

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE		
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS		
Date: 18.11.2025		
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	25/01926/OUT	Public objection
Strongly object to this application. This has been rejected twice and the concerns remain the same from the last times it was rejected.		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	25/01926/OUT	Public objection
<i>This is a summary – the full representation can be viewed on the file</i> The recommendation is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and appears to be based on a fundamentally flawed interpretation of policy and procedural requirements. Misapplication of NPPF 11(d) The report wrongly assumes that the lack of a five-year housing land supply guarantees approval. NPPF 11(d) requires a proper assessment of adverse impacts versus benefits, which has not been done. The tilted balance does not override other policy requirements. Noise Assessment Deficiencies MOD confirms the applicant's noise monitoring is inadequate—short duration, non-compliant, and unrepresentative. NPPF 185 requires full assessment before permission, not deferred to conditions. Current uncertainty on meeting internal noise standards justifies refusal. Drainage Strategy Failures United Utilities rejects the drainage strategy: no foul drainage plan, two unconfirmed outfalls, and full redesign needed. NPPF requires drainage capacity to be proven before approval, not later. Incomplete Highways Assessment No modelling of cumulative impacts, flooding underpass, or agricultural vehicle interaction. NPPF 111 requires refusal where impacts are severe, yet evidence is missing. Reliance on Withdrawn Local Plan Allocation The site's former draft allocation carries no weight. Using it risks predetermination, bias and irrational decision-making. Unsupported Sustainability Claims No bus service, unsafe pedestrian access, and car dependency conflict with NPPF 105, 110 and 112. The site is not sustainable. Infrastructure and Legal Omissions No capacity assessment for schools or healthcare, no S106 commitments, and no demonstrable mitigation, and only an assertion that CIL "could" be used, contrary to NPPF 92-97. No evidence of a Habitat Regulations Screening Assessment, which is required before lawfully granting planning permission. Outdated technical documents; unclear that Certificate B has been correctly served in relation to land required to provide visibility splays and off-site highway works. No Stage 1 Road Safety Audit has been provided,		

contrary to NPPF 110-111. Not demonstrated that the Council has discharged its Public Sector Equality Duty in relation to provision of safe, inclusive, step-free pedestrian access for disabled users or families with pushchairs. These are legal barriers to determination.

Overall Position

The recommendation relies on selective policy reading, defers fundamental issues, and lacks evidence. Adverse impacts clearly outweigh benefits. The proposal fails NPPF tests for sustainable development and should be refused or deferred until all required assessments are provided.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	25/01926/OUT	Principal Planning Officer

In response to the above public objection:

Paragraph 6.2.11 states in full what paragraph 11(d) of the NPPF says. The remaining parts of this section provide additional assessment and interpretation of this. Paragraph 6.2.12 clearly reinforces the primacy of the Development Plan.

Noise impacts have been assessed in the committee report in section 6.7. The application has been made in outline and the detailed positioning and design of the houses would be dealt with at reserved matters stage, as part of which a further noise assessment would need to be submitted.

United Utilities have not objected to the proposals. They have, though, requested that detailed drainage matters are submitted as part of a planning condition. This aligns with the comments of the Council's drainage team.

The draft Local Plan has now been withdrawn. Cabinet agreed on 12th February 2025 that the evidence base supporting the draft Local Plan is a material consideration in decision making on relevant planning applications, to support the implementation of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. This will include planning applications for new development on sites that were proposed to be allocated in the draft Local Plan. This resolution applies to the current proposal in that the site was included in the withdrawn draft Local Plan as one which is proposed to be allocated for residential development.

In the opinion of officers, the site occupies a sustainable location, as explained in section 6.2 and paragraph 7.1 of the committee report

Matters relating to infrastructure capacity are discussed in paragraph 6.15.1 of the committee report. The proposal would be liable for CIL payments.

In relation to HRA matters, the local authority do not need to carry out a HRA if there are no relevant protected ecological sites affected. No HRA is required for this proposal.

Consultees have not raised any concerns over the submitted assessment work.

The Highways Authority have been notified of the planning application through the consultation process, and have therefore been given the opportunity to comment on any implications for the public highway land.

In relation to the Public Sector Equality Duty it is acknowledged that the application is submitted in outline and that detailed design matters would take place at reserved matters stage. The report also addresses these matter in paragraphs 6.2.19 and 6.2.20.		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	25/01926/OUT	Highways Officer
In relation to the matters raised in the public objection above which related to highways, the Council's Highways Officer has provided the following additional comments: In points of note as direct responses to matters raised: • The A53 underpass floods frequently The point is noted but the area is extant highway and if the matter of flooding requires remedy then it can be addressed as part of the detailed design works in the area of the underpass. • It reduces to a single lane with no safe pedestrian separation The submissions clearly establish that all movements on Longford Turning are less than 1000 per day without and with development. The character of the existing rural lane will be retained by enhancing the 'quiet lane' aesthetic with an opportunity to formalise the character in the future. The site itself has high quality footways and cycle ways and ties these into the existing highway network. It should be noted that movements on the existing lane are a mix of walking, small vehicles, HGV including agricultural and equestrian movements. • No cumulative assessment has been made of the immediate road network A development of 100 dwellings generating no more than 50 movements in any peak hour with an 80/20 tidal coming and going does not generate sufficient movements to raise concerns in relation to the overall impacts of traffic. The Transport Assessment modelled 3 junctions: • SJ1 Longford Turning/Site priority control; • SJ2 Longford Turning/Shrewsbury Road roundabout; • SJ3 A53/Shrewsbury Road roundabout; and included sensitivity modelling for if the sports facilities were relocated. The junctions were modelled on a scoping out basis and a wider area was also considered. • No modelling of traffic turning left toward Longford Refer to point above, but the roundabout movements were considered and these junctions were also scoped out due to limited numbers of movements - SJ4 A53/A41 roundabout; SJ5 Shropshire Street/A529 mini-roundabout. • No assessment of agricultural vehicle interaction I would have to state that the rural nature of the lane is established and so is the presence of residential properties. In terms of interaction the whole length between the underpass and the proposed access was assessed for width, originally proposed with traffic calming but given the low movements, of less than 1000 per day that will be an outcome of granting permission nothing further is required. I am uncertain exactly what agricultural vehicle interaction is a concern here and notionally someone is as likely to encounter a refuse vehicle as much as a 'tractor'. The TA has undertaken assessment and based its findings on a reasonable assumption of 'Junction modelling is undertaken if the proposed development is predicted to		

generate an increase in traffic at a study junction of: (i) Test 1: 30 vehicles or more, and (ii) Test 2: 2.5% or greater of the total 2030 Base junction flow'. This is reasonable.

A development should only be refused on highways grounds if by Para 116 – '116. Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe, taking into account all reasonable future scenarios.'

Retaining an existing quiet road, as a future quiet road could not be construed to being unsafe.

Creation of a new access satisfying technical requirements with no other behavioural change is not on its own sufficient to warrant a safety audit of something that can be designed safely and will be subject to combined safety audit at a later date. A safety audit is not a planning tool to ensure safety.

The residual cumulative impacts on the network have been assessed in current and future scenarios and mitigation is proposed to enhance the user experience.

There is nothing about the significant traffic generated by this development i.e. impact of peak hour flows that would be severe i.e. cause the network to fail or function in an unacceptable manner.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
7	25/02658/FUL	Alison Lloyd – Case Officer
Should members be minded to approve the proposed development, Officers would advise that the following three conditions relating to Tree Protection, Tree Planting and Landscaping Plan are applied to the decision. <u>Tree Protection:</u> No existing tree shall be wilfully damaged or destroyed, uprooted, felled, lopped, topped or cut back in any way other than in accordance with the approved plans and particulars, without the prior written approval of the Local Planning Authority. Any approved tree surgery works shall be carried out in accordance with British Standard BS 3998: 2010 - Tree Work, or its current equivalent. No works associated with the development permitted will commence and no equipment, machinery or materials will be brought onto the site for the purposes of said development until a Tree Protection Plan and Arboricultural Method Statement prepared in accordance with and meeting the minimum tree protection requirements recommended in BS5837: 2012 or its current equivalent have been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All tree protection measures detailed in the approved Tree Protection Plan and Arboricultural Method Statement must be fully implemented as approved before any equipment, machinery or materials are brought onto the site for the purposes of the development. All approved tree protection measures must be maintained throughout the development until all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site. Nothing shall be stored or placed in any area fenced in accordance with this condition and the ground levels within those areas shall not be altered nor any excavation be made, without the prior written consent of the Local Planning Authority. All services will be routed outside the Root Protection Areas indication on the TPP or, where this is not possible, a detail method statement and task specific tree protection		

plan will be submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to any work commencing.

No works associated with the development permitted will commence and no equipment, machinery or materials will be brought onto the site for the purposes of said development until a responsible person has been appointed for day to day supervision of the site and to ensure that the tree protection measures are fully complied with. The Local Planning Authority will be informed of the identity of said person.

Reason: To safeguard existing trees and/or hedgerows on site and prevent damage during building works in the interests of the visual amenity of the area, the information is required before development commences to ensure the protection of trees is in place before ground clearance, demolition or construction.

Tree Planting:

In this condition 'retained tree' means an existing tree, large shrub or hedge which is to be retained in accordance with the approved plans and particulars; or any tree, shrub or hedge plant planted as a replacement for any 'retained tree'. Paragraph a) shall have effect until expiration of 5 years from the date of occupation of the building for its permitted use.

No development (or no above-ground works) shall take place until full details of proposed tree planting have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details shall include, but not be limited to:

- a) A detailed planting plan showing the location, species, stock size, and planting density of all proposed trees, including identification of trees to be planted within both hard and soft landscape areas.
- b) Full planting pit construction details for each type of planting location, including dimensions, soil specification, and details of root barriers, aeration and irrigation systems, anchoring methods, and surface finishes.
- c) Confirmation of soil volume provision for each proposed tree, demonstrating compliance with minimum soil volume standards appropriate to the selected species and anticipated mature canopy size, in accordance with the principles of BS 8545:2014 (Establishment of trees in hard landscapes) and the CIRIA "Tree Root Space Design" guidance.
- d) Details of all associated below- and above-ground infrastructure required to support successful tree establishment, including structural soil systems, root directors, load-bearing tree pits, or linked soil trenches as applicable to hard landscape areas.
- e) Specification of tree protection and establishment measures, including irrigation, mulching, staking/guying, and aftercare maintenance for a minimum of five years following planting.

The approved details shall be implemented in full prior to the occupation of the development (or in the first planting season following completion, whichever is sooner), and all trees shall thereafter be maintained and replaced as necessary in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason: To ensure the provision, establishment and maintenance of a reasonable standard of landscape in accordance with the approved designs

Landscaping Plan:

Prior to the occupation or use of any part of the development hereby approved, full details of all hard and soft landscaping shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include, but not be limited to:

Hard landscaping:

- Materials, colours and finishes for all paths, patios, driveways and other surfaced areas
- Boundary treatments (walls, fences, gates), including height, design and materials
- Location and design of any external lighting and street furniture

Soft landscaping:

- Planting plans showing species, sizes, numbers and planting densities
- Details of grassed areas, wildflower meadows or other ground cover
- Measures for biodiversity enhancement (e.g., native species, habitat features)

Implementation and maintenance:

- Programme for planting and completion
- Maintenance schedule for a minimum period of five years

The approved landscaping scheme shall be implemented in full prior to occupation or in accordance with an agreed phasing plan and thereafter maintained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory appearance of the development, to safeguard the character and visual amenities of the area, and to secure biodiversity enhancements, in accordance with Policies CS6, CS17, MD2 and MD12 of the Shropshire Local Development Framework and the National Planning Policy Framework.