Planning Decisions

Agenda 8.2 - To receive details of any decisions made by Shropshire Council which conflict with Shrewsbury Town Council's comments taken between 17 October – 13 November 2026

SHREWSBURY TOWN COUNCIL LIST OF PLANNING DECISIONS
REGISTERED BETWEEN 17 October - 13 November 2026

Agenda No 8.2

Application	Location	Proposal	STC Decision	STC Comments	SC Decision	SC Comments	Meeting Date
26/03082/TPO	51 Ridgebourne Road, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, SY3 9AB	Fell 1no. Lawson Cypress (T1) and 1no. Eastern Hemlock (T2) protected by The Borough of Shrewsbury (Ridgebourne Road) Tree Preservation Order 1968 (SA/37)	Objection	decision made under Town Clerk's delegated authority. The Town Council object to this application and ask if there is sufficient evidence supplied to remove the tree in the first instance. If agreed there is no mention of replanting the trees	grant permission	In respect of T1- The tree removed following this approval shall be replaced by a tree of the following species and specification: Liquidambar styraciflua (Sweet Gum) container grown 8cm– 10cm. The replacement tree is to be planted in the front garden, close to the position of the tree removed and must maintained for a minimum period of 5 years, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The replacement tree must be planted in the next planting season following the felling of the tree subject to this consent. In respect of T2- The tree removed following this approval shall be replaced by a tree ofthe following species and specification: Field Maple (Acer campestre) container grown 8cm– 10cm. The replacement tree is to be planted in the rear garden and must maintained for a minimum period of 5 years, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local PlanningAuthority. The replacement tree must be planted in the next planting season followingthe felling of the tree subject to this consent.	29/09/2026
26/03145/TPO	Canonbury House, 10 Canonbury, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, SY3 7AH	Reduce crown by 20-25%, slight crown lift and crown thin and reshape 1no Copper Beech protected by The Borough of Shrewsbury (Kingsland No 2) Tree Preservation Order 1969 (Ref: SA/34)	Objection	decision made under Town Clerk's delegated authority. The Town Council object to this application as there is no measurement put on the percentage reduction or a measurement on the lifting on the copper beech tree. Can this be put as a condition? There is also no mention of any measurement on the reduction in height of the 2 silver birch trees. Are these part of the TPO application as they are not mentioned in the description or are they part of a separate Conservation application?	grant permission	The pruning works shall consist only of the following: (a) the removal of any branch stubs, deadwood, hung up branches and climbers and the removal of sucker growth. (b) crown lifting to a maximum height above ground level of 3 metres; (c) crown reduction by a maximum of 2 metres; (d) crown thinning throughout the crown to a maximum of 5%, inclusive of the above work; (e) reshaping and balancing. The works shall not include: (a) the removal of any branch of which would leave a pruning cut of more than 75 millimetres in diameter when measured over bark; (b) any pollarding or topping	29/09/2026
26/03618/TPO	3A Kendal Road, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, SY1 4ES	Fell 1no Ash protected by the Shrewsbury & Atcham Borough Council (Land at and adjacent to the former MAFF site, Harlescott, No 2) Tree Preservation Order 2003 (Ref: SA/377)	No objection	decision made under Town Clerk's delegated authority. The Town Council raises no objection to this application if the insurance report as stated within the application has been received by Shropshire Council	refuse	Lack of Evidence of Subsidence– No supporting arboricultural, structural or subsidence investigation evidence has been submitted to demonstrate that the Ash tree subject to this application is causing or contributing to subsidence or damage to the property. 2. Loss of Amenity Value– The proposed felling would result in the loss of a protected tree and its associated visual and environmental contribution to the locality. In the absence of sufficient justification for its removal, this loss is considered unacceptable. 3. Failure to Demonstrate the Necessity for Removal– Although another nearby tree has reportedly been identified as causing subsidence, this does not establish that the Ash tree subject to this application is responsible for the same issue. The necessity for its removal has therefore not been demonstrated.	06/11/2026