

# AGENDA ITEM



Committee and date

## Development Management Report

**Responsible Officer:** Tim Collard, Service Director (Legal and Governance)

### Summary of Application:

<b>Application Number:</b> 25/03645/OUT	<b>Parish:</b>	Clunbury
<b>Proposal:</b> Erection of affordable dwelling and detached garage, formation of replacement vehicular access, and installation of package (sewage) treatment plant (outline application to include means of access but with matters of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale reserved)		
<b>Site Address:</b> Land north of Little Brampton, Clunbury, Shropshire		
<b>Applicant:</b> Mr William Evans		
<b>Case Officer:</b> Trystan Williams	<b>email:</b> <a href="mailto:trystan.williams@shropshire.gov.uk">trystan.williams@shropshire.gov.uk</a>	

**Grid Ref:** 336760 - 281616



## **Recommendation:** Refuse

### **Recommended reasons for refusal:**

1. The site is in an isolated location in open countryside, and visually and spatially divorced from any established built form such that it cannot be regarded as being within or adjoining the recognisable named settlement of Little Brampton. Consequently, and notwithstanding the fact that the applicant has been found to fulfil the local connections and housing need criteria for an affordable home, the proposed development is fundamentally contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CS5 and CS11 of the Shropshire Local Development Framework Adopted Core Strategy, Policies MD3 and MD7a of the Shropshire Council Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan, and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document on the Type and Affordability of Housing.
2. Given its isolation and prominence in the wider countryside, any new dwelling here would detract from the essentially open agricultural character and scenic beauty of this part of the Shropshire Hills National Landscape. Moreover, this environmental harm could not be satisfactorily mitigated and would not be offset by the scheme's relatively minor wider public benefits. The application is therefore contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies CS5, CS6, CS11 and CS17 of the Shropshire Local Development Framework Adopted Core Strategy, Policies MD2 and MD12 of the Shropshire Council Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan, and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document on the Type and Affordability of Housing.

## **REPORT**

### **1.0 THE PROPOSAL**

- 1.1 This application seeks outline planning permission to erect an 'affordable' dwelling for occupation by a named individual in local housing need, together with a detached domestic garage. It is made in outline form, with exact details of the development's appearance, layout, landscaping and scale being reserved for consideration under a separate application in the future, so in those respects the submitted plans are only indicative. However, approval of the means of access is sought upfront and would involve slightly repositioning and upgrading an existing field gate off an adjacent Class B highway, in accordance with amended details now provided. Also submitted upfront are details of a non-mains package treatment plant and soakaway system for foul drainage.
- 1.2 A previous similar application (25/01642/OUT) was withdrawn following officer and third-party concerns about the site's location and highway safety.

### **2.0 SITE LOCATION/DESCRIPTION**

- 2.1 Little Brampton is a hamlet centred around a crossroads junction on the B4368 midway between Craven Arms and Clun in the Shropshire Hills National Landscape (SHNL). The proposed dwelling and garage would occupy a rectangular plot in the

southeast corner of a field west of the B4385 heading north towards Bishop's Castle, some 240 metres from the crossroads, and beyond a paddock associated with the closest neighbouring dwelling (which is a converted former agricultural building named 'Little Brampton Barn'). The red-edged site area also includes two north-westerly protrusions to accommodate a fairly long and winding driveway and the foul drainage system. Along the roadside and southern boundaries are native hedges with some mature trees, whilst the other boundaries are currently open to the remainder of the field. There is also open agricultural land opposite and further north and west.

## 3.0 REASON FOR COMMITTEE DETERMINATION OF APPLICATION

3.1 In accordance with the 'Scheme of Delegation' in the Council's Constitution, the application is referred to the Southern Planning Committee for determination following a request from the Local Member (Cllr Sam Walmsley), based on material planning reasons and made within 21 days of his being notified of the application. Cllr Walmsley's comments are as follows:

*House building in the Clun area is severely limited by environmental concerns about water quality in the River Clun. Although protection of the river is essential, the impact is to increase the price of available houses, which particularly impacts younger people who have grown up in the area and wish to remain living here. With this in mind, as a general principle I am keen to see more affordable houses being built in the area, particularly when they are being built for local people. This application for an affordable dwelling gives a valuable opportunity for the Planning Committee to consider the appropriate balance between provision of housing, protection of the Clun and compliance with relevant planning rules.*

*A previous application attracted a number of comments detailing concerns about the proposed house before being withdrawn. The new application has attempted to deal with these where possible, notably by reducing the house to a single storey to reduce visual impact. Recognising that this is an outline application, there are items which do require finalisation prior to full permission being given. Notably, the external appearance of the house should be in keeping with the area. It is also essential that arrangements for dealing with wastewater are shown to protect both the River Clun and a nearby borehole that supplies drinking water to an adjacent house.*

## 4.0 COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIONS

### 4.1 Consultee comments

#### 4.1.1 Shropshire Council Trees – comment:

Two mature turkey oak trees stand in the roadside hedgerow, and their crowns overhang the eastern corner of the site to a far greater extent than is suggested on the indicative site plan. Their root protection areas will also extend some distance into the site, so the development's design and layout must take account of and respond appropriately to the constraints imposed by these highly prominent and

visually important trees. This can, however, be addressed as part of a future reserved matters submission, and at this outline stage there is no objection on arboricultural grounds to the principle of residential development here.

4.1.2 The revised vehicular access will require removal of a short length of the roadside hedgerow, but this could be compensated for with new planting as part of a landscaping scheme to be agreed.

4.1.3 Accordingly, any permission granted should include conditions to secure an arboricultural impact assessment, method statement and tree protection plan before development commences, plus detailed landscaping specifications as part of the reserved matters application.

4.1.4 Shropshire Council Affordable Housing – comment:  
Under the ‘single plot exception site’ scheme for affordable dwellings as set out in the Council’s ‘Type and Affordability of Housing’ Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), the following four aspects must be satisfied:

- 1) The applicant’s household must be in housing need whereby the household unit has no independent home of its own.
- 2) Applicants must have strong local connections.
- 3) The housing need should be met in the local area (e.g. applicants must show a need to live in the area for employment, to provide or receive support for/from extended family members, and/or because of active community involvement).
- 4) Applicants must have a suitable site which accords with the SPD’s locational requirements.

4.1.5 In terms of Point 4 above, the usual process advocated in the SPD is for applicants to seek favourable pre-application advice from Planning Officers. In this case the proposed site does not have the benefit of such support. However, the eligibility requirements under Points 1-3 are met.

4.1.6 Shropshire Council Flood and Water Management – comment:  
The proposal is for minor development where flood risk is low. Accordingly, ‘informatives’ encouraging use of sustainable surface water drainage systems (SuDS) which avoid impacting on the public highway, together with a foul drainage system which accords with the relevant Building Regulations, will suffice.

4.1.7 Shropshire Council Highways Development Control:  
28/10/25 – objection:  
The approach to visibility assessment in the submitted highway consultant’s report combines elements from various different industry standards and guidelines. In particular, following updates to the *Design Manual for Roads and Bridges*, wet weather speed reduction should no longer be applied. Without any specific justification, this departure risks accepting lower visibility standards without confidence that they would be sufficiently safe compared to tried and tested calculations.

-	Land north of Little Brampton, Clunbury
---	---

- 4.1.8 Regardless of this the site's location is unsustainable in transport terms, being car-reliant and lacking genuine choice of mode. However, with reference to Paragraph 110 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) a single dwelling would not necessarily constitute 'significant development', and the weight to be attributed to this issue should be considered by the decision-maker.
- 4.1.9 18/11/25 – objection:  
Whilst the consultant's response and other information provided is broadly sufficient, it does need to be applied in an agreed manner, and there remains inadequate justification for departing from the standard approach for calculating the visibility requirements for the new access. To that end a revised plan should clearly demonstrate that the absolute minimum applicable Stopping Sight Distances are achievable in both directions along the full extent of the visibility splays.
- 4.1.10 The previous comment about the location being unsustainable in transport terms is also reiterated.
- 4.1.11 3/12/25 - comment:  
Fundamental concerns remain in relation to sustainability of location and the lack of genuine choice of travel modes besides the private car. For example, any travel to schools from here would potentially require financial support at public expense.
- 4.1.12 The proposed visibility splays have been reviewed and are now acceptable in addressing highway safety concerns, subject to their being secured by condition. Nonetheless, the scheme would introduce waiting refuse vehicles where this does not currently occur and which is unlikely to be anticipated by other road users.
- 4.1.13 Shropshire Council Ecology – no objection:  
No objection subject to conditions and informatives to ensure protection of wildlife and provision of ecological enhancements. The submitted Ecological Appraisal is satisfactory and confirms that the mature trees with bat roosting potential will be retained.
- 4.1.14 Additionally, a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) completed by the Ecology Team confirms that the proposed foul drainage system is unlikely to affect water quality in the River Clun Special Area of Conservation (SAC) downstream.
- 4.1.15 Clunbury Parish Council – support/comment:  
Most Parish Councillors support the application overall, provided the eligibility criteria for an affordable home are met, and subject to Shropshire Council's Highways Officer being assured that the reconfigured vehicular access would be safe.
- 4.1.16 Concerns under the previous application regarding visual impact and sewerage arrangements have been addressed, including by now proposing only a single-

storey dwelling. However, other previous comments regarding compliance with the SPD remain applicable, notably in terms of the site not having been agreed through pre-application advice, proximity to the settlement remaining contentious, and applications of this type needing to be made in full rather than outline form.

## 4.2 Public comments

4.2.1 Representations from nine separate households have been submitted directly to the Local Planning Authority, with seven supporting the application, one objecting and one neutral overall. Several further comments in support have been forwarded by the applicant's agent, but their origin and context cannot be verified, with some predating the current application. The following points are made:

- Developments such as this are essential to allow young local people to afford their own home in the area and avoid being 'priced out' by others, thereby helping to support local services, social networks and the rural economy.
- Several relatively low-cost homes of various sizes (between £120,000 and £285,000 and with 2-4 bedrooms) are currently for sale in the area, whereas build costs for the proposed dwelling plus garage and other works could be in the region of £400,000, far exceeding what would generally be regarded as affordable for many local people.
- The applicant has demonstrated compliance with the eligibility criteria for this type of affordable home. Availability of properties in other settlements further afield is irrelevant as they would not meet the applicant's particular needs.
- The applicant's livestock-tending duties at the nearby family farm amount to a functional need for him to live locally, and no suitable existing properties are available.
- The development would be restricted by a Section 106 legal agreement to ensure that it continues to meet local housing needs in perpetuity.
- The Council's rural exception site scheme is unrealistic and unfair in that it favours people whose families already own land and have finances available to build a house in locations where planning permission would not normally be granted, rather than those genuinely most at need of affordable housing.
- Contrary to the SPD's requirements, the site was deemed unsuitable by Council officers in pre-application advice. This was because it is spatially and visually separated from Little Brampton's existing buildings by an agricultural field (which the application documents falsely portray as domestic land), meaning the development would appear isolated and unduly prominent in the wider landscape.
- The 'paddock' between the site and Little Brampton Barn could be considered part of the latter's domestic curtilage, and historic mapping shows that it has long been associated with the settlement. Consequently the site should be regarded as adjoining Little Brampton.
- Little Brampton is quite widely scattered rather than a tight-knit settlement, and this site is closer than some of the existing properties. Again this suggests the development would adjoin the settlement rather than looking out of place.
- The site's small separation from the neighbouring barn conversion would maintain privacy and space for both parties.

- The application also conflicts with the SPD in that it seeks outline rather than full permission, so there is no guarantee of a high-quality design and/or landscaping sympathetic to the countryside location in the SHNL. Not adhering to the relevant policies risks setting a dangerous precedent.
- The field's gentle downhill slope away from the road, combined with limiting the dwelling to a single storey and retaining the existing boundary vegetation, will minimise the development's visual and landscape impacts.
- The proposal makes good practical use of the space available and appears well thought out in terms of scale, design and sustainability.
- Previous concerns about highway safety and proximity to a neighbour's borehole have been addressed.
- The existing field gate has been used for decades by agricultural vehicles and provides good visibility in both directions. The revised proposals would further improve it, whilst the adjacent road is relatively quiet and capable of accommodating a slight increase in traffic movements.
- The Council's Highways Team still has some concerns about highway safety.
- The site is of low ecological value.

## 5.0 THE MAIN ISSUES

- Principle of development
- Scale, layout, design and impact on landscape
- Access, highway safety and transport
- Ecology and foul drainage
- Residential amenity

## 6.0 OFFICER APPRAISAL

### 6.1 Principle of development

6.1.1 A key objective of both national and local planning policy is to concentrate residential development in locations which promote economic, social and environmental sustainability. Specifically, the Council's Core Strategy Policies CS1-CS5 seek to achieve managed, targeted growth by steering new open-market housing to sites within market towns, other 'key centres' and certain named villages ('Community Hubs and Clusters') as identified in the Site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan. Isolated or sporadic development in open countryside (i.e. outside the designated settlements) is generally unacceptable unless there are exceptional circumstances.

6.1.2 One of the exceptions mentioned under Core Strategy Policy CS5 and SAMDev Policy MD7a is where named individuals with strong local connections and who are demonstrably in housing need wish to build their own 'affordable' home. Detailed guidance on this initiative, including definition of the terms 'strong local connections' and 'housing need', can be found in Chapter 5 of the SPD referenced by the Housing Enabling Manager (see Paragraphs 4.1.4 and 4.1.5 above), who in this case is satisfied that *those* aspects of the eligibility criteria are met. Whilst the public criticism of the policy and comments about availability of other properties are noted, it is not part of the Local Planning Authority's role in determining this

application to reassess the applicant's housing need or seek to change the policy. Moreover, if Committee Members are minded to grant planning permission this would need to be subject to prior completion of a legal agreement to control both initial and future occupancy of the dwelling and cap its resale value.

- 6.1.3 Returning to the issue of location, even affordable homes on rural exception sites are required by the SPD to be within or adjoining "recognisable named settlements". Again, isolated or sporadic development, or schemes which would otherwise adversely affect the landscape, are unacceptable. The SPD explains that all settlements comprise a group of houses occupied by households from different families, with the group becoming a settlement on account of the number houses and their proximity. Its limits are defined by where the relationship between the different properties peters out, and hence a site a short distance from a dispersed or loose-knit settlement might be considered to adjoin it, whereas one a similar distance from a tightly clustered or nucleated settlement would not.
- 6.1.4 Officers accept that Little Brampton is a recognisable named settlement, but most of its existing buildings are tightly nucleated around the crossroads on the B4368. Given the expansive gap and natural screening between the proposed site and the closest neighbouring dwelling (Little Brampton Barn), together with its location on the north side of the hamlet where no other properties are encountered before reaching the neighbouring settlement of Kempton, it appears visually detached and feels disconnected. The development would therefore be seen in isolation in the context of a largely open and undeveloped agricultural landscape. Although there are some outlying cottages *southwest* of and slightly further away from the crossroads, they at least have some intervisibility with the main grouping, including Little Brampton Farm. Meanwhile the only other properties lie in the southeasterly direction so again set no direct precedent.
- 6.1.5 Officers also acknowledge the debate in the applicant's submission and the public comments about the current nature and historic usage of the paddock between the site and Little Brampton Barn. However, recent grazing of sheep and the depiction of an orchard on historic maps would tend to suggest predominantly agricultural rather than domestic functions, as would the fact that the barn was itself an agricultural building before its relatively recent conversion. In any event, whether or not the paddock is domestic curtilage is not determinative in assessing the visual relationship, or lack of it, between the proposed development and existing buildings. Neither are positions of road signs nor permissions for affordable dwellings in different contexts elsewhere.
- 6.1.6 For these reasons officers consider that the site does not adjoin the settlement, and hence that the proposal fundamentally conflicts with the aforementioned locational requirements for affordable dwellings on rural exception sites. Whilst it would potentially have some wider social and economic benefits in terms of increasing the stock of affordable homes and supporting local services, these would be modest given the scale of the development, and offset by the harm which an isolated

dwelling would inevitably cause by eroding the character and scenic quality of the wider landscape (see below). Moreover, with reference to the public comments, it should be emphasised that the application is *not* for an agricultural worker's dwelling tied exclusively to the applicant's family's farm, to which different locational and other policy criteria would apply (notably a requirement for detailed evidence of a specific functional need to house another worker at or immediately adjacent to the main livestock enterprise, and of the business' financial viability and ability to fund such development).

## 6.2 **Scale, layout, design and impact on landscape**

- 6.2.1 With appearance, landscaping, layout and scale being reserved matters, these details are currently largely unknown. It is also acknowledged that the SPD says applications for affordable dwellings on rural exception sites should be made in full rather than outline since they generally involve sensitive countryside locations where a particularly high standard of design is paramount. However, the Council *has* approved outline applications for affordable dwellings in or adjoining other rural settlements since the SPD's adoption, and indeed the more recent SAMDev Plan designates many hamlets in the SHNL as Cluster settlements where even speculative market housing has been approved. Moreover, should Members decide to approve the current application they could impose a condition stipulating single-storey accommodation only, whilst compliance with the SPD's 100m<sup>2</sup> restriction on floor space, along with detailed design and landscaping proposals, would still fall to be carefully assessed and could be challenged at the reserved matters stage.
- 6.2.2 That said, as explained in Section 5.1.1, officers judge that any form of residential development on this site, whatever its height and design, would inevitably detract from the open, undeveloped character and scenic beauty of the wider landscape given its detachment and poor visual association with the existing buildings at Little Brampton. Whilst the established trees and hedges and the additional planting now indicated would soften and screen the development to some extent, it would remain clearly visible and isolated in views from the adjacent stretch of road plus various points across the Kemp valley to the west and northwest, rather than reading as an integral part of or 'natural' extension to the hamlet.
- 6.2.3 Furthermore, although the dwelling and garage themselves would be confined to the corner of the field, and the domestic curtilage would not exceed the SPD's 0.1ha limit, this necessitates the long winding driveway in order to meet the road further north where visibility can be maximised, and at a perpendicular angle. This will exacerbate the development's visual and landscape impacts by increasing the amount of hard landscaping and domestic paraphernalia (such as bins, signage, gates etc.) and the extent of its encroachment into the open agricultural landscape beyond the settlement. It also represents poor design in that it would leave an 'island' of land marooned between the driveway and the road, which could neither be practicably farmed nor incorporated into the domestic curtilage without exceeding the maximum permissible plot size. Whilst the latest plans attempt to address this by indicating additional landscaping, which is better than nothing, this

does not escape the fact that it is a contrived solution only necessary because of the site's separation from the hamlet and other constraints, thus serving to emphasise its fundamental unsuitability.

- 6.2.4 Overall, given that the NPPF affords designated areas such as the SHNL the highest level of protection, and bearing in mind the scheme's limited public benefits besides those to the applicant himself, officers do not consider the development's harmful visual and landscape impacts to be justified or capable of satisfactory mitigation.

### 6.3 **Access, highway safety and transport**

- 6.3.1 As summarised above, following submission of additional information and amended plans, the Council's Highways Development Control Team is now satisfied that the reconfigured access would meet the relevant standards in terms of its alignment, visibility splays, construction and surface drainage. Whilst previous versions in fact indicated longer splays, there were uncertainties about the methodology used and whether the full length of the splays was actually achievable. Although there remains some concern about waiting refuse collection vehicles obstructing the road in an unexpected location, having regard to NPPF Paragraph 116 the impact on highway safety and/or free-flow of traffic is unlikely to be severe or unacceptable.

- 6.3.2 Also noted is the Highways comment on the location being unsustainable in transport terms. In response the applicant's agent has pointed out that Little Brampton has a public bus service, although this is in fact limited to one return journey off-peak on two days a week only. The agent also argues that, by their very nature, rural exception sites are likely to be in relatively remote and therefore not inherently sustainable locations. However, whilst officers do not dispute that, it is also worth reiterating that this site does not even meet the locational requirements for an affordable dwelling, as explained above.

### 6.4 **Ecology and foul drainage**

- 6.4.1 To elaborate on the Local Member's and Ecology Team's comments, the River Clun SAC is among the most ecologically important and sensitive sites in Europe, with the highest level of protection under the Conservation of Species and Habitats Regulations 2017 (as amended). It is notified for its rare freshwater pearl mussel population, whose condition is currently unfavourable because of excess nutrients and sedimentation. In particular, additional phosphate entering the river system is likely to further worsen its water quality, and a major source of phosphate is treated wastewater from residential properties. All planning applications in this area are therefore subject to a HRA by the Council as 'competent authority', and only with complete certainty that the development would have no adverse effect on the SAC's integrity can planning permission legally be granted.

- 6.4.2 That said, in this instance the available space and ground conditions are sufficient to install a non-mains package treatment plant and soakaway system which meets exacting criteria agreed with Natural England to avoid increasing phosphate

loadings in the river system, and hence to allow significant effects to be ruled out. Neither is there any conflict with the usual hierarchical approach to foul drainage under other legislation such as the Building Regulations and Environment Agency permitting regime, since no mains sewerage is available for connection in any event, irrespective of the SAC issue. Consequently there is no legal barrier to granting planning permission.

- 6.4.3 It is also accepted that no other significant ecological impacts are likely either. Meanwhile the neighbour's borehole appears to be adequately separated from the proposed drainage system and would ultimately be protected under separate legislation in any event.

## 6.5 Residential amenity

- 6.5.1 It is also agreed that the development would not unduly overlook, overshadow or appear overbearing to the neighbouring property given its separation. However, to avoid any doubt, this should not be seen as justifying the site's spatial and visual separation from the settlement.

## 7.0 CONCLUSION

- 7.1 The applicant has been found to fulfil the local connections and housing need criteria for an affordable home, and it is also accepted that Little Brampton is a recognisable named settlement. However, the scheme is fundamentally contrary to the relevant planning policies in that the site is spatially and visually divorced from existing built form such that it cannot be regarded as being within or adjoining the established settlement. Moreover, given its isolation and prominence within the wider countryside, any new dwelling here would detract from the essentially open agricultural character and scenic beauty of this part of the SHNL, and it is not considered that this environmental harm could be satisfactorily mitigated or would be offset by the scheme's relatively minor wider public benefits. For these reasons it is recommended that planning permission is refused.

## 8.0 RISK ASSESSMENT AND OPPORTUNITIES APPRAISAL

### 8.1 Risk management

- 8.1.1 There are two principal risks associated with this recommendation as follows:

- As with any planning decision the applicant has a right of appeal if they disagree with the decision and/or the imposition of conditions. Costs can be awarded irrespective of the mechanism for hearing the appeal, i.e. written representations, hearing or inquiry.
- The decision may be challenged by way of a Judicial Review by a third party. The courts become involved when there is a misinterpretation or misapplication of policy or some breach of the rules of procedure or the principles of natural justice. However their role is to review the way the authorities reach decisions, rather than to make a decision on the planning issues themselves, although they will interfere where the decision is so unreasonable as to be irrational or perverse. Therefore they are concerned with the legality of the decision, not its planning merits. A challenge by way of Judicial Review must be made a)

promptly and b) in any event not later than six weeks after the grounds to make the claim first arose.

Both of these risks need to be balanced against the risk of not proceeding to determine the application. In this scenario there is also a right of appeal against non-determination for application for which costs can also be awarded.

## 8.2 Human rights

8.2.1 Article 8 of the First Protocol of the European Convention on Human Rights gives the right to respect for private and family life, whilst Article 1 allows for the peaceful enjoyment of possessions. These have to be balanced against the rights and freedoms of others and the orderly development of the County in the interests of the community.

8.2.2 Article 1 also requires that the desires of landowners must be balanced against the impact of development upon nationally important features and on residents.

8.2.3 This legislation has been taken into account in arriving at the above decision.

## 8.3 Equalities

8.3.1 The concern of planning law is to regulate the use of land in the interests of the public at large, rather than those of any particular group. Equality will be one of a number of 'relevant considerations' that need to be weighed in Planning Committee members' minds under section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

## 9.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

9.1 There are likely financial implications if the decision and/or imposition of conditions are challenged by a planning appeal or judicial review. The costs of defending any decision will be met by the authority and will vary dependent on the scale and nature of the proposal. Local financial considerations are capable of being taken into account when determining this planning application – insofar as they are material to the application. The weight given to this issue is a matter for the decision maker.

## 10.0 BACKGROUND

### Relevant Planning Policies:

Central Government Guidance:

National Planning Policy Framework

Shropshire Local Development Framework Adopted Core Strategy Policies:

CS1 - Strategic Approach

CS5 - Countryside and Greenbelt

CS6 - Sustainable Design and Development Principles

CS7 - Communications and Transport

CS11 - Type and Affordability of housing

# AGENDA ITEM

-	Land north of Little Brampton, Clunbury
---	---

CS17 - Environmental Networks  
CS18 - Sustainable Water Management

Shropshire Council Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan Policies:

MD1 - Scale and Distribution of Development  
MD2 - Sustainable Design  
MD3 - Managing Housing Development  
MD7A - Managing Housing Development in the Countryside  
MD12 - Natural Environment

Supplementary Planning Documents:  
Type and Affordability of Housing

## Relevant Planning History:

25/01642/OUT - Erection of affordable dwelling and detached garage, alterations to existing vehicular access, and installation of package (sewage) treatment plant (outline application to include means of access but with matters of appearance, landscaping, layout and scale reserved) (withdrawn 14th August 2025)

## 11.0 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

View details online: <http://pa.shropshire.gov.uk/online-applications/applicationDetails.do?activeTab=summary&keyVal=T3B8Q1TDL2C00>

<b>List of Background Papers:</b> See weblink above
<b>Cabinet Member (Portfolio Holder):</b> Councillor David Walker
<b>Local Member:</b> Cllr Sam Walmsley
<b>Appendices:</b> None