both the existing infrastructure evidence and the statutory arrangements for any necessary reinforcement, officers consider that development of up to 25 dwellings is of a scale which can be accommodated insofar as foul sewerage infrastructure is concerned.

- **Potable water supply:** The reported interruptions to supply, low pressure and tanker-supported supply are acknowledged. The Council's Water Cycle Study, prepared with input from Severn Trent Water, identified water-resource availability as Green for the growth assessed. Severn Trent Water subsequently entered into a Statement of Common Ground with the Council confirming its commitment to implementing the actions identified in the Water Cycle Study. This provides relevant positive evidence regarding the ability of water infrastructure to support planned growth, whilst recognising that it does not establish the current hydraulic capacity or pressure of the local distribution network for this application.

Importantly, Policy S5(1)(j)(i) requires consideration of both the existing and proposed availability of infrastructure. Severn Trent Water's developer process provides for hydraulic modelling to assess whether existing infrastructure can

accommodate a development or whether off-site reinforcement is required. Its published guidance confirms that a pre-development capacity enquiry is encouraged but is not a requirement; where it has not been undertaken, hydraulic modelling can be carried out when the full water-main application is made. The process then identifies any off-site or reinforcement works required to serve the development.

- The reported operational incidents do not establish that the water infrastructure required to serve up to 25 dwellings is incapable of being provided. Taking account of the existing evidence and the arrangements for identifying and providing any necessary reinforcement, officers consider that the proposal is of a scale capable of being accommodated for the purposes of Policy S5(1)(j)(i). Accordingly, officers do not consider that a Severn Trent Water capacity assessment prior to determination, or an additional planning condition requiring confirmation of capacity or completion of any necessary reinforcement, is necessary. These matters are appropriately addressed through Severn Trent Water's separate statutory water-infrastructure regime.
- **Healthcare contribution:** The ICB's requested contribution has been considered. The ICB has not been re-consulted on the use of CIL rather than a Section 106 contribution; however, the appropriate mechanism for securing infrastructure mitigation is a matter for the Local Planning Authority. The Council's latest Infrastructure Funding Statement identifies primary healthcare infrastructure as infrastructure capable of being funded through CIL, and this approach is consistent with that taken on other recent residential proposals within Shropshire. Healthcare infrastructure is therefore proposed to be addressed through CIL rather than through a separate site-specific Section 106 contribution.
- **Biodiversity Net Gain:** The habitat-unit deficit and absence of a final off-site solution are expressly acknowledged in the officer report. The Ecology Officer confirmed that the outstanding habitat-unit requirement can be addressed through the Reserved Matters process, provided the biodiversity gain hierarchy is followed and appropriate mechanisms are secured through the statutory Biodiversity Gain process, planning conditions and the Section 106 Agreement. The precise means of delivering any necessary off-site units is therefore not required to be fixed at this outline stage.
- **Affordable housing:** The identified need for affordable rented one- and two-bedroom bungalows is recorded in the officer report. The indicative layout is not submitted for approval and does not determine the affordable dwelling mix. The precise tenure, dwelling types and distribution will be secured through the Section 106 Agreement and agreed through the Reserved Matters process, having regard to the identified local housing need.
- **Cumulative development:** The potential cumulative implications of other current development proposals within Clive have been considered where relevant, including expressly by the Local Highway Authority in assessing cumulative transport impacts.
- **Potential further development to the south:** The indicative layout is not for approval at this stage. Should an access to the adjoining land be included within a future Reserved Matters scheme, this would not grant permission for development of that land; any future development proposal would require a separate planning application and assessment on its own merits.

- **Pedestrian access:** The Local Highway Authority specifically considered pedestrian provision at the proposed access, including the extent and appropriate termination of the footway to enable pedestrians to transition between the footway and Station Road. The recommended condition requires full engineering details of the site access junction and associated footway works to be approved before development commences and implemented before occupation of the first dwelling.
- **Landscape and archaeology:** The landscape and visual effects identified by Clive Matters are expressly acknowledged within the officer report and have been afforded weight against the proposal in the planning balance, including the moderate to major adverse effects identified from part of Public Right of Way 0206/12/1 during the early years. The absence of intrusive archaeological evaluation prior to determination is also expressly addressed. The Council's Archaeology Officer considered the information sufficient for determination of the outline application and raised no objection subject to a phased programme of archaeological investigation secured by condition.
- **Overall planning balance:** The additional representation has been considered in full, including the combined effect of the matters raised. Having regard to the further assessment above, the officer assessment of the overall planning balance and recommendation remains unchanged.

This page is intentionally left blank