



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 July 2026

by N Bromley BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 5 August 2026

Appeal Ref: 6009040

Land adjacent to eastern side of lane leading to 14 Myddlewood, Myddle, Shrewsbury SY4 3RY

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant permission in principle.
 - The appeal is made by Mr. S Croft against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 26/00627/PIP.
 - The development proposed is Permission in Principle for the construction of between 2 No and 7 No dwelling houses.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Planning Practice Guidance advises that the Permission in Principle route is an alternative way of obtaining planning permission for housing-led development. It has two stages: the first stage (or permission in principle stage) establishes whether a site is suitable in-principle, and the second ('technical details consent') stage is when the detailed development proposals are assessed. This appeal relates to the first of these two stages.
3. The scope of the considerations for permission in principle is limited to location, land use and the amount of development permitted. All other matters are considered as part of a subsequent technical details consent application if the first stage is granted. I have determined the appeal accordingly.

Main Issue

4. Whether the location, the proposed land use and the amount of development would be suitable for residential development, having regard to the development plan strategy for housing and access to services and facilities.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises an agricultural field, set behind a frontage hedgerow, located along a rural road. There are a number of residential dwellings nearby and adjacent to the site, but the site is not within a settlement, and it is therefore located within the open countryside. Indeed, the wider area has a prevailing rural character, largely surrounded by open fields.
6. Policy CS1 of the Shropshire Local Development Framework: Adopted Core Strategy 2011 (the CS) outlines the strategic approach to development across the County. The strategy includes seeking to ensure that rural areas will become more

sustainable through a rural rebalance approach, which includes accommodating around 35% of the area's residential development in rural areas over the plan period. Such development will be located predominantly in Community Hubs and Community Clusters. Outside these settlements, development will primarily be for economic diversification and to meet the needs of the local communities for affordable housing.

7. Policy MD1 of the Shropshire Council Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan, December 2015 (SAMDev), identifies the market towns, key centres, community hubs and community clusters as prime locations for sustainable development.
8. Although Myddle is the nearest village and is identified within the list of community clusters of Policy MD1 of the SAMDev, the site is a considerable distance from the village. The distance from the appeal site to the villages of Baschurch and Harmer Hill is significant also.
9. Policy CS5 of the Shropshire Local Development Framework: Adopted Core Strategy, 2011 (CS), allows new development in the open countryside only where it maintains and enhances countryside vitality and character and improves the sustainability of rural communities, particularly where it relates to certain types of development. There is no evidence before me to suggest that the proposal falls within any of the development listed in Policy CS5.
10. Policy MD7(a) of the SAMDev states that new market housing will be strictly controlled outside of Shrewsbury, the Market Towns, Key Centres and Community Hubs and Clusters. It sets out various types of residential development that would be permitted in the countryside. The proposal would be for open market, family housing in the open countryside and therefore would fail to satisfy these policies. Also, although reference has been made to SAMDev Policy S17.2(ii) Myddle and Harmer Hill Cluster, the development does not comprise infill development and is outside the development boundaries of both settlements. Accordingly, the proposed development is contrary to the Council's development plan strategy for housing.
11. Policy CS6 of the CS seeks proposals that are in accessible locations where opportunities for walking, cycling and use of public transport can be maximised and the need for car-based travel to be reduced. This is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
12. As a rural road there is no footway or streetlighting and it is subject to the national speed limit. Combined with the distance to the village, future occupants of the proposed development would be discouraged from walking and cycling to access services. Furthermore, there is no evidence before me of cycle routes or bus stops nearby, or that the occupants would have access to a frequent bus service, thereby providing a realistic alternative mode of transport.
13. Even though Myddle is a short car journey away, and it is claimed that social habits have changed, future occupants would nonetheless be highly dependent on the use of private cars for their day-to-day needs. These journeys would be frequent, despite the availability of home-based employment, as well as online grocery shopping. Particularly when travelling to local schools. Consequently, the proposal would not prioritise sustainable transport modes, and it is not clear to

what extent the proposal would enhance or maintain the vitality of the nearby community.

14. Given the above reasons, I conclude that the location, the proposed land use and the amount of development would not be suitable for residential development, having regard to the development plan strategy for housing and access to services and facilities. As such, the proposal conflicts with Policies CS1, CS5 and CS6 of the CS and Policies MD1 and MD7(a) of the SAMDev.
15. The Council's reason for refusal also refers to Policy MD2 of the SAMDev which primarily sets out design considerations. As design matters would largely be considered as part of a subsequent technical details consent application, the policy is not clearly related to the reason for refusal and is not directly relevant.

Other Matters

16. The Council's delegated officer report also suggests that the proposed development would harm the rural character of the area, and result in the loss of Grade 3 agricultural land. However, these matters have not been elaborated on, and they were not referred to in the reason for refusal. As I am dismissing the appeal for other reasons, it is not necessary for me to examine these further.
17. Up to seven additional family houses would contribute to boosting the supply of new housing, as referenced in the Framework. Family houses would also add to the mix of housing stock in the area. Therefore, I attribute positive weight to these matters.

Planning Balance

18. The proposal's location, land use and amount of development would be unsuitable having regard to the Council's development plan strategy for housing and access to services and facilities, and the degree of harm would be significant.
19. The Framework makes it clear that weight should be afforded to policies of the development plan according to their degree of consistency with the Framework. In this regard, the Framework seeks rural housing to be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities, directing development towards locations with good access to services and facilities and ensure that sustainable transport modes are prioritised. As such, Policies CS1, CS5 and CS6 of the CS, and Policies MD1 and MD7(a) of the SAMDev are broadly consistent with the Framework and the development plan policies can be given significant weight in this appeal.
20. The Council accept that they cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of housing land, and my attention has been drawn to a recent appeal decision¹ which identifies that the housing land supply currently sits at 3.81 years. This is a notable shortfall. Accordingly, the presumption in favour of sustainable development, as set out at Paragraph 11(d) of the Framework applies. In these circumstances, paragraph 11(d)(ii) of the Framework states that planning permission should be granted unless any adverse effects of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies which include, amongst other things, directing development to sustainable locations.

¹ Appeal reference: APP/L3245/W/25/3362414

21. The benefits associated with the proposed development, particularly within the context of the Council's housing land supply position, attract positive weight, albeit at a modest level. However, the proposal does not represent a suitable location for housing having regard to relevant development plan policies and its spatial strategy, and future occupiers would be highly dependent on the use of private cars, which would not prioritise sustainable transport modes.
22. Consequently, the adverse impacts of the proposal would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. Therefore, the presumption in favour of sustainable development does not apply.

Conclusion

23. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

N Bromley

INSPECTOR