

NORTH PLANNING COMMITTEE		
SCHEDULE OF ADDITIONAL LETTERS		
Date: 18.08.2026		
NOTE: This schedule reports only additional letters received before 5pm on the day before committee. Any items received on the day of Committee will be reported verbally to the meeting		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	24/03015/EIA Trefarclawdd Farm	Case Officer
A revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published on Monday 17th August 2026. This replaces the previous version which has been referred to in the Committee Reports. The references to the former 2025 NPPF and its policies in the Committee Reports are therefore now out-of-date and should be disregarded. Officers have assessed the planning application in relation to the revised NPPF, and provide the following updated advice to Members. In summary, it is the advice of Officers that the revised NPPF does not fundamentally change the planning balance, or the recommendation to Members that planning permission should be granted. The revised NPPF continues to provide support to proposals such as agricultural developments as part of seeking sustainable development; whilst seeking to ensure that adverse impacts are avoided. <u>Planning policy context; principle of development</u> Paragraph 6.2.2 of the Committee Report should be replaced by the following: The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a material planning consideration. It states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, by managing the use and development of land in the long-term public interest. It states that ‘achieving sustainable development means that the planning system has three overarching objectives in providing for the homes, commercial development, facilities and infrastructure which society needs. These objectives are interdependent and need to be pursued in mutually supportive ways (so that opportunities can be taken to secure net gains across all three)’: The revised NPPF includes the following policies and objectives of relevance to the proposed development. The NPPF: - Seeks to achieve sustainable development and states that this would include enabling development which will support the rural economy (Chapter 4) - Policy S5.1 states that, outside settlements, only certain forms of development should be approved. These should be approved, unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in this Framework. These types of development include: ‘development for: agriculture, horticulture and forestry’ - Policy E2.2 (Meeting the need for business land and premises) states that: - o “To support business growth, substantial weight should be given to ... Benefits for domestic food production, animal welfare and/or the environment which can be demonstrated through proposals for development for farm and agricultural modernisation”. - Policy E4 (Rural business development) states that the sustainable growth of businesses in rural areas should be supported, including through:		

- - the development and diversification of agricultural and other land-based businesses
- development to maintain and enhance farm viability and sustainability and support domestic food production, such as improved accommodation for livestock, on-farm reservoirs, greenhouses, polytunnels, farm shops and temporary accommodation for seasonal workers

Relationship between planning and other regulatory regimes

Paragraph 6.2.6 of the Committee Report should be replaced with the following:

Policy DM7 (Relationship with other regulatory regimes) of the NPPF states:

“1. Development proposals should be assessed on the basis of whether they would be an acceptable use of land. Matters which are controlled by separate regulatory regimes may, in the context of a particular development proposal, be a material consideration where they have land-use implications. Decision-makers should assume, unless there is clear evidence to the contrary, that those separate regimes will operate effectively.

2. Planning decisions should not seek to duplicate or extend controls imposed by separate regulatory regimes other than where there is a development plan policy in place applying optional technical standards for the development proposed (see policy PM13).”

Nevertheless, the EIA regulations require that likely effects of the development on the environment are identified and taken into consideration in the decision-making process. These effects will include matters that are also regulated by the EA.

Traffic and access

The reference to NPPF paragraph 116 in the Committee Report should be replaced with the following:

Policy TR3c of the NPPF states “Any significant adverse impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, should be mitigated to an acceptable degree using a vision-led approach”.

Residential amenity and pollution

NPPF Policy P3 (Living conditions and pollution) states:

- Development proposals should be appropriate for their location, taking into account the likely effects (including cumulative effects) of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment, whether these effects are on or off-site; and whether this is as a result of the development itself or the product of preexisting conditions in its vicinity. In assessing the potential effects of pollution, consideration should be given to the potential sensitivity of the site, and its intended occupiers and users, as well as that of the environment and population in the surrounding area (including where certain groups could be particularly vulnerable to its effects, such as children and older people)

This new national policy does not fundamentally affect the Officer assessment of the application as set out in the Committee Report.

Ecology

Paragraph 6.6.2 of the Committee Report should be replaced with the following:

NPPF Policy N2 (Improving the natural environment) states that development proposals should conserve and enhance existing natural features where possible; and use appropriate landscaping; minimise any adverse impacts on biodiversity; refuse applications where significant harm to biodiversity cannot be avoided, mitigated or compensated for. NPPF Policy N6 (Areas of particular importance for biodiversity and

geodiversity) states that development affecting a site of international importance should be refused unless ‘i. An appropriate assessment has concluded that the proposal will not adversely affect the integrity of the site (either individually or in combination with other developments), or the proposal can satisfy the derogation tests; and/or
ii. The impact of development on the relevant protected features of the protected site is being addressed through an Environmental Delivery Plan which has been made and the developer has committed to paying the nature restoration levy.

Policy N6 states that development affecting a site of national importance should only be supported if: “There would be no adverse effect (either individually or in combination with other developments) on the site’s features of special scientific interest; or ii. The benefits of the development in the location proposed clearly outweigh both the likely impact on the features of special scientific interest, and any broader impact on the national network of Sites of Special Scientific Interest; or iii. The impact of development on the relevant protected feature of the protected site is being addressed through an Environmental Delivery Plan which has been made and the developer has committed to paying the nature restoration levy.

Historic environment

NPPF Policy HE7 states that “Where a development proposal would harm the significance of a non-designated heritage asset, this should be weighed against the benefits of the proposal and a balanced judgement made, having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the non-designated heritage asset”.

The last sentence in paragraph 7.7 of the Committee report should be replaced with the following:

The requirements of NPPF Policy HE7 are therefore satisfied.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	24/03015/EIA Trefarclawdd Farm	Public objections
Following the publication of the Committee Report, a significant number of additional public objections have been made, currently 791 in total. The majority of these cite animal welfare concerns and issues in relation to ammonia impacts. They also raise the following matters. These matters are addressed in the Committee Report: • significant increase in slurry generation, with associated risks of ammonia emissions, odour, water pollution and wider environmental harm • Inadequate assessment of cumulative impact of the farm’s previous and proposed expansion, particularly in relation to local air quality, water quality, climate impacts and community amenity • unsuitable local road network and impact on highway safety due to additional milk tankers, feed deliveries, livestock movements and other heavy vehicles • adverse impact on rural character and visual amenity due to scale and appearance of additional sheds, lagoons and associated infrastructure • harm to living conditions and quality of life due to increased noise, odour, traffic and general disturbance • intensification of dairy production, resulting in higher stocking densities, reduced access to pasture and adverse impacts on animal welfare • insufficient consideration of contribution to greenhouse gas emissions, increased water use and other climate-related impacts • public health impacts, including air quality effects, particulate matter, antibiotic resistance and possible disease risks associated with intensive livestock farming • ethical opposition to intensive dairy farming and animal agriculture; concerns about calf separation, slaughter and the treatment of dairy cattle		

- should be refused on environmental, amenity, highway safety, animal welfare, climate and ethical grounds.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	24/03015/EIA Trefarclawdd Farm	Public objection

Communities Against Factory Farming (CAFF) has objected to the application on the following grounds:

- The Report contains no assessment of greenhouse gas emissions.
- The Report recommends granting permission notwithstanding a live, unwithdrawn objection from the Council's own Lead Local Flood Authority
- The Report contains unreconciled internal inconsistencies as to the size of the slurry lagoon and the herd figures used in the nutrient calculations.
- The Report relies on an assumption about the effectiveness of other regulatory regimes that recent case law confirms cannot be applied without further inquiry, especially in circumstances where the Environment Agency has itself disclosed pollution incidents at this farm.
- The Report accepts, without further inquiry, the applicant's own position that odour and dust from manure spreading cannot be meaningfully assessed.
- The Habitats Regulations Assessment conclusion depends entirely on mitigation that is not yet legally secured and that, even once secured, leaves increased ammonia and nitrogen loading at the majority of the designated sites assessed.
- The ammonia modelling has not been independently verified by Natural England.
- Traffic and manure transport impacts are likely understated.
- Piecemeal development and cumulative impact.
- The Animal Welfare Assessment is extremely inadequate.
- The proposed development is not compatible with the principles in NPPF.

Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
5	24/03015/EIA Trefarclawdd Farm	Case Officer

Case officer's response to CAFF comments above:

- The Environmental Statement (ES) includes a chapter on Air Quality, Health and Climate. It states that an assessment was undertaken which took account of matters which include climate change. It states that "The proposed development, while resulting in emissions of Carbon Dioxide which derives from fossil fuel sources of carbon, would amount to an overall reduction as the milk and beef produced on site would be offset against imported beef and milk i.e. the environmental cost of producing meat abroad for domestic consumption is higher than producing meat in the UK for UK consumption". The ES identifies specific mitigation measures which would be incorporated within the operation, including: providing adequate ventilation; controlling shed temperature and humidity; dietary manipulation; and good practice management of manure disposal and storage. In terms of airborne pollutants it states that "no air quality standards or guidelines are expected as a result of emissions from the proposed development, either in isolation or in combination with estimated baseline levels of airborne pollutants" and concludes that "the proposed development will have no significant effects on air quality". It re-affirms that, although carbon dioxide would be emitted, the fossil-origin CO₂ would be offset as a result of avoided emissions from a reduction of transportation via air travel using fossil fuels". The ES notes that during the operational phase there would be an increase in domestic production leading to a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions through transportation of overseas produce". It concludes that "the nature of the development and environmental controls built into the proposed development mean that emissions to the air will have no significant adverse effects on air quality or the health of local people or designated wildlife sites. Therefore no further mitigation measures are required".

b. The Lead Local Flood Authority have now withdrawn their objection. See further in the section below.

c. This is covered in paragraph 6.7.7 of the Committee Report. The lagoon has been sized appropriately, and it would provide six months' storage capacity on a precautionary basis.

d. This is covered in paragraph 6.7.10 of the Committee Report. The EA note in their comments that they had in the past received reports of slurry leakage and that this was possibly associated with spillage during transportation. The EA comments indicate that they do attend incidents, albeit they are not able to attend all. In addition, the applicant has confirmed that the EA do carry out site inspections in response to incidents. The Council's Environment Protection team investigate a report recently relating to the operation of the existing lagoon and confirmed that it was functioning satisfactorily. There is no indication that pollution control authorities are not effective in regulating the site under their own regulatory regimes.

e. This is covered in paragraphs 6.8.8 – 6.8.10 of the Committee Report. The *Finch* Supreme Court judgement emphasised that environmental effects must be 'capable of meaningful assessment'. Neither the applicant's technical consultant, nor officers, are aware of any recognised methodology for assessing the potential indirect odour and dust impacts resulting from manure storage and spreading.

f. This is covered in paragraphs 6.6.4 – 6.6.7 of the Committee Report. Should Members resolve to grant planning permission, this would not be issued until the Section 106 agreement which provides the required mitigation has been signed.

g. Natural England have been consulted on the planning application on a number of occasions, including the ammonia modelling. Their comments are provided in paragraph 4.1.3 of the Committee Report. By email on 6th August 2026 they confirmed that they received the Council's Habitat Regulations Assessment, which was based upon the findings of the ammonia modelling.

h. This is covered in paragraphs 6.5.2 – 6.5.5 of the Committee Report. As referenced in the Council's Highways Officer's comments in paragraph 4.1.12, a proportion of manure would be transported via an umbilical cord system. This would reduce the level of additional traffic movements.

i. Cumulative impacts are covered in the Committee Report. The technical assessments which have been submitted with the ES include an assessment of the proposed development along with the existing operation.

j. This is covered in paragraph 6.9.1 of the Committee Report. The proposed additional cows would be managed in the same way as the existing operation, and would comply with the relevant animal welfare regulations.

k. The application has been assessed in relation to the Development Plan taking account of other material considerations including the revised NPPF which was published on 17th August 2026. The revised NPPF does not fundamentally alter the planning balance, or the officer recommendation that planning permission should be granted.

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

5	24/03015/EIA Trefarclawdd Farm	Lead Local Flood Authority
Further comments following submission of additional information: <i>No objection. We are satisfied that the information provided addresses our previous concerns and we remove our objection.</i>		
Item No.	Application No.	Originator:
6	25/03499/FUL	Shropshire Council
Revised National Planning Policy Framework published 17th August 2026 Material consideration Since the publication of the Committee Report, a revised National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has come into force, having been published on Monday 17th August 2026 by the UK Government. This is a material consideration of significant weight in the determination of the application. Members are advised that the revised NPPF has been substantially restructured and a number of paragraph references contained within the published officer report are no longer extant. References to former paragraph numbers, including paragraph 11(d) (tilted balance) and previous paragraph references relating to the Agent of Change principle in the committee report and conditions, should therefore be read as references to the equivalent policy provisions within the revised Framework. Officers have reviewed the proposal against the revised NPPF and are satisfied that the conclusions of the report remain broadly unchanged, subject to the matters set out in this update. The revised NPPF introduces a new policy-based structure, including Policy S3 which establishes a presumption in favour of sustainable development and Policies S4 and S5 which govern the application of that presumption within and outside settlements respectively. Policy S5 is of particular relevance in this case given that the site lies adjacent to, but outside, the adopted development boundary for Shawbury. Annex A, paragraph 2 of the revised NPPF also confirms that development plan policies which are materially inconsistent with national decision-making policies should be afforded very limited weight unless they have been examined and adopted against the revised Framework. Officers have had regard to this transitional provision in reviewing the proposal. Assessment Officers note that the application site adjoins the existing built form of Shawbury and represents a logical extension to the settlement. The site remains well-related to existing services and facilities and benefits from proposed pedestrian links and accessibility improvements secured through the application. The Council remains unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply, with the committee report identifying a supply position of approximately 4.61 years. Officers consider that the proposal falls squarely within the circumstances anticipated by Policy S5(1)(j), namely residential development proposed in response to an evidenced housing need where the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites and the site is physically well-related to an existing settlement. Officers therefore consider that the revised NPPF does not materially alter the substantial positive weight afforded to the delivery of housing on this sustainable edge-of-settlement site. Officers further note that Policy HO7 of the revised NPPF requires substantial weight to be given to the benefits of providing homes which contribute towards meeting evidenced accommodation needs. Officers consider that this further reinforces the significant positive weight attributed to the delivery of 128 dwellings on this site.		

Officers do, however, note that the revised NPPF places increased emphasis on the delivery of accessible and adaptable housing. The submitted accommodation schedule identifies six accessible dwellings within the proposed development. Officers acknowledge that this level of provision falls significantly below the national expectation set out in Policy HO5(1)(b), which requires development plans to ensure that no less than 40% of homes on major developments are delivered to M4(2) standards. Officers note, however, that Policy HO5 is a plan-making policy rather than a national decision-making policy and does not establish a requirement that every individual planning application must provide 40% M4(2) dwellings. Nevertheless, the proposal's level of accessible housing provision attracts additional weight against the proposal when compared to the planning balance set out within the published committee report

Officers also note that Policy N2(1)(b) of the revised NPPF requires decision-makers to take account of the quality of agricultural land, including Best and Most Versatile agricultural land, and where significant development of agricultural land is necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be used where possible. As set out within the committee report, the proposal would result in the loss of Grade 2 and Grade 3 agricultural land. This remains a harmful effect and continues to attract moderate weight against the proposal.

Other aspects of the officer assessment, including heritage, arboriculture, biodiversity, design, highways, residential amenity, flood risk and drainage, have been reviewed against the revised NPPF. Officers are satisfied that the conclusions reached in the committee report can remain unchanged.

Reassessed Planning Balance

Officers have also reassessed the planning balance for this site in light of the changes to national policy. The revised NPPF substantially restructures national planning policy and revises the operation of the presumption in favour of sustainable development, including through Policy S5 relating to development outside settlements. Officers consider that the site's position immediately adjoining the built form of Shawbury, together with the Council's ongoing housing land supply shortfall, means that substantial positive weight continues to be afforded to the principle of housing delivery on this site.

Furthermore, Policy S5(1)(j) applies to residential development which addresses an evidenced unmet housing need and is physically well-related to an existing settlement, whilst Policy HO7 requires substantial weight to be given to the benefits of providing homes which contribute towards meeting identified accommodation needs. These policies reinforce and increase the substantial positive weight afforded to the proposal's housing delivery benefits when compared with the original planning balance set out within the published committee report.

In terms of harms, officers also acknowledge that the revised Framework places greater emphasis on the delivery of accessible and adaptable housing and the protection of Best and Most Versatile agricultural land. These matters increase the weight afforded to the adverse impacts identified within the committee report. However, officers consider that the accessibility shortfall attracts limited to moderate weight against the proposal, whilst the loss of Best and Most Versatile agricultural land continues to attract moderate weight against the proposal. The assessment of other identified harms, including landscape, heritage, arboricultural and other environmental impacts, remains unchanged from that set out within the published report.

In reassessing the planning balance, therefore, officers consider that substantial positive weight should be given to:

- The delivery of 128 dwellings in circumstances where the Council is unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply;
- The contribution towards meeting identified housing needs, in accordance with Policy HO7;
- The site's sustainable edge-of-settlement location and its relationship to Shawbury, as reflected through Policy S5;
- The delivery of affordable housing.

Additional moderate positive weight also continues to be afforded to:

- Significant biodiversity net gain and ecological enhancement measures;
- Healthcare contributions and wider infrastructure benefits secured through the Section 106 Agreement and CIL;
- Public open space, landscaping and recreational provision; and
- Improved pedestrian connectivity and sustainable travel opportunities.

In terms of the harms of the proposal, moderate weight should be given to:

- The loss of BMV land as reflected through Policy N2;
- Landscape effects.

Whilst limited to moderate weight should be given to:

- Development boundary conflict;
- The shortfall in the supply of accessible dwellings (noting the caveat that HO5 is a plan making policy, rather than a national decision-making policy and does not explicitly apply to individual developments).

Having reassessed the proposal against the revised NPPF, officers do not consider that the revised policy weighting fundamentally alters the planning balance. Whilst more weight is now afforded to accessible housing provision and the protection of Best and Most Versatile agricultural land than had previously been afforded in the published committee report, the revised Framework also strengthens support for housing delivery on sustainable sites that are physically well-related to existing settlements and contribute towards identified housing needs. In officers' judgement, the revised NPPF therefore strengthens both the positive and negative elements of the planning balance, but the net effect remains firmly in favour of the proposal.

Conclusion

Officers therefore conclude that, notwithstanding the changes introduced by the revised NPPF, the overall planning balance remains in favour of the proposal. As such, the recommendation for its approval remains unchanged. For the avoidance of doubt, delegated authority is sought to make any consequential amendments to the wording of planning conditions, informatives and reason for approval necessary to reflect the requirements of the revised NPPF, provided such amendments do not fundamentally alter the nature of the development recommended for approval.