



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 December 2025

by **N Bromley BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 January 2026

### **Appeal Ref: 6000986**

### **Land adjacent to Walldene, Uffington Lane, Uffington, Shrewsbury SY4 4SE**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Draper & Lea against the decision of Shropshire Council.
- The application Ref is 25/02353/OUT.
- The development proposed is outline planning for the erection of 3 dwellings and all associated works.

### **Decision**

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### **Preliminary Matters**

2. The Government launched a consultation on reforms to the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) in December 2025, but as the proposals are still subject to change, they carry little weight. Accordingly, the decision was made with reference to the December 2024 version of the Framework.
3. The application was submitted in outline with all matters (access, appearance, landscaping, layout, and scale) reserved for subsequent approval. I have therefore dealt with the appeal on that basis, treating all submitted plans and drawings as illustrative.

### **Main Issue**

4. Whether the proposed development accords with the development plan strategy for housing and would be in a sustainable location.

### **Reasons**

5. The appeal site comprises open, agricultural land, located beyond the end house of a small ribbon of development that fronts Uffington Lane. The site and the surrounding area have a rural character with open fields, bounded by hedgerows.
6. Policy CS4 of the Shropshire Local Development Framework: Adopted Core Strategy, 2011 (the CS) sets out how new housing will be delivered in the rural areas by focusing it in Community Hubs and Community Clusters, which are identified in Policy MD1 of the Shropshire Council Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan (the SAMDev) 2015.
7. While Uffington is listed as a Community Cluster Settlement in Policy MD1 of the SAMDev, the site is located beyond the settlement, which is approximately 0.5 kilometres away. Indeed, the site and small ribbon of development are detached

from the nucleus of properties within Uffington. As such, the appeal site is not viewed within the context of the buildings within the settlement. Instead, it is viewed within the context of the predominantly, open rural landscape, where buildings and development are more sporadic. Accordingly, the site lies outside of the settlement, within the open countryside.

8. Policy CS5 of the CS, allows new development in the open countryside only where it maintains and enhances countryside vitality and character and improves the sustainability of rural communities, particularly where it relates to certain types of development. Policy MD7(a) of the SAMDev states that new market housing will be strictly controlled outside of Shrewsbury, the Market Towns, Key Centres and Community Hubs and Clusters. It also sets out various types of residential development that would be permitted in the countryside.
9. The proposal would be for open market dwellings in the open countryside and there is no evidence before me to suggest that the proposal falls within any of those development types listed in Policy CS5 of the CS or Policy MD7(a) of the SAMDev. Consequently, the proposed development would fail to satisfy these policies and, overall, it is contrary to the Council's development plan strategy for housing.
10. Uffington is accessible on foot and by cycling from the appeal site. The edge of Shrewsbury is also nearby. As such, the site is not remote. The proposed development would also not be functionally separate from other development. Given such, and with due regard to the cited judgment<sup>1</sup>, the site is not within an isolated countryside location.
11. The services and amenities in Uffington are limited to a public house, church and a village hall. The level of services and amenities within the settlement are therefore limited, and it is not clear, on the evidence before me, how the proposal would enhance or maintain the vitality of the nearby community.
12. The obvious and most direct route to the edge of Shrewsbury is along busy roads and the footways are narrow and overgrown in parts. Future occupiers would also need to cross the B5062 and the A49 roundabout. The roundabout is particularly busy, and although the distance to access services, amenities and facilities around Sundorne Road on foot would be achievable from the appeal site, due to safety concerns, I am not persuaded that future occupiers would regularly choose walking and cycling along this route as an option. This would particularly be the case for families with young children, older people or those with mobility issues.
13. Cycling, using national routes, including cycle route no. 81 would be more attractive. Although during inclement weather and the darker winter months, the prospect of future occupiers cycling to access services and amenities along the route, including nearby employment opportunities would be limited. Likewise, the same could be said for walking along the route.
14. My attention has not been drawn to nearby bus stops or the frequency of a bus service operating locally, which could serve as a realistic alternative to car use to access Shrewsbury but also other Key Centres and Community Hubs and Clusters. Therefore, there is limited evidence before me that the proposal would promote and encourage public transport use, which would limit car usage by future occupants of the proposed development.

---

<sup>1</sup> Braintree DC v SSCLG, Greyread Ltd & Granville Developments Ltd [2018] EWCA Civ 610

15. The Framework states that opportunities to maximise sustainable transport solutions will vary between urban and rural areas. Nonetheless, future occupiers would not benefit from a range of modes of transport to access services and amenities elsewhere. Therefore, they would be highly dependent on the use of private cars, and the proposal would not prioritise sustainable transport modes.
16. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposed development does not accord with the development plan strategy for housing, and it would not be in a sustainable location. It would thereby conflict with Policies CS4 and CS5 of the CS and Policies MD1 and MD7(a) of the SAMDev, as well as the aims and objectives of the Framework.

### **Planning Balance**

17. The Council accept that they cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of housing land. The main parties suggest that the shortfall is 4.73 years, and even though the shortfall is modest, the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out at Paragraph 11(d) of the Framework applies. In these circumstances, paragraph 11(d)(ii) of the Framework states that planning permission should be granted unless any adverse effects of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.
18. The Framework makes it clear that weight should be afforded to policies of the development plan according to their degree of consistency with the Framework. In this regard, the Framework seeks rural housing to be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. The Framework also seeks to direct development towards locations with good access to services and facilities and ensure that sustainable transport modes are prioritised. As such, Policies CS4 and CS5 of the CS and Policies MD1 and MD7(a) of the SAMDev are broadly consistent with the Framework.
19. The proposal would be within walking distance of Uffington and future occupiers would, albeit to a limited extent, contribute to maintaining the services within the settlement. There would also be some limited opportunity to access services and amenities within Shrewsbury by walking and cycling. Nonetheless, the proposal does not represent a suitable location for housing having regard to relevant development plan policies and its spatial strategy, and future occupiers would be highly dependent on the use of private cars, which would not prioritise sustainable transport modes. Within this context, although the conflict between the proposal and Policies CS4 and CS5 of the CS and Policies MD1 and MD7(a) of the SAMDev is somewhat reduced, the policies should be given moderate weight in this appeal.
20. Three additional family houses would contribute to boosting the supply of new housing, as referenced in the Framework. The development could also be delivered relatively quickly, representing a windfall site, and the layout of the scheme could be designed to be reflective of the density of neighbouring properties. Indeed, the dwellings could be built to respect the character and appearance of the area, incorporating sustainable energy methods, such as solar PV panels and heat pumps. There would also be social and economic benefits to local services during the construction phases, supporting small local builders and building suppliers.
21. There is also a suggestion that the proposal would make a financial contribution to the CIL payment which would contribute towards infrastructure. Concerns related to

ecology, trees, visual impact, highways and drainage matters have not been raised but these are requirements of planning policy and taken together they are neutral matters that carry limited weight.

22. In combination, the benefits attract positive weight in my determination. However, the provision of three new homes would only make a limited contribution to housing supply. Overall, due to the small-scale nature of the proposed development the benefits of the scheme would attract modest weight.
23. Numerous appeal decisions for residential development within Shropshire have been referenced by both main parties. Full details for each case, in particular those submitted by the appellant<sup>2</sup>, have not been provided and a proper comparison between those previous appeal decisions and the appeal scheme before me has not been possible. In any event, as demonstrated by those previous appeal decisions, each proposal must be judged on the site-specific circumstances and on its own merits. Given this, I attach limited weight to those previous appeal decisions.
24. Consequently, the adverse impacts of the proposal would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. Therefore, the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply.

## **Conclusion**

25. For the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would conflict with the development plan when considered as a whole and there are no material considerations, including the Framework, that indicate that the development should be determined otherwise than in accordance with it. For these reasons, the appeal should be dismissed.

*N Bromley*

INSPECTOR

---

<sup>2</sup> Appeal references: APP/L3245/W/24/3352860; APP/L3245/W/23/3324882; APP/L3245/W/21/3288835; APP/L3245/W/22/3310764; APP/L3245/W/21/3267148 and APP/L3245/W/21/3288834