

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS**

**Date: 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2026**

**NOTE: This schedule reports only additional letters received before 4pm on the day before committee. Any items received on the day of Committee will be reported verbally to the meeting**

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Originator:</b>
5.	25/01722/OUT	Morville Parish Council

Morville Parish Council comments of 10<sup>th</sup> June 2025 in full inadvertently omitted from the Committee Report:

Morville Parish Council (MPC) unanimously opposes this planning application, a position strongly supported by parishioners of Morville Parish, and requests that Shropshire Council refuse the planning application in its current form.

There are many underlying issues which remain unresolved with further investigations and assessments yet to be carried out and submitted for approval.

General:

MPC has concerns about many aspects of the application but does not support it for the following specific reasons:

1.

Size and Location of the Development:

Residential Dwellings: The proposed development is too large, not proportional to the size of Bridgnorth, is separated from the town by a major road and does not meet the needs of the town.

Employment Land: The proposed development allows for 14.6 ha of employment land to be developed. This is not needed as there is sufficient employment land either unfilled, under construction or already approved.

Location: The proposed development is taking residential development away from the main employment areas of the town and the region (eg Stanmore, Wolverhampton and Telford). Other more suitable and smaller locations should be considered.

2.

Infrastructure:

Roads and Highways: The proposed development is out of proportion to the existing local infrastructure and existing transport links which are not capable of supporting much growth in population and business activity without significant investment of which there is little sign.

Vehicle Access and Pedestrian/Cycleway Provision: MPC has serious concerns with the proposed access points off the A458 and B4364 and does not support the proposal to use signal controlled crossings of the A458 and B4364 for pedestrians and cyclists.

Water Resources - Sewerage Network: Severn Trent Water (STW) has confirmed that the sewerage network is near capacity. The Proposed Development will see a substantial increase in foul flows yet no plans have been made to ensure that increased flows can be accommodated.

MPC does not support any proposed development until such plans have been made and approved. Work on site should not start until these plans are in place.

3.

Ecology: MPC has concerns that the massively increased human and dog footprint would be disastrous and far outweigh any possible biodiversity benefit from the proposed country park. MPC reserves the right to make further comments after the current consultation closes on 18 June 2025.

Details:

1.

Size and Location of the Development:

a.

Residential Dwellings: The proposed development is for 1,500 dwellings "in a variety of sizes, types and tenures to meet local need" of which 20% would be affordable housing.

When considered, in conjunction with the planning approval already given for 500 dwellings north of A458 (Tasley Gateway), it would allow for 2,000 dwellings to be built.

MPC does not believe that this large number of dwellings is proportional or 'meet local need'. MPC recommends that a Local Housing Needs Assessment is carried out to establish what is the 'local need'? According to the 2021 census the population of Bridgnorth was approximately 11,857. Using the calculation provided in the Outline Planning Application, the 2021 Census data indicate an average

household size of 2.3 in Shropshire. Therefore the proposed developments will increase the population of Bridgnorth by 4,600 people which represents an increase of 39%.

MPC does not support the development of a single, large development which is separated from Bridgnorth by a major road and recommends that several smaller sites be considered.

MPC does not believe the town of Bridgnorth and surrounding areas have the infrastructure to support a 39% increase in its population size.

b.

Employment Land: The Proposed Development will provide up to 14.6 ha for a mix of B2, B8a, E(g)ii and E(g)iii employment uses.

This does not include the 6.6 ha of land south of the A458 which has been approved for the re location of the Livestock Market together with its existing or alternative ancillary uses. In addition, a further 6.7 ha adjoining the area reserved for the Livestock Market has also been approved for a business park for Class B uses.

In total 27.4 ha of employment land has been allocated to the Tasley Garden Village and the Tasley Gateway.

Stanmore Business Park covers just over 17 ha in area and is not at full capacity. More buildings are being constructed within the Park and there is room for further development if needed. In addition, work to develop Chartwell Business Park has recently started.

Bridgnorth has poor logistics with no infrastructure and no evidence of future funding being made available for improvements. It takes approximately one hour to get from Bridgnorth to one of the motorways and can take longer if traffic movement is slow. Why would any business which is reliant on fast, efficient road networks choose to set up in Bridgnorth? Telford for example has land available, is close to the M54, has a mainline railway station and is already an industrial hub.

Assuming the employment land earmarked for Tasley Gateway is built in addition to that being constructed at Chartwell Business Park, MPC does not support the proposal for a further 14.6 ha of employment land as outlined in this planning application.

c.

Location: MPC accepts that there is a need for more housing in the Bridgnorth area but they need to be built in the right place including the use of brown field sites.

The Outline Planning Application for the 'Tasley Garden Village', when considered in conjunction with the already approved Tasley Gateway, is more akin to a large suburban development but with no supporting infrastructure.

MPC does not support the development of a single, large development and recommends that several smaller sites be considered, including the original location of Stanmore, once the needs of the town and surrounding areas have been identified.

Before the draft Local Plan was published the area around Stanmore was the favoured location.

MPC recommends that this area should be reconsidered as a possible location.

2.

Infrastructure:

a.

Roads and Highways: The proposed development, together with the already approved Tasley Gateway, will provide a total of 2,000 dwellings. Assuming a minimum of one car per dwelling, (a conservative estimate), these developments will put at least 2,000 additional vehicles onto roads which the Council admits are inadequate and in reality most households will have more than one vehicle per dwelling. In addition, the proposed employment land in Tasley will increase the number of vehicles coming in and out of Bridgnorth, many of which will be large vehicles supplying or working from the B class units proposed for these areas.

Previously, Shropshire Council acknowledged that there were topographical and landscape restraints within Bridgnorth and its surrounding areas which severely restrict development and road improvements: the town is bisected by the River Severn, there are only two bridges across the river in the Bridgnorth area which are accessible to vehicles thus creating natural pinch points, High Town sits on an escarpment as does the A442 to Telford. In addition the A roads to Telford, Wolverhampton, Stourbridge, Kidderminster and Shrewsbury are mainly single, winding carriageways and therefore slow.

Existing local infrastructure, transport links, public facilities and services are not capable of supporting much growth in population and business activity without significant investment of which there has been little. There have been no major improvements to the road network since the bypass was opened in 1985. Approximately 60% of people in Bridgnorth travel to work outside Bridgnorth mainly to Telford, Wolverhampton and Kidderminster and a similar percentage of jobs in Bridgnorth are filled by travelling in to the town. This is unlikely to change significantly despite the proposed employment land earmarked for development.

The proposed sites at Tasley (Tasley Gateway and Tasley Garden Village) are taking residential development away from the main employment areas of the town and the region (eg Stanmore, Wolverhampton and Telford). Whilst some employment is to be provided on site, the majority of the residents in Bridgnorth and surrounding areas will continue to travel to work at Stanmore, Wolverhampton and Telford. Some of those who choose to live in the proposed new residential areas will take up employment in the new settlements but many will choose to travel to the larger, better paid jobs on offer in

the West Midlands. Many of those who choose to work in the proposed new settlements will be travelling into the area from where they already live. MPC believes that the A roads leading to Shrewsbury, Wolverhampton, Telford, Stourbridge and Kidderminster are already close to their capacity, especially at peak times, and are not capable of supporting the growth in population and business activity outlined in the planning application. MPC recommends that a strategic highways assessment for the Bridgnorth area takes place and that any recommendations are committed to and funded before further development occurs. Any such assessment should include the repercussions of the Tasley Gateway development which has already been approved.

MPC does not support the development of a large, single development until the roads and highways are improved so that they are capable of catering for the large influx of vehicles which will be generated by this development.

b.

Vehicle Access and Pedestrian / Cycleway Provision: The Proposed Development is envisaged to be served by three principal vehicular access points; two to serve the residential areas, and a separate access for the employment area.

In addition, the proposals seek to retain the existing Private Rights of Way (PRoW) crossing the Site and will be enhanced with new footpaths/cycle links to provide additional connectivity. Crossing points for pedestrians and cyclists across the A458 and B4364 will be by signal controlled crossings assisted by a reduction in speed limits.

The A458 which forms the Bridgnorth bypass, is a very busy road and crossing from the proposed TGV development to the new development north of the A458 (Tasley Gateway), and to Bridgnorth, is dangerous. MPC does not support the proposal to use signal controlled crossings of the A458 and B4364 and recommends that crossings are by footbridge.

c.

Vehicle Access to the Playing Fields: It appears that the developer has come to an agreement with Bridgnorth Spartans FC on the use of the playing fields and clubhouse. If this is correct, MPC notes that access to the grounds and clubhouse is through the residential area. The amount of additional sports related traffic will be significant, particularly on match days, and the proposed car park at the club house is likely to be inadequate. This will result in vehicles being parked in the residential area.

If the development goes ahead MPC recommends that a separate access point be built to avoid unnecessary congestion and possible health and safety issues in the residential area and that car parking provision be reviewed to ensure vehicles do not encroach into the residential area.

d.

Water Resources:

Sewerage Network. Severn Trent Water (STW) has confirmed that the sewerage network is near capacity. STW informed Shropshire Council that they have some concerns about the proposed development, advising that the whole development (including the Tasley Gateway development) would have a significant impact on the network. STW have confirmed that they need to carry out investigations to understand what improvements would be required to the sewerage network to accommodate the development and have advised a formal Development Enquiry be submitted to them for this site.

In Section 9 of the Environment Investigation it is stated that "Following occupation of the Proposed Development there will be an increase in foul flows. Correspondence with STW... has demonstrated that modelling is required to determine the impact the Proposed Development will have upon the Application Site. STW is yet to progress, however they have confirmed that this will have no bearing upon the planning application. It is anticipated that the modelling will progress as the Application Site progresses through planning which will inform the required improvements to the public network that will be necessary to cater for the anticipated additional foul flows."

MPC does not support the proposal that work commences before appropriate investigations have taken place and a plan to ensure that the sewerage network can accommodate the development has been approved.

3.

Ecology:

The outline proposals include a 19.5 ha country park with woodland, pools and a network of footpaths along Tiddlebrook. Although a potential public amenity, any biodiversity net gain would be severely diminished by the high level of recreation disturbance.

The public footpath network would inevitably funnel people and dogs onto the 110 acre wildlife reserve south of Mor Brook. This site includes endangered species and priority habitats and the increased human and dog footprint would be negatively impactful and far outweigh any possible biodiversity benefit from the proposed country park.

MPC recommends that Shropshire Council's Ecology Department carry out a site visit in conjunction with the National Trust and Shropshire Wildlife Trust to discuss ways to mitigate the potential damage that could be caused by people and dogs.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	25/01722/OUT	Tasley Parish Council
<p>Tasley Parish Council (TPC) continues to object planning application (ref: 25/01722/OUT) and considers the Planning Officer's recommendation that this outline planning application be approved is, at best, premature given the obvious shortcomings in the application.</p> <p>The Planning Officer's Report (POR) says that ongoing work is being carried out on a Design Code based on the vision of a stand alone Garden Village and a few in person meetings between the Applicants and Council Officers.</p> <p>However, TPC's Neighbourhood Plan (TNP) is well advanced, and includes Design Policy and Codes specifically aimed at positively influencing the character and design of new development within Tasley. These Design Codes are based on the views of local residents and in-depth study of the local area and its characteristics, and were undertaken by AECOM Limited in accordance with its contract with Locality to provide for an appreciation for the existing character of Tasley.</p> <p>TPC's TNP has completed Regulation 14 consultation and is imminent for Regulation 15 submission, and therefore should bear planning weight when considering this application. Yet, this has not been referred to nor taken into account in the POR.</p> <p>Moreover, the POR has failed to include TPC's representation (lodged on Shropshire Council's (SC) planning register on 29th September 2025), so it can only be concluded that the further material concerns raised by TPC have not been considered, particularly those regarding the location and sustainability of the proposed Tasley Garden Village (TGV):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Whilst 763 houses have been built in Bridgnorth over the last 15 years (with a further 587 undeveloped commitments), there is little evidence that the equivalent jobs have been created in Bridgnorth as the vast majority of employment land in and around Bridgnorth lies undeveloped;</li> <li>- TPC is concerned that eventually the employment land identified in the TGV proposal will instead be used for more housing, further reinforcing the fact that the proposed TGV as it stands is an unsustainable development.</li> <li>- TPC has been made aware that there are far better suited locations other than Bridgnorth and Tasley for building Back Country houses, and it is our understanding that there are also options to build houses within the Black Country itself. Wolverhampton City Centre, with its excellent road and rail links, has huge quantities of derelict buildings where 5,000 plus apartments could be located.</li> <li>- South Staffs is the nearest and most favourably located county to take on the Black Country overspill, with ample land in Perton to build 1,500 homes with quick access to the Black Country employment market.</li> <li>- In Shropshire, the Bradford Estates proposal, sited close to junction 3 of the M54, offers 3000 houses alongside jobs (including a Tech Park), training opportunities, public transport, community facilities and green spaces near major roads and national rail networks. Furthermore, Para 1.4 of the POR outlines expectations (in planning terms) from a new Garden Development, yet the plans put forward by the developer of the TGV fly in the face of many of these expectations. To mention but a few: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "The right location is essential to avoid unsustainable commuting patterns." We would argue that the location conversely does, by necessity, actively encourage unsustainable commuting patterns. Bridgnorth lies some 15 miles from Telford and the M54 Corridor on very poor link roads with limited public transport, there is no rail connection with the West Midlands Conurbation, and no direct road link to the M5, M6 or M1. Neither does the TGV offer easy access to Bridgnorth Town centre facilities, unless of course people take the car.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Its location, is in reality, a dormitory-style extension built on prime agricultural land and tacked on to Tasley Parish and Bridgnorth whilst being eternally divided by the busy A458 trunk road. And, whilst we welcome the proposed slowing of traffic to 40mph and the various proposed roundabouts and pedestrian crossings we are not convinced these will encourage residents to walk or cycle all the way into Bridgnorth Town Centre and back up again.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. "Of high-quality materials and attention to detail."</li> </ul> <p>We've been looking for, but are unable to find any evidence of the expected high-quality and innovative design, nor can we see innovative use of local and sustainable new materials, or high-quality imaginative architecture, or making use of expert craftsmanship. We look at the plans put forward and see yet another pernicious housing estate which, quite frankly, looks like most other large faceless housing estates across Britain.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. "Homes should be..... a short distance from employment opportunities and local facilities..."</li> </ul> <p>Whilst TPC acknowledges the Bridgnorth Chartwell site has eventually attracted McDonalds and Starbucks, these types of businesses typically employ low numbers in unskilled jobs. It appears that when houses have been built in Bridgnorth the vast majority of jobs went elsewhere, in particular the M54 Corridor around Telford, due to the superior road, motorway and national rail links. This strongly indicates that the employment land proposed as part of the TGV development will simply not attract new employment opportunities and as a consequence the proposed TGV is an unsustainable development.</p> <p>TPC recognises that SC are under mounting pressure from national government to build yet more houses. However, this increased demand, allied with the withdrawal of its draft Shropshire Local Plan (SLP) after</p>		

examiners deemed it unsound, presents developers with the opportunity to submit a planning application on land allocated in the withdrawn draft SLP without necessarily being subject to the more up-to-date policies set out within in the now defunct draft SLP.

The TGV developer unsurprisingly seized upon this opportunity and submitted this application for 1500 houses. Whilst we appreciate that the developer is looking to incentivise the local community and SC to support this application, we are conscious that ultimately a developer's focus is naturally on making a profit, an observation born out by the TGV developer's decision to increase the number of houses from 1050 to an unjustified 1500 houses, of which only 450 were originally deemed to be actually needed to meet local needs.

SC withdrew its draft SLP after examiners challenged its soundness, so de facto, as it was part of that draft SLP, the TGV allocation itself is potentially also unsound. No sound justification nor benefit to the Bridgnorth area has ever been put forward by SC or developers for locating two major independent developments; Tasley Gateway (550 houses) and TGV (1500 houses), arbitrarily within the same parish. Furthermore, Thatchers Wood and Westwood Covert SSSI and Ancient Woodland (AW) is located approximately 2.5km to the south-west of the TGV site and comprises a predominantly damp wood in the valley of Mor Brook with areas of dry rocky woodland on slopes in Westwood Covert.

On 02/09/2025, the applicant added an Air Quality Technical Note (dated 28/08/2025) to SC's planning portal. This note says that the process contribution for all pollutants from the TGV do not exceed the relevant critical level / load thresholds - an opinion, which of course, falls in the applicant's favour.

Pollution levels are already in excess of critical levels and loads at the SSSI and AW thereby having an adverse impact upon it through eutrophication. In TPC's view, the resultant pollutants from the TGV development would unacceptably result in the further degradation of the SSSI and AW. Whilst benchmark ammonia levels have already been exceeded this is not justification to make an undesirable situation even worse.

It must be forgotten that air pollution relating to a previous planning application (ref: 17/01033/EIA) on the TGV site was similarly disregarded by SC Ecology. However, at Planning Appeal (after two High Court Cases against the application) the Planning Inspectorate judged the application unsound on the grounds of the impact of pollution on the Thatchers Wood and Westwood Covert Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).

Notably, the Planning Inspector acknowledged that neither SC's Ecologist nor Natural England raised objections to the planning application, however this did not alter the Inspector's conclusion that the proposed development would adversely affect the Thatchers Wood and Westwood Covert SSSI by reason of ammonia concentration. (See Planning Appeal APP/L3245/W/21/3289216 - grounds for dismissal).

TPC is therefore not satisfied that the proposed TGV development is unlikely to have a significant detrimental effect on Thatchers Wood and Westward Covert SSSI and Ancient Woodland (AW).

Further, it has just been brought to our attention that the developer has preemptively started work on the TGV by taking out hedgerows thereby already negatively impacting local wildlife. There are two grade II listed buildings within the proposed development site - The Leasowes and Leasowes Farm. The proposed development will present a visual change and a change in landscape character within the setting of the listed buildings. Whilst the view from the rear of the grade II listed The Leasowes would be towards the Community Orchard and neighbourhood park, proposed TGV houses would border the Leasowes gardens and these are well within The Leasowes setting. The Leasowes is set within its own landscaped gardens which were designed to 'borrow' views of the surrounding countryside. The proposed TGV community orchard and neighbourhood park fall well short of mitigating the effect of the proposed development on The Leasowes.

The Barnwell Manor Wind Energy Appeal judgment makes clear that the desirability of preserving the settings of listed buildings must be given "considerable importance and weight" when the decision-maker carries out the balancing exercise. Building 1500 houses and an employment site close to and within Grade II listed The Leasowes' setting therefore cannot be justified. In addition to all this, the football pitch and associated facilities as proposed by the TGV developer are placed immediately next to long established horse paddocks. This raises serious concerns over the welfare and safety of the horses due to noise, particularly on match days; flood lighting; and increased traffic and activity.

The TGV development as proposed would cause significant and longterm harm to the owner of the horse paddocks.

TPC notes that comments supporting the application are primarily based on the developer's offer to provide a football pitch with associated facilities. Whilst we acknowledge this amenity would be positive for some of the local community, and recognise that the developer has offered a quality solution, we do however consider it poorly located within the TGV site as it is far too close to the aforementioned horse paddocks.

Should SC allow this development to go ahead, we strongly advise that the football pitch and associated facilities are located close to the proposed primary school and near the entrance of the development to allow for dual use and ease of access for the increased traffic it would inevitably bring.

It is for all these and previously stated reasons that Tasley Parish Council continues to object to this planning application and respectfully requests that Shropshire Council refuse it.

Tasley Parish Council reserves the right to make further comments.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation
<p>1. This representation is made by Kingsbridge Property Management Services on behalf of Tasley Estates, developers of the consented Tasley Gateway Project (21/05023/OUT), next to the application site, which was approved with no objections under a SAMDev allocation. When that allocation was being negotiated, the Council made it clear that development south-west of the A458 was to be for relocation of the Livestock market and employment space ONLY. Further development adjacent was then stated to be completely out of the question and my client's land was planned based on its allocated use and the assumption that it was next to agricultural land.</p> <p>2. Our clients had objected to the Tasley Garden Village proposal because it did not sit well with their Gateway project. Despite much contact with officers on those objections, we were never able to engage in any discussion on how (if the Garden Village were to be approved) that would impact on development of my client's land SW of the A458.</p> <p>3. Members are well aware that, after a lengthy process, the Shropshire Local Plan Review was abandoned following unfavourable comments from the Planning Inspectors.</p> <p>4. At the time the Local Plan Review was being abandoned, the government was producing the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which, as your officers have pointed out, has left the Council with a deficit in its Housing Land Supply. Bloor Homes and Taylor Wimpey have taken advantage of this deficit to submit the application now before you.</p> <p>5. Our clients have progressed their own Tasley Gateway proposal which provides for relocation of the Livestock Market, some 550 homes, with a Local Centre, Hotel, Pub, Filling Station and significant employment space in which they particularly specialise. Site works are underway.</p> <p>6. Our clients believe the first Tasley Garden Village plan was not well conceived, and despite assertions that the latest iteration incorporates all the required features of a Garden Village, we suggest it is effectively just a large disconnected housing development adjacent to the town with public open space, a primary school and land for employment purposes.</p> <p>7. We find it surprising that there has been absolutely no contact from the applicants - and moreover that the Planning Officer did not insist that they should explore with other stakeholders how a fully comprehensive proposal might be produced.</p> <p>8. Our clients recognise that Shropshire is short of housing land and that the Council has to provide more sites. Their view is that, if it is decided that a large new housing area is to be located at Tasley, it should at least be planned in the best and most comprehensive way. They make the following observations:</p> <p>a) Despite Tasley Gateway plans being in the public domain, the Applicants have ignored inconvenient details, such as the location of the new Livestock Market, in producing their Garden Village Masterplan. They have carefully reproduced details north of the A458 but have chosen not to replicate our client's approved scheme layout on land to the south where the relocated Market was shown, but instead show random buildings that do not correlate with the outline permission. We consider this to be extremely misleading and we suspect is deliberate.</p> <p>b) No account has been taken of the new Livestock Market in the Garden Village Masterplan This was originally sited next to open countryside where it would not impact anyone. Markets cause smells, animal noises, flies and very early traffic and unloading. Introducing a major housing development immediately adjacent, creates a requirement for a buffer zone around the [market/building/livestock pens] from any residential uses. The Applicant's Masterplan shows houses and a school right next to the Market, which will not be permissible.</p> <p>c) A new Market cannot operate with a raft of adverse conditions imposed on its planning consent to protect housing which was never planned to be adjacent. If the Council approves the Garden Village plan it may then seek to impose restrictive conditions on the new Livestock Market at the reserved matters stage. Any restriction (e.g. on hours of operation or keeping livestock in external pens) will render the Livestock Market unviable.</p> <p>d) This will impact on the ability of Tasley Estates to complete its Tasley Gateway project unless it closes the Livestock Market. This is a valued facility for the local farming community and supports approximately 200 jobs. If the Garden Village application is approved in its current form there is a risk of creating a 'Hillside Parks' situation (Hillside Parks Ltd v Snowdonia National Park Authority [2022] UKSC 30) because</p>		

it will be impossible to complete the Tasley Gateway scheme in accordance with its consent.

e) We find it most surprising that the Case Officer has not made any reference to the situation arising from the intended relocation of the Livestock Market, despite all the details being in the public domain.

f) Further, there has been no attempt by the Applicants to explore whether an element of cooperation with Tasley Gateway might be of mutual benefit, save costs and produce a better overall scheme.

g) The Applicants seem intent on demonstrating they can develop their site entirely independently of others. However, it is clear that they cannot provide complete linkages in some locations, nor a pedestrian/cycle bridge over the A458 (as specified in the Council's planning brief) without using third party land.

h) They propose to construct along the A458, a Toucan (at grade) pedestrian crossing next to the Ludlow Rd roundabout (which will interrupt traffic flows) and a new main site roundabout 400m west of the Wenlock Rd junction. (Another obstruction to A458 through traffic).

i) This is in addition to the new 5 leg roundabout my clients will shortly be constructing at the Wenlock Road junction on the A458. That will provide access to the new Livestock Market and could, by agreement, double as a major access into the Application site. It would save significant cost by omitting one roundabout and a length of expensive spine road.

9. Officers suggest that the Evidence Base from the old Garden Village proposal in the abandoned Local Plan Review (which has been 'approved' by Cabinet) can be a 'material consideration' in determining this application. Cabinet does not make planning policy and we believe this is an incorrect assertion.

10. Officers are clearly nervous about the deficit in housing numbers and are keen to get the 1500 units here 'on the books' to help defend against applications elsewhere. We suggest that treating this application as an 'emergency', needing a quick approval, is the wrong approach to making planning decisions of this magnitude and which will have such a major impact on the Bridgnorth community.

11. We believe Members should defer a decision and instruct their officers to discuss the matter with Tasley Estates so that a better plan can be devised.

12. We are also extremely surprised that, despite making a request to speak at the planning meeting, we were told that all the speaking slots had been filled well before the advised deadline. We do not believe this to be a proper or fair way of deciding who should be permitted to speak and will result in Members being unable to put questions to speakers.

We have sent Members a Plan which more accurately combines the Tasley Gateway and Tasley Garden Village Masterplans

Members may wish to ask the applicant/case officer the following important questions:

1. Why has the applicant not shown the correct approved layout for the Tasley Gateway scheme on their masterplan?

Why has there been no dialogue between the applicant and the adjacent Tasley Gateway developer, particularly given that one of the applicants is actively involved in the Tasley Gateway scheme?

3. Why has the case officer not sought to bring parties together to develop a comprehensive strategy combining the 2 developments that would provide greater benefits for Bridgnorth and improved town planning?

4. Why has a primary school and significant housing been located directly behind the proposed Livestock Market?

5. Why has the applicant not approached the Tasley Gateway developer to discuss making use of a large new roundabout for which works are about to commence?

6. How does the applicant propose to provide safe and easy-to-use pedestrian access between the development and the town, and do they have control of all land required to make this happen?

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation
<p>You will have seen our response to Tim Ward regarding the rejection of our request to speak at the hearing. If the Council's position on this remains unchanged, which we feel is wholly inappropriate, given that this application is of major importance to Bridgnorth, then it is imperative that the members are aware of our concerns and are able to ask pertinent questions of the applicant and yourselves about a number of key issues that have not been addressed in your report or in the applicant's submitted documentation.</p> <p>We will shortly be submitting a formal objection on behalf of Tasley Estates, which I send to you and copy in all the development committee members. In essence we are most concerned about the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The applicant has not shown the correct approved layout for the Tasley Gateway scheme on their masterplan – on the basis they have shown our client's masterplan layout to the north of the A458 but not to the south (instead they have chosen to show random buildings here, totally unrelated to the approved scheme), it could be suggested they have sought to mislead members by deliberately not including the full extent of our client's approved masterplan where appropriate, all of which is in the public domain.</li> <li>2. There has been no dialogue between the applicant and our clients Tasley Estates, the adjacent Tasley Gateway developer. This is surprising considering one of the applicants is actively involved in the Tasley Gateway development.</li> <li>3. There has been no attempt by Shropshire Council to bring stakeholder parties together to develop a comprehensive strategy combining the 2 developments that could provide greater benefits for Bridgnorth and improved town planning. As you will know our client has considerable holdings in Bridgnorth and they have always sought to make decisions based on the best outcome for Bridgnorth rather than on a purely commercial basis. To have ignored the opportunity to bring the 2 developers together could be seen as missed potential for the town.</li> <li>4. The applicant is showing a primary school and significant housing directly behind the proposed Livestock Market, which goes against all manner of odour and noise issues.</li> <li>5. The applicant's proposals would prevent the livestock market from relocating to its new location, which has been approved under 21/05023/OUT in accordance with the existing SAMDev, which is the current precedence in the absence of an updated Local Plan. This would therefore bring about the devastating closure of the livestock market, it being a hugely important community and economic asset to South Shropshire and Bridgnorth.</li> <li>6. The applicant has not approached our clients Tasley Estates, the Tasley Gateway developer, to discuss making use of a large new roundabout for which works are about to commence. Our clients would be willing to offer access off the new 5-leg roundabout, which has been designed with potential expansion in mind, but no approach has been made.</li> <li>7. It is unclear as to how the applicant proposes to provide safe and easy-to-use pedestrian access between the development and the town - we believe they will require 3<sup>rd</sup> party land to achieve any connectivity.</li> </ol> <p>Considering the fact that our clients always have a number of live applications with your department, of which you will be aware, it is very disappointing that there has been no contact from yourselves to discuss their application or any of these matters.</p> <p>We believe these issues need to be addressed by yourselves and the applicant before a decision can be made and we are urging the members to therefore defer a decision pending resolution of these concerns.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation
<p>Under the proposed plans, Tasley Garden Village (TGV) does not demonstrably align with the requirements of the current or proposed National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). In particular, the proposal fails to demonstrate that a development of this scale in this location would be socially, economically and environmentally sustainable, as required by Paragraph 8 of the NPPF. Bridgnorth is a historic market town of approximately 12,000 residents. The proposed 1,500 dwellings at TGV, in addition to the 550 already approved nearby, would represent growth well in excess of 2,000 new homes - a transformational increase in housing stock where there is no demonstrable local need. A central concern is the proposal's failure to demonstrate genuine sustainable transport options, despite Bridgnorth's highway network already being under significant pressure. Roads including St John's Street and Salop Street experience prolonged congestion, and air quality monitoring has previously identified regular exceedances of legal emission limits. The proposal does not convincingly show how additional</p>		

traffic from over 2,000 dwellings would avoid exacerbating congestion and air quality deterioration. In addition, Bridgnorth retains a medieval urban form, including narrow carriageways, tight turning geometry, steep gradients, low arches and a historic bridge over the River Severn. These features cannot be meaningfully reconfigured without unacceptable harm. As such, they represent absolute physical constraints on vehicular capacity. The proposal appears to assume mitigation through traffic management rather than structural capacity improvements, but given the inherent physical limitations of the town, the ability to absorb significant additional traffic is fundamentally restricted. Meanwhile, Bridgnorth functions primarily as a commuter settlement, with significant outward flows towards Shrewsbury, Telford and Wolverhampton. The principal connecting routes - the A458, A442 and A454 - are already congested during peak periods and are subject to known accident and bottleneck locations. In the absence of substantial, funded and deliverable upgrades to these corridors, it is reasonable to conclude that additional commuter traffic generated by TGV would worsen congestion and potentially increase accident risk.

At the same time, the geographic location of Bridgnorth presents fundamental sustainable transport challenges. The nearest motorway (M54) is over 14 miles away from TGV by the fastest route, whilst there is no mainline railway station, with the nearest railway station (Cosford) being over 13 miles away. It is highly material that the Shropshire Local Plan, within which TGV was included, was recently withdrawn following identification of significant shortcomings. In particular, it was identified that the Local Plan contained insufficient allocation of development within reasonable proximity to the M54 corridor - the principal strategic transport link between Shrewsbury, Telford and the West Midlands. Bridgnorth was specifically highlighted by the Planning Inspectorate as being poorly related to this key transport corridor, whereas settlements such as Shifnal were identified as more sustainable alternatives due to direct access to the M54 and mainline rail connections.

If Shropshire is expected to contribute toward accommodating Black Country unmet housing need, the M54 corridor provides the most logical and sustainable location for such growth. Telford New Town was historically developed precisely to serve this strategic function, but TGV does not appear to have been reconsidered in light of the withdrawal of the Local Plan, creating a clear disconnect between emerging strategic planning conclusions and the continuation of this proposal.

Alongside this, bus services serving Bridgnorth and Tasley are limited, with no Sunday bus service, no bus station, no bus lanes and no services operating after approximately 7pm. This severely restricts access to employment, education, healthcare and leisure for those without access to a car. Some bus services, meanwhile, are already operating beyond safe capacity, particularly after the closure of all sixth form provision locally, resulting in overcrowding at peak times due to college travel demand. Bridgnorth also has limited taxi provision, so without substantial and secured transport investment, the proposal risks embedding car dependency. Separately, whilst parking provision in Bridgnorth appears relatively high for a town of its size, raw capacity figures do not reflect demand volatility. Bridgnorth functions both as a traditional market town (creating significant weekend demand spikes), and a seasonal tourist destination (creating substantial summer uplift). On market days and during peak tourist periods, town centre car parks frequently operate at or beyond effective capacity. During weekdays and winter months, demand falls considerably. This fluctuation means that average annual utilisation figures mask acute peak stress. The introduction of over 2,000 additional dwellings (approved and proposed combined) would significantly increase baseline parking demand, intensifying congestion in the medieval core and increasing illegal or obstructive parking. The proposal does not demonstrate how these cumulative impacts will be mitigated. It's also important to note that Bridgnorth High Street and Whitburn Street experience high pedestrian volumes, particularly on market days. Pavements are narrow in comparison to road width, resulting in pedestrians walking in the carriageway alongside traffic, creating clear safety conflicts. Additional population growth would increase pedestrian demand, but the proposal does not present any mitigations for this.

Meanwhile, the TGV site lies approximately 1.5 miles from the town centre. Research consistently indicates that walking rates decline significantly beyond 1 mile for regular utilitarian trips, even with high-quality pavements and crossings. Topography further compounds this issue, with the TGV site lying at an elevation of approx. 410ft. This compares to the High Street elevation of approx. 220ft, and a Low Town elevation of approx. 105ft along the Severn. As such, the steep gradient between the TGV site and the town centre presents a substantial barrier to regular walking and cycling, particularly for older residents, children and those with mobility impairments. These constraints are physical and cannot be mitigated through minor infrastructure improvements.

With regards to the design plans for the proposed dwellings, the design documentation refers to "high-quality materials and attention to detail". However, the submitted illustrative material does not convincingly demonstrate that this ambition will be realised. The current proposals appear to rely on a generic volume housebuilder typology that could be replicated in almost any settlement in Britain. The submitted documents do not show a distinctive architectural language rooted in Bridgnorth's character or meaningful variation in building form. For a development of 1,500 dwellings described as a "Garden Village", a far stronger design narrative should be evident at outline stage. The NPPF (Section 12 - Achieving Well-Designed Places) is clear that planning decisions should ensure developments add to the overall quality of the area, are visually attractive as a result of good architecture, are sympathetic to local character and history and establish or maintain a strong sense of place. At present, it is not clear how these tests are

satisfied.

Bridgnorth possesses a highly distinctive built character, shaped by local red sandstone, blue Broseley brick, timber framing and varied rooflines responding to steep topography. The illustrative material for TGV does not demonstrate a clear commitment to using locally distinctive materials or detailing. Instead, elevations appear to rely on standardised brick palettes and house types typical of national housing products. For development at this scale on the edge of a historic market town, greater attention should be given to the use of locally characteristic materials, varied roof pitches and building heights, and gable-fronted forms reflecting Shropshire vernacular. Without this, there is a risk that the development becomes visually disconnected from Bridgnorth's identity.

Concerningly, the proposal to locate a new primary school and new residential properties within close proximity to a planned new livestock market raises serious questions regarding land-use compatibility. Livestock markets are, by their nature, associated with early morning and weekend activity, HGV and trailer movements, noise from animals and loading/unloading, odour, and potential public safety risks. The NPPF is clear that planning decisions should ensure that developments are appropriate for their location, taking into account the likely effects (including noise and general amenity) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment.

There is also a well-established planning principle of avoiding the "agent of change" problem - where new sensitive uses (housing/schools) are introduced next to existing or proposed noise generating uses, leading to future restrictions or operational constraints. The application does not convincingly demonstrate how long-term coexistence between these uses can be secured without future conflict. Similarly, the proposal to include new football pitches within the TGV site raises the potential for further land-use conflict. The proposal situates new pitches within a new residential area, adjacent to long-established horse paddocks. This creates the potential for residential amenity conflict, with football pitches generating regular match-day noise. Spectator activity, car parking demand and evening floodlighting also risk noise/light complaints and limitations on community access. The presence of established horse paddocks adjacent to the proposed pitches is also a material consideration. Horses are sensitive animals, with noise, crowd activity and unpredictable movement associated with football matches having the potential to cause distress or safety concerns. The proposal does not appear to provide adequate buffering, separation distances, or mitigation strategy to prevent such conflict.

On top of this, there appear to be no proposals for alternative sports infrastructure, such as rugby pitches or tennis courts. The NPPF typically requires that sports provision be informed by an up-to-date Playing Pitch Strategy or equivalent. It is not clear that the allocation of land to additional football pitches is proportionate to identified demand, nor that alternative sporting needs have been fairly considered. A balanced community should provide diverse sporting opportunities rather than disproportionately prioritising one sport over others.

Finally, it is noted that Severn Trent have submitted their own representations. Given the cumulative scale of development proposed in Bridgnorth, it is essential that adequate clean water supply is secured without impacting existing residents, wastewater treatment capacity is demonstrably sufficient prior to occupation, surface water and foul drainage strategies are robust and deliverable, and there is no increased risk of flooding or pollution either on-site or downstream. These matters must be fully resolved and secured prior to any grant of permission.

The cumulative infrastructure demands of over 2,000 additional dwellings should not outpace confirmed utility capacity.

In its present form, the application does not provide sufficient evidence that the identified impacts can be adequately mitigated. Until comprehensive and deliverable mitigation is demonstrated across transport, infrastructure, environmental and design matters, the proposal cannot reasonably be considered sound. Determination should therefore be deferred pending the submission and assessment of such evidence.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation
<p>I wish to register my formal objection to the proposed Tasley Garden Village development. I have significant concerns regarding the scale of this proposal and the impact it will have on Bridgnorth and the surrounding areas.</p> <p>In addition to the 550+ homes already approved in Tasley, the further construction of 1,500 properties represents an excessive and disproportionate level of expansion for a town with a current population of approximately 12,000 residents. Combined, these developments could increase the population by up to 50% depending on household size and property type. The development already approved will place considerable pressure on the town; the addition of the Tasley Garden Village scheme risks pushing local capacity to the point of saturation.</p> <p>Bridgnorth's existing infrastructure is already struggling to meet current demand. The mitigation measures and incentives proposed by the developers are insufficient to address the substantial additional pressures this development would create. Transport links for commuters are limited, resulting in a high reliance on road travel. This inevitably increases traffic volumes and contributes to the deterioration of local road surfaces, which are already in frequent need of maintenance and repair.</p>		

Beyond infrastructure concerns, the development would also have a detrimental impact on the environmental landscape surrounding Bridgnorth.  
For these reasons I strongly object to the Tasley Garden Village application.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
----------	-----------------	-------------

5	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation
---	--------------	-----------------------

We live at Tiddlebrook House Telegraph Lane Bridgnorth, our property has a boundary with Tiddlebrook and we have riparian responsibilities. It is our understanding that it is unlawful to drain water into your neighbours property. Based on UK drainage law, developers cannot artificially channel water, such as from roofs /drainpipes/ paved roads, onto a neighbours property OR into a watercourse in a way that increases the volume, speed, And risk of flooding. If the developers actions cause flooding or damage we may be able to take civil action. If a developer causes an increase in flooding they risk a claim for an injunction to stop the flow and, or, damages. New developments should not increase peoples exposure to the long term impacts of climate change, such as increased flood risk. The developer has openly admitted they will channel water into Tiddlebrook. Even if done in the way they describe, IT IS STILL UNLAWFUL. Laws are there for a reason and nobody is above the law. By allowing this development, each of you are actively encouraging flood risk. The council is already aware we have problems with flooding and an inadequate culvert.  
We object to this planning application and respectfully request that it be refused.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
----------	-----------------	-------------

5	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation
---	--------------	-----------------------

Would hope that consideration is given to a 30mph speed limit from the top of the dual carriageway towards the existing livestock market (A458). Requires protection of the existing trees, hedges and wildlife that line the A458 / Wenlock Rise Estate.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
----------	-----------------	-------------

5	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation
---	--------------	-----------------------

will have on the lives of the people of Bridgnorth and the wider impact on the areas radiating west, eg Much Wenlock and the already highly congested A458 road. The egress from this vast estate over the road system each day and the subsequent impact on the pinch points, over the river, the Gaskell corner and Harley Hill in Much Wenlock;pollution;damage to wildlife through environmental impact of run off of water. The damage to existing mature and increasingly rare trees already affected by global weather changes; the impact on schools and other services and not least the ever increasing demise of this nation to retain food security in an ever dangerous world. Finally the terrible impact of the people who already live in the area whose lives will be changed forever by the effects of this over sized development. The balance of benefit to destruction is unequal.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
----------	-----------------	-------------

5	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation
---	--------------	-----------------------

These houses are Not wanted Not needed ,why is shropshire council trying to destroy Bridgnorth..The roads ,The schools ,The health care, The infrastructure. But im sure the envelopes would have been filled . Disgraceful. Only people to gain are the house builders

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
----------	-----------------	-------------

5	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation
---	--------------	-----------------------

Wish to register my formal objection to the proposed Tasley Garden Village development. I have significant concerns regarding the scale of this proposal and the impact it will have on Bridgnorth and the surrounding areas.  
In addition to the 550+ homes already approved in Tasley, the further construction of 1,500 properties represents an excessive and disproportionate level of expansion for a town  
The town's infrastructure cannot support the existing population so to add this huge development is madness

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation
<p>There is so much I could say to object to this application, but I am an individual at ground level so can only add my voice to the perfectly articulated objections by Tasley Parish Council and Councillor Huw Rees. Will you do more than skim through the many valid points you have constantly failed to observe? I very much doubt it. The pre-emptive work already causing complete chaos on Wenlock Rise since January is bringing all manner of filth and works traffic onto our residential estate. Done deals long ago at a level higher than we are permitted to reach. It stinks.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation
<p>I object to this proposed large scale development which should not be viewed in isolation as the already approved planning for Tasley Gateway which would take the new housing total to 2,050 homes and would increase the population by more than 40% from 12,000 to 17,000. The infrastructure of Bridgnorth and its surrounding areas is already at breaking point and will not be able to handle this many (or any!) more people relying on its roads, healthcare, car parks, leisure facilities, etc. Bridgnorth is already struggling to handle its current population level. Instead of building on green belt and increasing pressure on already stretched small towns, build on the plethora of derelict brown land that's available around the West Midlands and actually needs constructed green spaces.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation
<p>Having read all of the objections raised by Tasley Parish Council, Bridgnorth Town Council and 350+ Objectors, it is disappointing that Shropshire Planners have recommended to approve a development that is inappropriate - too large, in the wrong location, with insufficient infrastructure going forward. TVG would be reliant on Bridgnorth's infrastructure - services and amenities which are already stretched. It is hoped that the Shropshire Planning Committee will support Bridgnorth/Tasley and the community by refusing this application.</p> <p>Scale</p> <p>This proposed large scale development should not be viewed in isolation as the already approved planning for Tasley Gateway would take the new housing total to 2050 homes, which would increase the population by more than 40% from 12,000 to 17,000. The proposed TVG is an extension of Bridgnorth, albeit 1.5 miles from the town centre and intersected by the A458. The map at the beginning of the Shropshire Council's Development Management Report is a good example of the sheer size of the proposed development to present day Bridgnorth. Unfortunately, the approved Tasley Gateway development and relocated Livestock Market is not shown on this map (this can be viewed on the planning application ref 21/05023/OUT - Location Plan).</p> <p>Developers incentives</p> <p>The spurious incentives offered by the developer do not mitigate the damage that this development would have on Bridgnorth/Tasley and its community.</p> <p>The incentives include:</p> <p>Affordable Housing:</p> <p>Should be close to employment and amenities.</p> <p>This is not the case as there is little employment locally so accessing employment will necessitate travelling outside of Bridgnorth. It is 1.5 miles to access amenities and services - a distance that may be difficult for the elderly, children and those with poor mobility or disabilities.</p> <p>Primary School:</p> <p>In the Shropshire Council's Development Management Report it states</p> <p>4.1.1 "Contribution to support the delivery of the primary school infrastructure"</p> <p>6.4.2 "The provision of the 2ha serviced site to allow the Council to provide the new 2 form entry primary school"</p> <p>Is this just the land and connection to services? Are the council paying for the building and fitting out? 2 entry level forms are of no value (only 60 children). The developer states this will meet the needs of the new community. This would not be the case as there would be older children moving onto the development - do we have the school capacity? Plus no 6th form in Bridgnorth necessitating children travelling out of</p>		

town.

On or off-site medical centre facilities (provision determined by ICB):

The funding requested by Integrated Care Board is only for basic fitting out of the space available at BMC and does not include equipment/furnishings etc.

The developers state that some of the new residents of TGV would already be registered with BMC but the properties they vacate will have new residents moving in (they will not be left empty!).

BMC is already stretched and there is a shortage of Doctors at the practice so it is assumed this will be an ongoing issue.

There is no dedicated parking.

Country Park:

We are a rural community and have access to many country parks, countryside and trails in close proximity.

Football pitches and facilities:

Whilst these facilities are needed and supported by Spartans (80%+ of the Supporter Comments relate to the provision of these facilities) it does not address any other sports or leisure requirements.

Additionally, these facilities are proposed next to existing horse paddocks and would cause noise and movement issues from crowd activity.

The existing sports/leisure facility at Bridgnorth Endowed School will not have the capacity for an additional 5000 residents.

Wider Highways Work:

Primarily, these are only being provided to access the development and not to support the additional traffic that will be generated. Congestion in the town and at junctions is already problematic, and emission levels already exceed safe limits at some junctions. Additionally, the old bridge is currently undergoing inspection regarding foundation issues.

Vehicle Movements

It is worth noting that the data stats (TRICS) provided by the developer to calculate the number of daily vehicle trips from the proposed TGV are 2011 stats (15 years out of date!).

Even utilising the OUT OF DATE TRICS data provided the proposed development would generate 9,479 2-way vehicle trips per day. If the TG development is taken into account that would be an additional 2,846 2-way vehicle trips per day. Totalling 12,325 2-way vehicle trips per day. That is a significant daily increase of vehicles for the roads and junctions in and around Bridgnorth, especially at peak times! Local roads are not suitable for this density of traffic and are already in need of significant maintenance, repair and updating.

Establish a new bus service:

This is primarily due to the fact that the proposed development will generate the necessity for those residents without cars to commute to access employment, as well as 6th form/college education, healthcare, and sports/leisure. The existing bus services would not be adequate to absorb the number of additional passengers. Bridgnorth has no train service and poor road links to larger towns offering employment opportunities.

Parking

The parking in the town is insufficient. Shopping at supermarkets at the weekend (and at peak times during the week) is difficult as car parks are overflowing - especially in the summer when Bridgnorth has many visitors who utilise all day parking at Sainsbury's and public car parks. Obstructive and illegal parking in the town and residential areas is already an issue and would increase.

The developers addressed the parking issue by suggesting that parking charges for the day should be increased to disincentivise people from accessing the town by car! Bridgnorth is a popular holiday, short break or day trip destination which brings much needed revenue to support businesses in the town so parking charge increases is not a solution.

Specialist Housing for Older People

What is meant by specialist?

How many?

The site is too remote from the town centre for easy access to amenities and services for elderly people.

There are numerous reasons to refuse this application which have been well documented in the 350+ Objection Comments.

These include:

Overdevelopment of local area

Lack of a robust infrastructure and detrimental impact on existing infrastructure

Impact on character and appearance of local area

<p>Impact on highways, traffic congestion and parking pressures          Inability to demonstrate requirement for an additional 1500 houses as 550 already approved          Noise and Pollution          Lack of sufficient local employment necessitating commuting          Healthcare provision - services already under pressure          Severn Trent Water concerns regarding water quality, sewage, drainage and flooding          Environmental impact - biodiversity, trees and flood risk          Loss of green belt, agricultural land</p>		
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Originator:</b>
5	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation
<p>For such growth. Telford New Town was historically developed precisely to serve this strategic function, but TGV does not appear to have been reconsidered in light of the withdrawal of the Local Plan, creating a clear disconnect between emerging strategic planning conclusions and the continuation of this proposal.</p>		
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Originator:</b>
5.	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation
<p>This application is rushed, poorly thought out and fails to act to enhance the town of Bridgnorth and surrounding area. Such a large development should enhance the local community but this one does not. There has been no coordination between this proposal and a similar but slightly smaller housing development only 50 yards away on the other side of the A458. For the planning team not to link these two proposals is ridiculous. Together these two proposals will increase the number of houses in the Bridgnorth area by over 2000 homes. This lack of coordination will see the relocation of a livestock market into the area that the Tasley Garden Village development is located with the ludicrous outcome that we might have primary school playgrounds next to the livestock market. There is an absolute lack of 'joined up thinking' which will result in a poorly planned large housing development on the edge of Bridgnorth.</p> <p>This poor planning can also be seen in the lack of any real sustainable measures being built into these plans. Without adequate public transport infrastructure in place, this development will lead to a significant increase in the amount of traffic moving in and around what is a medieval market town with already overcrowded, polluted and inadequate roads.</p> <p>I fully understand that there are several positive outcomes from increasing housing provision, especially social and affordable homes in the Bridgnorth area but this proposal is poorly thought out, does not coordinate other developments and as such will be highly detrimental.</p> <p>I fully understand the pressure to build more homes but to do so with such a lack of thought and consideration for the notion of community is unacceptable. It is clear that this proposal needs to be deferred so that greater thought for the wider impacts can be mitigated for and specific conditions linked to transport and the need to bring this new housing development into the wider community of Bridgnorth in a way that recognises the needs of the existing town is vital.</p> <p>This cannot become an administrative exercise to provide a tick in a box to allow more houses that lacks thought coordination and cooperation with the existing residents. Decisions made now will have long lasting impacts. Take your time, cooperate and coordinate to get it right.</p>		
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Originator:</b>
5.	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation
<p>Awful idea for Bridgnorth, the infrastructure can't &amp; won't support that number of houses and further residents let alone the medical practice which is already a nightmare to get an appointment.</p>		
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Originator:</b>
5.	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation
<p>Bridgnorth can't possibly sustain this amount of new housing.          Police presence almost non-existent          Drs can't cope with existing numbers of residents          Schools intake already oversubscribed          Nothing for young people to do          Poor public transport          Even plans are to expand these services there is a shortage of Drs, Teachers and Police Officers, not to mention lack of money.</p>		

The amount of new residents housed in 1500 homes is off the scale.  
I absolutely object to this development

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
----------	-----------------	-------------

5.	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation
----	--------------	-----------------------

I wish to register my strong objection to the above planning application on the grounds that the proposed development would increase the size of the town by approximately 35%, placing an unsustainable strain on local infrastructure and significantly reducing the quality of life for existing residents.

Local healthcare services are already operating beyond capacity. Residents routinely struggle to secure GP appointments, with waiting times increasing year on year. Adding thousands of new residents without any guaranteed, funded expansion of medical facilities will exacerbate an already critical situation. The proposal does not demonstrate how essential healthcare provision will be expanded to meet the increased demand especially with outlying villages medical practices closing.

Both primary and secondary schools in the area are oversubscribed. Many families already face difficulty securing places for their children. The situation is even more concerning for post 16 education: there is currently no provision within the town, meaning students must travel elsewhere to continue their studies. This development would dramatically increase the number of school age children without offering any credible plan to expand educational infrastructure at all levels.

The existing road network is not capable of absorbing the additional traffic this development would generate. Congestion is already a daily issue, with key routes frequently gridlocked at peak times. The proposal fails to provide realistic solutions for managing increased vehicle volume, and the likely rise in commuter traffic will worsen air quality, journey times, and road safety.

A 35% population increase is not a minor adjustment it represents a fundamental transformation of the town. Such a dramatic expansion requires long-term, strategic planning across all public services, transport, utilities, and community facilities. This application does not provide evidence of coordinated infrastructure investment or partnership with relevant service providers. Without this, the development risks overwhelming the town's capacity and undermining its character and liveability.

The development would result in the permanent loss of valuable greenbelt land, which exists specifically to prevent urban sprawl, protect the countryside, and maintain the distinct identity of rural communities. This area is home to a rich variety of wildlife and supports important natural habitats that contribute to the town's biodiversity. Once these landscapes are built over, they cannot be restored. The application fails to demonstrate how such a significant environmental loss would be mitigated or compensated.

The town is widely recognised as a rural tourist attraction, valued for its natural beauty, open spaces, and biodiversity. Visitors come precisely because the area offers an unspoilt countryside experience. A development of this scale would fundamentally alter the character of the town, replacing green vistas with dense housing and increased traffic. This risks undermining the local tourism economy, which relies heavily on the preservation of the town's rural charm and environmental quality.

For these reasons, I strongly urge the planning authority to reject this application. The scale of the proposed development is disproportionate to the town's existing infrastructure, and without substantial, guaranteed investment in healthcare, education, transport, and community services, it would be irresponsible to approve it.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
----------	-----------------	-------------

5	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation
---	--------------	-----------------------

This plan is grossly disproportionate to our rural town and to our surrounding countryside. The town's population is currently approximately 12000 people. Assuming an average of even 3 people in each household on this development would add approximately 4500 people to our town. How is our infrastructure to cope? Our roads- already in a dismal state of repair? Our schools, many already oversubscribed, our healthcare service (within which it is already almost impossible to get doctors appointment) That's all before you even consider the character of our town which we will lose. We are a tourist town, priding ourselves on our history and our community. This development will fundamentally destroy that. As for the location of the development, it would also destroy a huge area of countryside, hedgerows and so, decimate wildlife in the area. This development is entirely wrong for our beloved town!

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Originator:</b>
5	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation
<p>I am writing to object to the Tasley Garden Village. Planning Application 25/01722/OUT</p> <p>There is no local demand for the number of houses proposed and if the scheme is intended to meet demand arising from the Black Country, the site's location on the south-western side of the town is illogical from a transport and sustainability perspective and would considerably exacerbate traffic congestion. These houses would simply be on the wrong side of the town.</p> <p>Bridgnorth's road infrastructure is already operating beyond its effective capacity and is struggling to accommodate current traffic volumes. The additional traffic generated by the 550 dwellings approved and under construction at Tasley Gateway will place further unsustainable pressure on the network. If this additional development is permitted, a Section 106 agreement must require substantial upgrades to the local road infrastructure to mitigate the cumulative impact of existing and proposed housing growth.</p> <p>To mitigate the impact on the existing Air Quality Management Areas (AQMAs), the minimum requirement must include the provision of dedicated bus and car drop-off/collection facilities for both Oldbury Wells School and Castlefields Primary School between the bypass and school playing fields. These measures are necessary to reduce peak-time congestion generally and associated emissions on Pound Street, Oldbury Wells Road and Conduit Lane.</p> <p>To mitigate the impact of increased vehicle journeys on the town generally and Low Town Bridge and given the existing constraints at the Bridge and the cumulative impact of approved and proposed development, a legally enforceable weight prohibition and clearly defined HGV diversion strategy are essential. This must be supported by comprehensive upgrades to Telegraph Lane, Westwood Lane and Halfway House Lane to provide a suitable alternative route.</p> <p>If planning permission is to be granted it must be subject to the developer fully funding all required highway, air quality and traffic mitigation measures. These obligations must be secured through legally binding and enforceable Section 106 agreements to ensure that the impacts of the development are properly mitigated and that local taxpayers are not required to subsidise the necessary infrastructure improvements.</p> <p>Even with these measures the quality of life for residents will be severely affected by this development and without them the 1,500 houses will ruin our town.</p>		
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Originator:</b>
5	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation
<p>I have lived in Bridgnorth for nearly 40 years and have seen many changes. In my view the road infrastructure in and around Bridgnorth, and Tasley in particular, is already at breaking point trying to cope with the vehicles of those who live here, those who visit and the lorries and vehicles that service the town. It is not only about the land to build houses, it is about road access to those houses and the access to the rest of the town for those who occupy them. The moment any road works happen the town already becomes grid locked. I firmly believe that this proposal should be rejected for the good of the town because the pressure it will put on roads already under pressure and often not coping will only be to the detriment of our community. Just because you can do something/pass something, doesn't mean you should.</p>		
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Originator:</b>
5	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation
<p>Our local services are already struggling. The roads are full of pot holes and the community is struggling. Priority should be given to those of us who already live in Bridgnorth. The houses will add more traffic to an already busy town we don't have the capacity and the budget to keep up with our current population yet alone more.</p>		
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Originator:</b>
5	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation
<p>I strongly object to the 1500 house development proposal. I have lived in Bridgnorth my entire life and do not understand how the town would cope with an additional 1500 houses. There has already been a 300+</p>		

house development approved which has already commenced work. This along with the old Council building that was demolished with a view to being houses. In recent years there has been three retirement apartment complexes built meaning the town has already seen increasing populations, which in turn, has caused huge impacts on schools and doctors.

The impact on green belt land too is catastrophic. They have already ripped all the trees out on the auction sites to make way for the approved development which will have a huge detrimental effect on wildlife on Church Lane so yet another monstrous development will be even worse.

The new development of this garden village will mean there are three massive new build sites all in close proximity in Tasley Village. I wholeheartedly object and I really really hope that the views of the local people are actually listened to and acted upon but I fear given that work has already started to remove trees that it is already a done deal and my objection, along with hundreds of others, may be in vain

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation

I am writing to formally object to the proposed development of 1,500 homes and associated village infrastructure in Bridgnorth, located a short distance from my home.

While I recognise the need for housing, this proposal is wholly disproportionate to the size and capacity of our small market town and would place unsustainable pressure on already stretched local infrastructure and services.

My objections are as follows:

**1. Overstretched Infrastructure and Services:**

Bridgnorth's GP surgeries, dental services, and schools are already operating at or beyond capacity. Securing routine medical appointments is increasingly difficult, and school places are limited. An additional 1,500 homes could equate to several thousand new residents, significantly exacerbating these pressures.

**2. Traffic and Highway Safety:**

Traffic congestion is already a serious concern, particularly during peak hours. The proposed development would dramatically increase vehicle movements, placing additional strain on local roads, junctions, and parking. This raises concerns about road safety, particularly for pedestrians, cyclists, and school children.

**3. Impact on Local Character and Landscape:**

Bridgnorth is valued for its historic character, countryside setting, and community feel. A development of this scale risks fundamentally altering the character of the town, resulting in urban sprawl and the loss of greenfield land. The scale of the proposal appears excessive and out of keeping with the nature of the area.

**4. Environmental and Drainage Concerns:**

There are legitimate concerns about drainage capacity, surface water runoff, and increased flood risk. Given existing pressures on drainage systems, it is unclear how this development can be accommodated without the situation worsening.

**5. Proximity to Existing Homes:**

Being in close proximity to my home, this development would significantly impact residential amenity through increased noise, traffic, pollution, light intrusion, and loss of outlook. The cumulative effect on residents in this immediate area has not been adequately addressed.

**6. Lack of Demonstrated Local Need at This Scale:**

A development of 1,500 homes represents a substantial expansion of the town. I question whether this scale aligns proportionately with local housing need and the capacity of the town to absorb such growth sustainably.

For these reasons, I respectfully request that the Council refuses this application.

Bridgnorth is a thriving but small community. Growth must be sustainable and proportionate. This proposal, in its current form, does not meet that standard.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5.	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation

I strongly object

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5.	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation
<p>The development will adversely affect the infrastructure of the town. Medical facilities, schools, parking, wildlife to mention a few. The only employment of any note will be during building works, most of whom will be from other areas. I note some steps have already been taken to develop land, by stealth, most certainly not transparent. The only reason this development will be approved is financial gain to the detriment of local population. There is no doubt in my mind this is a fait accompli. Shropshire Council should hang their heads in shame.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation
<p>I believe with the additional planned houses to be built up near Tasley that an additional 1500 houses is too much for the infrastructure of Bridgnorth to cope with. Access roads into Bridgnorth are already grid locked at peak times. GP practice will not have capacity. No thought seems to have been given to these crucial factors. Secondary schools in Bridgnorth are already at capacity. Where will children go to senior school. Bridgnorth is already at capacity. Totally object to the proposed plans. I do not believe due consideration to the impact on Bridgnorth's infrastructure has not been taken into account.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5.	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation
<p>I object to the plans for these homes to be built. This is because there isn't the infrastructure now to sustain the people already living within the town and surrounding areas. Between greedy landowners, developers and the SC, you are all responsible for destroying this beautiful town. Draining the life from what is already a depleted and asset-stripped town that can't look after its own now, let alone with 1500 new homes. Disgraceful.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5.	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation
<p>My objection is based on the following planning grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Traffic and Highway Safety</b> The proposed development is likely to significantly increase traffic in the area, which already experiences congestion and limited visibility at junctions. This raises concerns about pedestrian and road safety.</li> <li><b>Impact on Local Infrastructure</b> Local services such as schools, healthcare, drainage, and parking are already under pressure. The application does not demonstrate how this additional demand will be adequately addressed.</li> <li><b>Character of the Area</b> The scale and density of the proposed development are not in keeping with the existing character of the surrounding properties and landscape.</li> <li><b>Environmental Concerns</b> There may be impacts on wildlife, green space, trees, and surface water drainage that have not been fully assessed or mitigated.</li> </ol>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5.	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation
<p>Current infrastructure cannot cope with existing population. This is the killing of a small market town. Once it's gone it's gone. You cannot reclaim green belt, nor a historic market town. It is the responsibility of the current leadership to protect our country's heritage for future generations. Not sell it off for private profiteering and increases in council tax revenue. Bridgnorth has been used as an asset and stripped since Bridgnorth Council relinquished power. The focus should be on developing the existing infrastructure to help local businesses thrive, generating the income by effectively exporting goods and services. Not by just selling it off.</p>		

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5.	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation
<p>The planned development of 1500 homes in, what is already a tightly packed market town, is nothing but ridiculous. The walk into the town centre, from where this proposed development is to take place, will take the best part of 20-25 minutes, and not everyone in these 1500 new homes is going to want to walk into town, especially when the weather is bad. They will drive.</p> <p>This in itself creates a massive problem for the town centre, as anyone who visits it on a week day, yet alone a weekend day, knows how difficult it is to get parked. Cars are parked up as far as Innage Lane and Richmond Gardens. I'm sure this causes much frustration for the residents who live on these streets. This also causes havoc in the mornings and afternoons on the school run (there are two Primary Schools and one Secondary School in the area I talk about here). Many of these 2 way streets are reduced to one lane. 1500 new homes isn't going to help this situation, the congestion will double. As the Government is on a drive to reduce pollution and greenhouse gases don't allow this development to happen here.</p> <p>Also, the amount of illegal parking in town during the day is rife, probably due to the congested town car parks. Blue badge holders, although not illegal, will park all over double yellow lined streets creating visual hazards for pedestrians and other road users alike. This is particularly dangerous for children who can't see over these vehicles. The bottom of Cliff Road and Northgate, outside The Bear pub, is a case in point, especially at weekends. I am amazed no one has been run over. The traffic from the planned development will only exacerbate this existing problem.</p> <p>The now privately owned car parks on the Smithfield, and in between the hospital and Sainsburys do not help. They used to be free to park on after 6pm, but this is not the case now. People will park anywhere after 6pm in the hope that the Traffic Inspector has clocked off. Visit Cliff Road on a Thursday night and you will see how bad this problem is. Surely the council have the power to open these large car parks up at night so people can park for free and enjoy the amenities that Bridgnorth has to offer? If you take a look at these car parks in the evening they are empty. Yet the double yellow lined roads are full of parked cars. This in itself is crazy!</p> <p>In conjunction with a Doctors surgery, where it is nigh on impossible to get an appointment, this planned development is not a good idea. Why spoil the town? Surely there are areas closer to Wolverhampton prime for this kind of development. A larger City or Town has the infrastructure already in place to deal with such a large development, not Bridgnorth. Yes, it is a pretty market town and people want to live here, but keep on building and that will soon change. The development up by Nock Deighton auction house is already an eyesore. In the words of Joni Mitchell "They paved paradise and put up a parking lot"... In our case here... "They paved paradise and put up a Lidl and 1500 houses that all look the same". Please re-think.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation
<p>I totally object to the garden village I live on Wenlock rise all the house there is no parking on here  The doctors in town won't can't cater for more yet you all agree to keep building  Your ripping out trees hedgerows what is happening to all the wildlife that has lived there for years  The high street is a mess the roads are a mess and yet you want to keep building and ruin the countryside  Where is all our money going  Your all willing to ruin the countryside  My thought is who is getting the benefits from  Who agrees</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	25/01722/OUT	Cllr Huseman
<p>I understand that I'm to late to register a question for planning and that its not like the other committee meetings so I can't just ask a question as leader.</p> <p>I've had issues with the 114 bus in my district and I understand that others have too. There are also problems with companies not wanting to take on routes and there are issues with a lack of changeover and rest facilities for drivers. I have had a meeting with Richard Davies who talked me through the situation and I would like to propose that IF the Tasley development goes ahead that a 106 requirement is built into the scheme to create a bus interchange facility on the Tasley site to act as a stop for all local services to</p>		

use. This would not only help with my local bus service but others too and would avoid the current congestion issues caused in Bridgnorth High Town by buses having to stop and wait.

What is the best way of me getting this request/suggestion to the planning team. Write in or can one of our planning committee councillors ask/propose this on my behalf tomorrow?

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation

Why would you locate a development of this size on the opposite side of the river from where the majority of people work. There is only one bridge to cater for a significant increase in car numbers travelling to Telford, Kidderminster, Birmingham M54. In the highways assessment there is no reference to likely destination journeys, which given that the scheme is to cater for black country overflow, is likely to be across the one bridge using the above noted routes.

No reference is made to the increased traffic during summer season to holiday homes and caravans located near to the proposed development, again, how is this catered for on the existing roads and what are the expert views on this.

Chaos Chaos Chaos

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5.	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation

This application appears rushed, poorly considered, and fails to enhance the town of Bridgnorth or its surrounding area. A development of this scale should deliver clear benefits to the local community; however, this proposal does not do so.

There has been no meaningful coordination between this application and a similar, though slightly smaller, housing development located only 50 yards away on the opposite side of the A458. The failure of the planning authority to consider these proposals together is deeply concerning. When combined, the two developments will increase housing in the Bridgnorth area by over 2,000 homes. This lack of joined-up planning risks serious unintended consequences, including the proposed relocation of the livestock market into the area designated for the Tasley Garden Village development. The prospect of primary school playgrounds being located adjacent to a livestock market highlights the absurd outcomes that can arise from such poor coordination.

This absence of strategic, integrated thinking will result in a large, poorly planned housing development on the edge of Bridgnorth, undermining the character and functionality of the town.

The deficiencies in planning are further evident in the lack of credible sustainability measures within the proposal. Without adequate public transport infrastructure, this development will inevitably lead to a substantial increase in traffic. Bridgnorth is a medieval market town with narrow, constrained roads that are already congested, polluted, and inadequate. Adding significant additional traffic without robust mitigation measures will exacerbate these existing problems and reduce the quality of life for residents.

I fully acknowledge the need to increase housing provision, particularly the delivery of social and affordable homes within the Bridgnorth area. However, this proposal fails to properly consider its wider impacts, does not align with neighbouring developments, and is therefore likely to be highly detrimental overall.

While there is clear pressure to deliver new housing, doing so with such limited consideration for community cohesion, infrastructure capacity, and long-term sustainability is unacceptable. This application should be deferred to allow for a more comprehensive assessment of cumulative impacts, particularly in relation to transport, land use compatibility, and integration with the existing town. Any future approval must be subject to clear and enforceable conditions that ensure this development is properly connected to, and supportive of, the wider Bridgnorth community.

This must not become a purely administrative exercise designed to meet housing targets without regard for planning quality or local impact. Decisions taken now will have long-lasting consequences. Time should be taken to cooperate, coordinate, and plan properly to ensure the right outcome for both existing residents and future communities.

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Originator:</b>
5	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation sent to Mr Stuart Anderson MP
<p>Dear Mr Anderson,</p> <p>I hope you are well. I am writing further to my previous correspondence regarding the proposed 1,500-home development and associated sports facilities near Bridgnorth, you have previously offered of support on this matter, and it was greatly appreciated.</p> <p>As a local constituent, this matter directly affects my established equestrian land use. I am becoming increasingly concerned that, whilst the outline application progresses, there is insufficient clarity around how noise and lighting impacts will be mitigated at the boundary of my land.</p> <p>My field has lawful equestrian use, including planning permission granted approximately ten years ago for a horse ménage. The current parameter plans show sports pitches surrounding my boundaries. Although I understand this is outline permission and details will follow at reserved matters stage, the principle of surrounding an existing equestrian use with multiple pitches raises legitimate concerns regarding cumulative noise, floodlighting, and long-term compatibility.</p> <p>I am not opposing housing or community sport. I am simply seeking reassurance that meaningful and enforceable mitigation will be secured, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequate buffer distances between pitches and my boundary</li> <li>• Robust acoustic mitigation (beyond landscaping alone)</li> <li>• Strict controls on floodlighting and light spill</li> <li>• A formal noise and lighting impact assessment that specifically considers the adjacent equestrian use.</li> </ul> <p>I would be extremely grateful if you could lend your support in ensuring that these protections are properly considered and secured as part of the planning process. At present, I feel that my concerns are being deferred due to the outline nature of the application, which is causing significant uncertainty.</p>		
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Originator:</b>
5	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation
<p>This development is not suitable for the area. There is no chance of local employment opportunities to fulfil the needs so the majority of residents will have to commute. This will have a huge increase on pollutants, degradation of roads and processing of raw sewerage which already is overloaded resulting in spills into the River Severn.</p> <p>Unless there is an absolute guarantee of sufficient schools and medical facilities with GP supplies before house building commences this development should be rejected.</p>		
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Originator:</b>
5.	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation
<p>I realise the town has to grow and it would naturally but not on this scale. The impact of a development of this size to the local community is huge. There is not enough infrastructure, even though there is a new store, school planned, the devastation to wild life, impact loosing farm land. There is not enough jobs, the town is already stretched, its loosing its identity. It appears to be cut and dried as works has already started with the removal of hedges on Shrewsbury Rd and Church Lane. Houses are not in keeping with the town architecture- just boxes - please look to reduce the scale of this development</p>		
<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Originator:</b>
5.	25/01722/OUT	Bridgnorth Town Council
<p>Further comment from Bridgnorth Town Council - 25/01722/OUT</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This comment is provided by Bridgnorth Town Council following publication of the Planning Officer's report for consideration at Shropshire Council's Southern Planning Committee meeting on 24th February 2026</li> <li>2. The Bridgnorth area already has a committed scheme for 550 homes, employment development and</li> </ol>		

relocation of the existing Livestock market (a valuable resource for the local rural economy) under 21/05023/OUT - the Tasley Gateway development. The proposed masterplan for the Garden Village development, which is key to all of the impact assessments which have been made, conflicts with the approved plans for that development and could jeopardise its delivery. Further, the proposed masterplan does not comply with site guidelines for this area, as draft allocation BRD030 in the now abandoned draft local plan 2016-2038, and which specifically required an appropriate buffer around the identified site for relocating the livestock market. That on its own is reason for the Committee to refuse this application.

3. The Tasley Garden Village proposed site was originally included in the draft Local Plan as a site (BRD030) for 1,050 homes plus employment, country park, etc. The robustness of that allocation was never tested at Examination and we would have contested that if the examination process had reached that stage.

4. The number of homes proposed for the site has now increased by 49%, and the employment area reduced by 9%, compared with that initial draft allocation. We further consider that the proposal is not a "garden village". The employment element in particular does not appear to comply with the site guidelines included in the draft local plan, which read: "Employment provision will represent an intrinsic element of the development, occurring alongside and cross-subsidised by the provision of housing. Employment land will be located in a gateway location on the site and be of a high-quality design and layout. It provides an opportunity for freehold employment land targeted towards office and research and development uses. In this way it will complement wider employment opportunities in Bridgnorth and contribute towards the objectives of the Shropshire Economic Growth Strategy."

5. The usage proposed for the employment land is now "office, industrial, storage and distribution" which seems somewhat less ambitious than what was included in the draft local plan. It also doesn't provide anything like enough potential employment for the additional population.

6. The Socio-economic and health section of the applicant's Environmental Statement indicates at table 5.25 that the employment provision could support 814 jobs, and at para 5.5.31 it indicates the employment needs of the resident population would be 1,674 jobs. In other words, the development would only provide 49% of the jobs its resident population would need. This fails the sustainability requirement to reduce the need to travel. Additionally, members of the committee should be aware that it can be quite difficult to persuade employers to come to Bridgnorth, and we are not given any information about how the applicants propose to cross-subsidise the employment development as required by BRD030 and ensure it is delivered on a timely basis.

7. The proposed local plan allocation was made at a time when the Tasley Gateway site was an allocation in the previous Local Plan (SAMDev) but had not yet achieved consent. During the Examination process, BRD030 was identified as potentially addressing a housing land shortfall in the Black Country. Given the extent of committed housing at Tasley Gateway, the open market housing elements of this proposal would appear to be mainly geared towards attracting buyers from outside of the local area. That proposition calls the sustainability of the proposal into question, since one of the key aspects of sustainability is reducing the need to travel.

8. The report portrays the problems caused by this scheme as moderate, claims they can be mitigated, and paints a picture of the economic benefits far outweighing the problems. That is really far too simplistic.

9. The economic gain ostensibly comes from the spending power of the people who would move to Bridgnorth and occupy these homes. There is no guarantee whatsoever that the additional household spending, whether it be on shopping, leisure activities, or anything else would remain in Bridgnorth or even in Shropshire. That is why we asked for funding for studies into our retail sector, the capacity of our leisure facilities, and our town centre infrastructure in our submission in June 2025. There is no sign in the planning officer's report that those requests have even been considered, notwithstanding that Shropshire Council was made aware of them 8 months ago.

10. The proposed development, in combination with the approved Tasley Gateway development, would represent a transformational change to Bridgnorth. The projected population increase amounts to adding roughly 1/3rd to the that of the urban area of Bridgnorth, possibly in as little as 10 years. By contrast, the approach taken in assessing the impacts appears to be geared towards smaller scale incremental additions to an existing community.

11. We have significant concerns about travel and transport. We cannot assume that future travel patterns, with a large number of people moving into the Bridgnorth area from elsewhere, necessarily mirror what currently happens. We asked for a more robust approach to assessing potential transport impacts, with the possible outcomes of a range of scenarios considered rather than a single assumed pattern. That has not been done.

12. There are several parts of the local road network that are already under stress, and we have had an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) for over 20 years. The cause of that air quality problem is recognised as being traffic fumes from queuing vehicles. In some key locations in the town, including around the AQMA, it is doubtful whether there is a realistic engineering solution to enable the road network to cope with higher traffic volumes or to reduce queuing.

13. We would draw members' attention to the consultation response of Shropshire Council's public protection function on 9th October 2025, and referred to in para 4.1.11 of the planning officer's report. This included a statement that "the Travel Plan should include measures specific to reducing vehicle movements within the AQMA and form a condition of any consent granted." We have no details of any

specific proposals to reduce vehicle movements within the AQMA.

14. We consider that the only realistic way of reducing vehicle movements through the AQMA, and other parts of the town where there are junction capacity constraints, is a significant mode shift to active travel and public transport.

15. The conclusion of Active Travel England's consultation response on 14th November 2025 included a statement that "ATE does not object to the principle of the development, but requests that an approval only be granted once sufficiently ambitious initial targets for each active travel mode have been added to the Travel Plan Framework." The Framework Travel Plan has not been revisited. Members should be aware that Active Travel England made a similar comment on a proposed development in Shrewsbury which Shropshire Council's Northern Planning Committee considered on 17th February 2026. That application was deferred so that travel and transport issues can be looked at again.

16. In contrast to the somewhat vague approach set out in the planning officer's report, leaving conditions and a S106 agreement to be worked out later under delegated authority, in our consultation response in June 2025 we put forward specific proposals for mode shift which we wanted to see in any final proposal. Whilst we are given some details of what is proposed, and monetary amounts which the applicant would be required to commit to via a S106 agreement, we cannot see a comprehensive statement of what will be delivered.

17. We asked for specific routes within Shropshire Council's adopted Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan to be implemented soon so that both this site and Tasley Gateway would have effective active travel routes both into Bridgnorth Town centre and along the A458 at least far as Oldbury Wells to support school access. We additionally asked that drop off facilities along the A458 near the end of Oldbury Wells be considered as we felt this would alleviate traffic on some stressed areas, including the AQMA. We felt there should be significantly improved bus services both within the town and on key routes out of it to support mode shift, and proposed to use the standards laid out in phase 3 of the Shropshire Bus Service Improvement Plan 2024. There are no indications in the Planning Officer's report that those proposals have even been discussed with the applicant, let alone accepted or adequately funded.

18. Under the circumstances we consider that the recommendation to approve the application is unsound and urge the committee not to do so.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation
<p>Strongly object!</p> <p>A development of this size is not warranted on any level for such a small town in an rural Area. (Especially when considered in conjunction with other approved developments already granted locally)</p> <p>Local infrastructure will not be able to cope with the huge increase in traffic and people requiring access to healthcare dentistry parking schools shopping etc.</p> <p>Where will the young adults get secondary education provision? Currently they all have to leave Bridgnorth for further education in particular, on already oversubscribed buses that are unreliable and few and far between.</p> <p>Bridgnorth has no real transport links to areas where there are jobs so it will be a village of commuters increasing traffic volumes at busy times, pollution and not benefitting local businesses at all.</p> <p>Infact the development is likely to put off tourists who currently visit our town as it will change the face of Bridgnorth forever removing the essence of the small historic market town people love to visit. This will therefore negatively affect local people and their businesses, in addition to destroying greenbelt land forever for no purpose other than council tax receipts.</p> <p>I can see no argument for this development that brings any positive argument.</p>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation
<p>My wife, 5 teenage/adult children and I are currently in the process of purchasing a property in Chelmarsh. As a family we have decided to leave our current home in suburban Wolverhampton to make a life change into Bridgnorth as it has been a place we have visited many weekends over the last decade or so and have fallen for the ambience and the welcoming feel of the town. I accept this development will be some 4 miles away but surely it is going to cause strain on the infrastructure in and around Bridgnorth and certainly make our families commute back to various parts of Wolverhampton for work even more troublesome than we were anticipating. I'd also imagine traffic gridlock at weekends in an already crowded town.</p> <p>We have recently decided to pause our plans regarding the property we are about to buy to see the outcome of the final decision on these plans and give us time to speak to some local people who will be able to give us a more educated and experienced idea of how much this will affect ours and their daily</p>		

lives.

This development on such a huge scale is something I believe will not enhance the town, quite the opposite.

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Originator:</b>
5	25/01722/OUT	Public Representation
<p>I have lived in Bridgnorth all of my life and in the Tasley area of the town. To see the proposals being forwarded to build thousands of houses in this area and I strongly oppose this planning application.</p> <p>We do not need any extra houses to be built in the town, this will put added pressure on the GP practice, community hospital, schools and many other services. The infrastructure will not stand the addition of 1500 more houses and cars, the roads are in a shocking state of neglect already.</p> <p>This is just a money spinning idea thought up by someone who can only see profit for themselves, not the town.</p> <p>Also whoever sanctioned the hacking of hedgerows and trees should be ashamed, to destroy nature when nothing has even been approved is shocking. No one was forewarned of this and it was only discovered after a load of woodland had been cut down destroying nature and animal homes.</p> <p>I wholeheartedly disapprove of this development, keep it to new towns such as Telford, not market towns like Bridgnorth.</p>		