

**NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS**

Date: 17th February 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:
5	22/01432/OUT – Land West Side of Ellesmere Road, Shrewsbury	Member of the public – seven comments from six individuals

Additional public representations have been received since the publishing of the Committee Report, these can be summarised as follows:

Traffic & Transport:

Ellesmere Road is already severely congested and that development of 150–450 homes without the NWRR would make conditions significantly worse. A request that only Phase 1 be approved and that Phase 2 be delayed pending an independent traffic and infrastructure review after five years.

Infrastructure Capacity:

Concerns raised about lack of capacity in local primary and secondary schools, no SEND provision, overstretched GP surgeries, and pressures on sewerage, water supply, and flooding infrastructure.

Planning Policy Issues:

Site is wholly outside the development boundary for Shrewsbury and is contrary to adopted planning policy

One representation challenges reliance on the presumption in favour of sustainable development, noting the absence of an adopted local plan and highlighting relevant NPPF sections (healthy communities, green amenities). It is argued the officer recommendation is not justified.

Landscape and Character:

Loss of green space, harm to countryside views, and cumulative impact alongside other developments.

Ecology and Biodiversity:

Development is too close to Old River Bed LWS and SSSI and could harm wildlife. Whilst on-site protected species (bats) may be harmed.

Residential Amenity:

Potential impacts on privacy and outlook.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	24/03767/OUT – Land North of Olden Lane, Ruyton XI Towns	Member of the public

A member of the public has provided a representation that is addressed to Members of the planning committee and can be summarised as follows:

1. Highway Safety & Access

- The site has previously been refused three times due to highway safety concerns, which the objector states remain unresolved.
- SC Highways has repeatedly advised (Nov 2024, Apr 2025, Apr 2025 follow-up) that the access is sub-standard and that the applicant's submissions do not address visibility and speed-related safety issues.
- Speed survey data reportedly indicates traffic travelling nearly 10mph over the limit, with proposed measures (moving the 30mph limit and adding a chicane) considered ineffective or unsafe.
- Concerns raised that the chicane would not reduce outbound speeds, creates risks for vulnerable road users due to road narrowing, and would obstruct agricultural vehicles and HGVs.
- The road (B4397) is also a key A5 diversion route; the objector states that restricting width could lead to major operational problems.
- Additional concern regarding refuse collection delays and emergency vehicle access.

2. Traffic Calming Measures

- The proposed chicane is described as serving only the applicant's visibility needs, rather than wider community benefit.
- The representation argues that approving it would set a precedent for developers using road alterations to compensate for inadequate site access.

3. Enforcement and Site Condition

- The objector states that a previous enforcement notice preventing further works had been breached.
- The site is described as having been cleared extensively over successive applications, resulting in harm to local wildlife habitat.

4. Delays and Application Process

- The application is reported to be over a year beyond its determination period, with the applicant repeatedly exceeding deadlines for submitting requested information.
- Comments from SC Trees objecting to the proposal and requesting revised plans are said to have been ignored.

5. Local Disruption

- Reference is made to severe traffic disruption during emergency works at the same location in January 2026, with concerns this reflects the impact permanent restrictions could have.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
3	25/03895/FUL	SUDS

SUDS comments have been received since the publishing of the Committee Report, these can be summarised as follows:

The LLFA objects due to the absence of an adequate drainage strategy. With the site lying in Flood Zones 2 and 3, key FRA gaps remain including unclear floor levels, no topographic survey, outdated rainfall data, an excessive discharge rate, and the missing SuDS A2 pro-forma.

The SUDS team have reassessed the comments and following their recent objection stating insufficient drainage information has been provided. The SUDS officer states as follows:

As a result, I am removing the objection and asking the LPA to condition the provision of the following information:

- Provision/confirmation of safe dry access routes to the front of the dwelling and establishment of finished floor levels above the max level of FZ2.
- Provision of an assessment of the developments impact on floodplain storage, and information on opportunities for mitigation within the site boundary.

The agents have today submitted additional technical information to seek to address the concerns of drainage. Officers will now reconsult on this information.

If members are minded to approve the application, give officers delegated power to agree the drainage solution and apply conditions as necessary.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	22/01432/OUT – Land West Side of Ellesmere Road, Shrewsbury	Local Ward Member

Cllr Ben Jephcott has submitted a detailed objection to the application, summarised as follows and citing cumulative traffic impacts from this and three other recent large developments in the area.

Key concerns include the lack of affordable housing, insufficient landscape and nature buffers, inadequate public transport and cycling provision, dangerous access points, strain on local schools and healthcare, privacy issues for existing residents, and inaccurate information on local NHS services.

Also highlighted were inconsistencies between the technical highway assessments and the local plan, questioning whether the traffic modelling accurately reflects the impact on Ellesmere Road and the town centre, and called for more detailed modelling and updated conditions.

Cllr Ben Jephcott recommends that the application be refused or at least deferred for further review, updated modelling, and revised conditions, especially since the North West Relief Road is now undeliverable and alternative traffic management strategies are not yet in place.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	22/01432/OUT – Land West Side of Ellesmere Road, Shrewsbury	Sustainable Transport Shropshire

Further detailed comments have been provided raising concerns with the site's remoteness from facilities and local school, and can be summarised as follows:

They recommend the Shrewsbury Movement Strategy be completed before occupation of the new homes and criticise the Travel Plan's modest target of a 5% reduction in single occupancy car journeys, suggesting a more ambitious 33% reduction.

Concerns were raised about the lack of specific targets and actionable plans for increasing bus, cycling, and walking use, and the need for all alternative travel measures to be in place before properties are sold.

They urge the addition of a walking and cycling access point to Ellesmere Road, improvements to the 501 bus service, and developer funding for infrastructure and travel plan communication.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator: