

SHREWSBURY TOWN COUNCIL

Planning Committee Meeting held at Livesey House, 7 St John's Hill At 6.00pm on Tuesday 1 September 2026

PRESENT

Councillors J Dean (Chairman), K Halliday (sub for Cllr Pardy), B Jephcott, A Mosley & A Wagner (sub for Cllr Tandy).

IN ATTENDANCE

Clare Turner (Deputy Town Clerk) and Michelle Farmer (Committee Officer) and 4 members of the public

APOLOGIES

Apologies were received from Councillor Daniels, Pardy & Tandy. Apologies were also received from Helen Ball (Town Clerk),

28/26 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE CODE OF CONDUCT

(i) Declarations of Pecuniary Interest

There were no pecuniary interests declared.

(ii) Declarations of Non-Pecuniary Interest

Shropshire Councillors	Those twin-hatted members declared a personal interest in any matters relating to the Town Council's relationship with Shropshire Council.
Councillor Wagner	Declared he was Deputy Leader at Shropshire Council. Also declared an interest in applications 26/02974/VAR & 26/03943/FUL and would not take part in any discussions

29/26 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

The minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 4 August 2026 were submitted as circulated and read.

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held on 4 August 2026 be approved and signed as a correct record.

30/26 MATTERS ARISING

Min 26/26 - Shrewsbury Bazaar – 18-19 Shoplatch

The Committee Officer provided an update to members who had raised concerns on this application regarding the proposed opening hours being daily from 7.00am – 5.15am. Representations were made to the Licensing Department and the applicant had responded to the concerns raised and confirmed that they had amended the proposed opening hours of the premises. The shop would operate from 7:00 am until 12:00 midnight daily, rather than remaining open until 5:15am the following day. They believed that the revised closing time of midnight significantly reduced the potential for disturbance and other concerns associated with operating during the early hours of the morning. The shop would operate as a general convenience and retail store, offering a broad range of everyday products.

RESOLVED:

Members were happy with the amendment and raised no further comment

31/26 HIGHWAYS ORDERS

31.1 Toucan crossing on Bank Farm Road, Shrewsbury

The Town Clerk informed Committee that notice was given that Shropshire Council, and after consultation with the Chief Officer of Police, proposed to establish a Pedestrian Crossing as follows:

Toucan Crossing on BANK FARM ROAD, SHREWSBURY at a point approximately 32 metres west of its junction with Longden Road. Any person wishing to make representations in relation to this scheme should send an e-mail or letter by 9 September 2026

RESOLVED:

That members were pleased with the notice and raised no further comments

31.2 Notification: changes to the parking restrictions and speed limit on Abbey Foregate, Shrewsbury

The Town Clerk informed Committee that on 11 August 2026 Shropshire Council made an order to make changes to the parking restrictions on Abbey Foregate, Shrewsbury. Also on 11 August 2026 Shropshire Council made an order to introduce a 20mph speed limit onto the following lengths of roads in Shrewsbury:

- Horsefair - In its entirety
- Abbey Foregate From its junction with Whitehall Street in a westerly and then south-westerly direction for a distance of 230 metres
- Railway Lane - In its entirety
- Railway Terrace - In its entirety

- Portobello - In its entirety

Any existing speed limits on these lengths of roads would be revoked. These changes came into effect on 17 August 2026

Councillor Dean was pleased with this change and commented that a 20mph wide scheme would also be welcomed.

RESOLVED:

That the above notice be noted

31.3 Notification: changes to the parking restrictions on Kingsland Bridge, Shrewsbury

The Town Clerk informed Committee that this item was for noting. On 13 August Shropshire Council made an order to make the following changes to parking restrictions in Shrewsbury:

REVOKE Pay and Display 8am – 6pm Kingsland Bridge (private road) (west side)

NEW RESTRICTION No Waiting At Any Time Kingsland Bridge (private road) (west side) Parking bay from its junction with Kennedy Road for a distance of 6 metres in a northerly direction. From its junction with Kennedy Road for a distance of 6 metres in a northerly direction.

The changes came into effect on 21 August.

RESOLVED:

That the above notice be noted

32/26 TREE PRESERVATION ORDERS

32.1 Notification of Revocation for Shrewsbury and Atcham Borough Council (No. 17 Walsham Close, Radbrook) Tree Preservation Order 1986

The Town Clerk informed Committee that Shropshire Council had informed the Town Council that in accordance with section 333(7) and paragraph 13(2) of Schedule 1 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and regulation 11 of the Town and Country Planning (Tree Preservation (England) Regulations 2012) Shropshire Council had decided to make an Order revoking the above-named Tree Preservation Order.

The Revocation Order took effect from the date specified and the Tree Preservation Order ceased to exist from that date. Shropshire Council was revoking this Order because the Scots Pine that was originally protected under this Tree Preservation Order was no longer present.

RESOLVED:

That the above notice be noted

33/26 PREMISES LICENCE APPLICATIONS

Councillor Mosley commented that there were two applications that should be looked at by Members which were Lucky Shot on Castle Street and Restaurant Dill on Wyle Cop.

Members considered the details of the application as noted on Shropshire Council website and raised no comment to either application.

RESOLVED:

There were no Premises Licence Applications for consideration at this meeting as the representation dates of the above applications had passed

34/26 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

34.1 Schedules of Planning Applications

The Town Clerk submitted the schedules of valid planning applications for planning consent for development within the Town Council's area, which had been registered between 25 July – 21 August 2026.

RESOLVED:

- (i) **That the following comments be submitted to Shropshire Council:**

1.	26/03057/FUL	104 Mereside Shrewsbury Shropshire SY2 6LQ	Single storey rear extension	No Objection
2.	26/02965/ADV	Proposed Business Units To The South Of Oteley Road Shrewsbury Shropshire	Erect and display internally and externally illuminated and other signage	No Objection
3.	26/03054/LBC	25 The Mount Shrewsbury Shropshire SY3 8PT	Proposed replacement of existing timber sash windows and front door	No Objection
4.	26/03035/FUL	8 Malvern Close Shrewsbury Shropshire SY2 6RF	Erection of first floor and rear extensions	No Objection
5.	26/02880/FUL	13 Moreton Crescent Shrewsbury Shropshire SY3 7BY	Replacement of 2No. windows to front elevation	Objection

The Town Council object to this application as the replacements do not appear to be like-for-like as it is going from timber to UPVC and do not appear to be true heritage replacements. Members respectfully request the Conservation Officer looks into this application.

6.	26/03021/FUL	Proposed Residential Development South Of Old Heath Shrewsbury Shropshire	Erection of a Detached Four Bedroom Dwelling	No Objection
7.	26/02869/ADV	Claremont House Claremont Bank Shrewsbury Shropshire	Installation of car parking management system (ANPR and associated signage)	No Objection
8.	26/02868/FUL	Claremont House Claremont Bank Shrewsbury Shropshire	Installation of car parking management system (ANPR and associated signage)	No Objection
9.	26/02990/FUL	18 - 19 Shoplatch Shrewsbury Shropshire SY1 1HS	Removal of existing shop front entrance doors and glazing and relocating within building (retrospective)	No Objection

Councillor Wagner left the meeting

10.	26/02974/VAR	Proposed Residential Development At Old Bush Gardens Abbey Foregate Shrewsbury Shropshire	Variation of Condition No. 3 attached to permission 18/01958/FUL dated 13 November 2018	No Objection
------------	---------------------	---	---	--------------

Councillor Wagner re-joined the meeting

11.	26/02964/FUL	Proposed Business Units To The South Of Oteley Road Shrewsbury Shropshire	Erection 2 No commercial units with proposed use class E(a), E(b) E(c) E(e) E(g(i)) and E g(ii) with access, parking to include EV charging points, and landscaping	Representation
------------	---------------------	---	---	----------------

Whilst the Town Council do not raise objections to the proposed units, Members would welcome more landscaping and possible shrubs being put in place. The tall signage post proposed for the corner looks excessive in size and appears to be too large. It was also noted that the pedestrian crossing shown on the plans provided did not give access to the site directly and would actually prevent you from walking to the facility and request that this is looked at by the Case Officer.

12.	26/02949/FUL	Royal Shrewsbury Hospital Mytton Oak Road Shrewsbury Shropshire	Construction of VIE compound (retrospective)	No Objection
------------	---------------------	---	--	--------------

Councillor Wagner left the meeting

13.	26/02943/FUL	6 Holywell Terrace Holywell Street Shrewsbury Shropshire SY2 5DF	Replacement rear sun room and internal alterations	No Objection
------------	---------------------	--	--	--------------

Councillor Wagner re-joined the meeting

14.	26/02736/FUL	Coleham County Primary School Greyfriars Road Shrewsbury Shropshire SY3 7EN	Erection of a detached garden room	No Objection
15.	26/02918/LBC	121 Abbey Foregate Shrewsbury Shropshire SY2 6AZ	Internal alterations to existing kitchen and utility room, with a rear infill extension	No Objection
16.	26/02904/FUL	35-37 Castle Foregate Shrewsbury Shropshire SY1 2EH	Change of use of ground floor retail unit (A1) to 2 bed room apartment (C3)	No Objection
17.	26/02898/FUL	38 Lady Herbert Way Shrewsbury Shropshire SY3 9DY	Erection of single storey side extension, conversion and extension of existing garage to create 2No. art studios, a workshop, general and garden store. Formation of 1No. off street parking space	No Objection
18.	26/02598/FUL	Tarmac Ltd Bayston Hill Quarry Sharpstones Lane Bayston Hill Shrewsbury Shropshire SY3 0AW	Installation of a ground mounted solar photovoltaic array of up to 3 MW, a battery energy storage system (up to 3.5 MWh), underground cabling to the adjacent quarry, security fencing, CCTV and track.	No comment made

Members agreed that no comment would be made by Committee on this application as it was just on the boundary and felt it was for the Bayston Hill Parish Council to pass comment

19.	26/02520/FUL	Veolia Energy From Waste Facility Vanguard Way Battlefield Enterprise Park Shrewsbury Shropshire	Retention of 2No. driver welfare cabins and 1No. two-storey contractor welfare unit (retrospective).	No Objection
20.	26/02862/FUL	23 Woodfield Avenue Shrewsbury Shropshire SY3 8HT	Single storey side extension	No Objection
21.	26/02834/FUL	110 The Mount Shrewsbury Shropshire SY3 8PH	Conversion of existing loft, removal of existing rear chimney breast, construction of two rear-facing dormer windows, alterations to existing	No Objection

			openings on the rear and east elevations, replacement windows and doors and internal reconfiguration of ground floor	
22.	26/02785/FUL	17 Primrose Terrace St Michaels Street Shrewsbury Shropshire SY1 2EY	Single storey rear extension	No Objection
23.	26/02781/FUL	7 Grangefields Road Shrewsbury Shropshire SY3 9DD	Single storey extension to side and rear following some demolition works; alterations and improvement works	No Objection
24.	26/02704/FUL	Wellspring Apostolic Church Belle Vue Road Shrewsbury Shropshire SY3 7LX	Erection of 8 dwellings and creation of memorial garden on the grounds of the former Apostolic Church	Objection

Shrewsbury Town Council objects to this planning application.

The Town Council recognises the contribution which the provision of additional housing within Shrewsbury can make and does not object in principle to the appropriate redevelopment of previously developed land. However, it considers that the particular characteristics and constraints of this site have not been adequately reflected in the scale, density and layout of the proposed development.

The Town Council's principal concern is that the application appears to seek to accommodate a predetermined quantum of eight dwellings on a site whose development capacity is materially constrained by its archaeological and burial-ground history, location within the Belle Vue Conservation Area, established woodland and ecological value, trees, drainage requirements, potential contamination and highway/access constraints.

In the Town Council's view, these matters need to inform the capacity and layout of the site from the outset. They should not simply be treated as individual matters capable of being mitigated through conditions after the proposed number and intensity of dwellings have effectively been established.

The Town Council therefore considers that the proposal conflicts with the adopted Shropshire Development Plan, in particular Core Strategy Policies CS6, CS17 and CS18 and SAMDev Policies MD2, MD12 and MD13, together with relevant provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

1. The principle of development and the capacity of the site

The Town Council acknowledges that the redevelopment of previously developed land and the delivery of additional housing are important planning considerations. However, national policy does not require the maximum possible number of dwellings to be achieved on every previously developed site irrespective of its character and constraints. Core Strategy Policy CS6 – Sustainable Design and Development Principles requires development to protect and conserve the built and historic environment and to be appropriate in scale, density, pattern and design, taking account of local context and character.

SAMDev Policy MD2 – Sustainable Design develops these requirements and requires development to respond positively to local character, site context, existing natural and built features and the principles of sustainable design.

The Town Council considers that these policies require the capacity of the site to be established by reference to its constraints and character rather than by seeking to accommodate the maximum number of units that can physically be fitted onto the land.

This is particularly important in this case because the proposal is not simply for eight houses. It includes:

- eight three-storey dwellings;
- four garages;
- private parking;
- access roads and associated hardstanding;
- surface-water drainage infrastructure;
- private gardens;
- landscaping; and
- a memorial garden.

All of these elements compete for a limited amount of land while having to respond to the archaeological, ecological, arboricultural, heritage and drainage constraints identified within the application material.

The Town Council is therefore concerned that the application has not demonstrated that eight dwellings represent the appropriate development capacity of this site. The issue is not whether eight buildings can be physically accommodated. The issue is whether eight dwellings, together with all associated infrastructure, can be accommodated without unacceptable harm to the site's heritage significance, Conservation Area character, woodland and ecological value and other environmental constraints. The Town Council considers that this has not been demonstrated.

2. Former burial ground and archaeological significance

The site's former use as a burial ground represents an exceptional constraint which should have a fundamental influence on the design and capacity of the development.

The submitted archaeological and heritage material identifies substantial numbers of burials associated with the former Belle Vue Cemetery. As identified in the application documents, documentary evidence, surviving monuments and geophysical evidence indicate a minimum number of burials in the order of 213–238, while the geophysical survey identifies responses interpreted as probable and possible graves.

The applicant's own Heritage Assessment also acknowledges that burials may be disturbed by construction and associated works and recommends that, where possible, development should be designed so that ground disturbance does not extend to depths likely to affect graves. The Town Council considers that this recommendation should be treated as a design principle, rather than simply as an archaeological mitigation measure.

Potential ground disturbance is not limited to the footprints of the proposed houses. It may arise from:

- building foundations;
- garages;
- access roads;
- parking areas;
- drainage infrastructure;
- utility connections;
- landscaping and tree works; and
- other associated construction works.

The Town Council is concerned that the application has not sufficiently demonstrated that the proposed layout has been derived from a comprehensive understanding of the location and extent of known, probable and possible graves.

SAMDev Policy MD13 – The Historic Environment requires proposals to avoid harm or loss of significance to designated and non-designated heritage assets wherever possible. It also requires proposals likely to affect the significance of heritage assets to be supported by an appropriate Heritage Assessment. The policy expressly recognises archaeological features and deposits as heritage assets.

The NPPF similarly requires the significance of heritage assets affected by development to be understood and requires applicants to provide proportionate evidence where archaeological interest may be affected. The Town Council therefore considers that the relevant question is not

simply how human remains would be dealt with if encountered during construction. The prior planning question is whether the development can reasonably be designed to avoid disturbance to graves in the first place.

Any statutory authorisation which may subsequently be required for disturbance or removal of human remains is a separate matter from the planning decision and should not be relied upon to justify a layout which has not first demonstrated that disturbance can reasonably be avoided.

The Town Council therefore asks the Local Planning Authority to establish, before determining the application:

1. the extent and location of known, probable and possible burial areas;
2. which elements of the proposed development would result in ground disturbance within or close to those areas;
3. whether the proposed houses, garages, roads, drainage and utilities can avoid such disturbance;
4. whether further archaeological evaluation is required to establish the extent of the burials; and
5. whether a lower-density or differently configured development would allow substantially greater avoidance of the burial areas.

In the Town Council's view, the archaeological evidence is itself a reason why the development capacity of the site should be reconsidered.

3. Belle Vue Conservation Area and historic character

The site lies within the Belle Vue Conservation Area and the Town Council considers that the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area is a significant material consideration. Section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 requires special attention to be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a Conservation Area.

The NPPF requires great weight to be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets and states that any harm to, or loss of significance of, a designated heritage asset requires clear and convincing justification. Where less than substantial harm is identified, that harm must be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The Town Council considers that the assessment should not be restricted to the architectural appearance of the individual houses.

The existing site comprises a combination of:

- established woodland and mature trees;
- open green space;
- the historic character associated with the former cemetery;

- surviving funerary features;
- boundary treatments; and
- the wider relationship of the site with Belle Vue Road and Hawthorn Road.

The proposed development would represent a substantial change from this established green and historic character to an intensive residential development comprising eight three-storey dwellings, garages, parking, roads, hardstanding and associated infrastructure.

The Town Council is particularly concerned about the cumulative visual effect of the development when viewed from Belle Vue Road and Hawthorn Road, and the extent to which the loss of woodland and established vegetation would alter the existing character of the Conservation Area.

SAMDev Policy MD13 requires development affecting heritage assets to avoid harm wherever possible and requires the significance of affected heritage assets and their settings to be properly considered.

The Town Council considers that the proposal has not demonstrated that the level of development proposed would preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Belle Vue Conservation Area. It is particularly concerning that the historic and green character of the site appears to be treated as something which can largely be consolidated into the proposed memorial garden, while the remainder of the site is released for relatively intensive residential development.

The preservation or interpretation of surviving monuments does not, in itself, remove the archaeological, landscape or historic significance of the wider former burial ground.

4. Loss of woodland and ecological harm

The Town Council has significant concerns regarding the proposed loss of established woodland. The submitted Preliminary Ecological Appraisal identifies approximately 2,600 square metres of secondary mixed woodland, of which approximately 800 square metres would be retained. This represents the loss of approximately 1,800 square metres, or around 69% of the existing woodland. The Town Council recognises that the ecological assessment describes the woodland as being in poor condition. However, the same assessment acknowledges that the woodland has ecological significance, contains native tree species and represents one of the remaining green spaces within this part of Belle Vue.

The ecological evidence also identifies opportunities for:

- birds;
- bats;
- hedgehogs;
- reptiles;
- badgers; and

- other wildlife.

The woodland also provides wider landscape and environmental functions, including tree cover, habitat connectivity, visual amenity, carbon storage, rainwater interception and local cooling.

These functions are particularly important in a densely developed urban neighbourhood where established green infrastructure is relatively limited. Core Strategy Policy CS17 – Environmental Networks seeks to protect and enhance environmental networks and natural assets. SAMDev Policy MD12 – Natural Environment is particularly relevant. It states that proposals likely to have a significant adverse effect, directly, indirectly or cumulatively, on important woodlands and trees, ecological networks, visual amenity, landscape character and local distinctiveness will only be permitted where it can be clearly demonstrated that there is no satisfactory alternative means of avoiding the impacts through redesign or relocation and that the social or economic benefits outweigh the harm.

The Town Council considers that the application has not demonstrated that the loss of approximately 69% of the woodland is unavoidable. The applicant's proposed Biodiversity Net Gain should not be regarded as resolving this issue. Biodiversity Net Gain is an important requirement, but a numerical net gain does not remove the need to consider whether existing habitat can reasonably be retained in the first place.

The Town Council therefore asks the Local Planning Authority to consider whether a lower-density or differently configured scheme could retain substantially more of the existing woodland and associated habitat. The Town Council also notes an apparent discrepancy within the submitted biodiversity information concerning the stated percentage Biodiversity Net Gain. The narrative appears to identify a net gain of approximately 26.76%, while another figure of 33.99% appears within the results. The Council requests that the correct baseline, calculation and deliverable post-development position are confirmed before the application is determined.

5. Biodiversity Net Gain does not remove the requirement to avoid harm

The Town Council recognises that the proposal seeks to achieve Biodiversity Net Gain through enhancement of retained woodland, habitat creation and new tree planting.

However, the NPPF makes clear that where significant harm to biodiversity cannot be avoided, adequately mitigated or, as a last resort, compensated for, planning permission should be refused.

The NPPF also requires the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and priority species.

The Town Council therefore considers that the applicant needs to demonstrate more clearly that reasonable alternative layouts have been considered which would reduce the extent of woodland loss. The key issue is whether the proposed loss of established woodland is necessary to achieve the proposed quantum of development. If eight dwellings cannot be accommodated without the loss of approximately 69% of the woodland, that is a material consideration in determining whether eight dwellings is an appropriate capacity for the site.

6. Cumulative effect of the site's constraints

A fundamental concern of the Town Council is that the various constraints appear to have been considered largely as separate technical matters. In reality, they are closely interrelated.

For example:

- drainage infrastructure needs to avoid burial areas;
 - drainage also needs to avoid tree root protection areas and retained ecological habitat;
 - retaining more woodland reduces the area available for buildings and infrastructure;
 - avoiding graves may require buildings, roads or drainage to be relocated;
 - relocating buildings may increase pressure on retained woodland;
 - retaining woodland affects the available area for parking, garages and gardens;
 - contamination investigation and remediation may require additional ground disturbance;
- and
- access and visibility requirements further constrain the site's developable area.

This is precisely why the Town Council considers that the capacity of the site needs to be reconsidered as a whole.

The application should demonstrate that there is sufficient genuinely unconstrained land to accommodate the proposed eight dwellings and all associated infrastructure while satisfying the requirements of the Development Plan. The Town Council does not consider that this has been demonstrated.

7. Drainage and sustainable water management

The Town Council is also concerned about the deliverability of the proposed drainage strategy. The submitted Sustainable Drainage Assessment acknowledges that the historic cemetery use may constrain the location of infiltration drainage and that proposed soakaways should avoid areas occupied by graves, with further investigation required to establish the location of graves in the vicinity of proposed infiltration features.

This reinforces the Town Council's concern that the archaeological and drainage issues cannot be separated from the question of development capacity. Core Strategy Policy CS18 – Sustainable Water Management requires development to integrate sustainable water management measures, reduce flood risk, avoid adverse impacts on water quality and quantity and incorporate appropriate sustainable drainage systems.

SAMDev Policy MD2 also requires sustainable drainage to be properly integrated into the design of development.

The Town Council therefore asks the Local Planning Authority to satisfy itself that the drainage strategy is genuinely deliverable without unacceptable conflict with:

- known or likely burial areas;
- retained woodland and trees;
- root protection areas;
- ecological habitat; and
- the proposed buildings and access infrastructure.

If this cannot be demonstrated, this would provide a further indication that the proposed density is excessive for the site's constraints.

8. Contamination and ground conditions

The Town Council notes that Environmental Protection has identified potential contamination associated with the site's former cemetery use, the former mortuary chapel, demolition and construction materials, hardstanding and potentially Made Ground. The Town Council accepts that contamination issues can in many circumstances be addressed through investigation and remediation. However, on this site, contamination investigation and remediation cannot be considered in isolation from the archaeological evidence and the presence of burials.

Any intrusive investigation, remediation or construction activity has the potential to create additional ground disturbance.

The Town Council therefore considers that the relationship between contamination, archaeology and the proposed development should be satisfactorily established before planning permission is granted.

9. Boundary wall and highway visibility

The Town Council also asks the Local Planning Authority to verify the current physical condition and dimensions of the boundary wall adjoining Belle Vue Road/Hawthorn Road. The Town Council understands that the wall has recently been altered, including an apparent increase in height and extension in length. It is important that the highway assessment and visibility assumptions are based on the actual existing site conditions. The Council therefore asks that the Highway Authority confirms that:

- the submitted visibility splays accurately reflect the wall as currently constructed;
- the required visibility splays can be achieved;
- they can be maintained in perpetuity; and
- the wall itself does not create an unacceptable impact upon highway safety.

The wall should also be considered as part of the assessment of the character and appearance of the Belle Vue Conservation Area.

10. Four garages and access arrangements

The Town Council also seeks clarification concerning the four proposed garages. The Design and Access Statement appears to indicate that the proposed dwellings have dedicated off-street parking within their respective private driveways, while the Transport Statement identifies four garages accessed separately from Belle Vue Road via the "existing Church access".

The application should therefore clarify:

- which dwellings the four garages serve;
- whether they are necessary to meet the parking requirements of the development;
- the precise route of vehicular access to the garages;
- whether the land required for that access is within the application site;
- the relationship between the proposed access and the separately developed Manse/No. 59B; and
- how permanent rights of access would be secured if the relevant parcels of land were subsequently sold separately.

If the garages are not necessary to provide the required parking for the eight dwellings, the Town Council questions whether four additional structures and their associated access and hardstanding represent an appropriate use of scarce land on an already highly constrained site.

11. Planning balance

The Town Council recognises that the application would provide eight additional homes and that the redevelopment of previously developed land within an established urban area can attract significant weight. However, the provision of housing is not the sole consideration. The NPPF establishes sustainable development as comprising economic, social and environmental objectives. The environmental consequences of development therefore need to be properly considered alongside its housing benefits. In this case, the Town Council considers that the proposal gives rise to a combination of environmental and heritage impacts which are not adequately resolved by the submitted mitigation measures.

These include:

- potential disturbance of a substantial number of burials;
- harm to the historic significance of the former burial ground;
- adverse effects on the character and appearance of the Belle Vue Conservation Area;
- the loss of approximately 69% of established woodland;

- loss of wildlife habitat and ecological connectivity;
 - substantial change to the established green character of the site;
 - uncertainty concerning the integration and deliverability of drainage;
 - potential interaction between contamination remediation and archaeological constraints;
- and
- unresolved questions concerning access, visibility and the proposed garages.

The Town Council considers that these impacts are cumulative and should not be treated as a series of matters which can each be addressed independently through planning conditions.

The housing benefit of eight dwellings is acknowledged. However, the Town Council does not consider that this benefit outweighs the identified heritage, ecological and environmental harm, particularly when the harm could potentially be reduced through a lower-density and differently configured development.

12. Conclusion

For the reasons set out above, Shrewsbury Town Council objects to planning application.

The Town Council considers that the proposal conflicts with the following adopted Development Plan policies:

- Shropshire Core Strategy Policy CS6 – Sustainable Design and Development Principles;
- Shropshire Core Strategy Policy CS17 – Environmental Networks;
- Shropshire Core Strategy Policy CS18 – Sustainable Water Management;
- SAMDev Policy MD2 – Sustainable Design;
- SAMDev Policy MD12 – Natural Environment; and
- SAMDev Policy MD13 – Historic Environment.

The proposal is also considered inconsistent with the relevant provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework concerning design, the natural environment, biodiversity, heritage assets and Conservation Areas, including the requirement to avoid significant biodiversity harm and the requirement to give great weight to the conservation of designated heritage assets.

In particular, the Town Council does not consider that the application has demonstrated that eight three-storey dwellings, four garages and the associated infrastructure represent an appropriate development capacity for this highly constrained site.

The Town Council therefore respectfully asks Shropshire Council to refuse the application as submitted.

If the Local Planning Authority considers that residential redevelopment of the site is acceptable in principle, the Town Council would strongly encourage the applicant to undertake a fundamental review of the scheme and bring forward a lower-density and more sensitive development, designed from the outset around:

1. the avoidance of known, probable and possible burial areas;
2. the retention of substantially more of the existing woodland and mature trees;
3. the protection and enhancement of ecological connectivity;
4. the preservation or enhancement of the character and appearance of the Belle Vue Conservation Area;
5. a demonstrably deliverable sustainable drainage strategy;
6. appropriate treatment and interpretation of the site's historic cemetery use; and
7. a proportionate approach to access, parking, garages and associated hardstanding.

Such an approach could enable the site to contribute to Shrewsbury's housing needs while providing a considerably more appropriate response to its exceptional archaeological, historic, ecological and environmental characteristics.

25.	26/02752/VAR	164 Hereford Road Meole Brace Shrewsbury Shropshire SY3 9LB	Variation of Condition 3 attached to planning permission reference SA/92/1262	No Objection
26.	26/02745/FUL	23 Broadway Close Shrewsbury Shropshire SY2 6HY	Alterations to conservatory walls, windows, doors and roof to form garden room	No Objection

34.2 Schedule of Planning Decisions

The Town Clerk submitted the schedules of planning decisions where the comments of the Town Council varied to the final planning decision of the Planning authority between 25 July – 21 August 2026

RESOLVED:

That the variance of planning decisions between the period 25 July – 21 August 2026 be noted.

34.3 Tree Applications

The Town Clerk submitted the decisions made under the Town Clerk's delegated authority to submit tree application comments between 25 July – 21 August 2026

RESOLVED:

That the comments submitted to Shropshire Council by the Town Clerk under delegated authority be approved

1	26/02778/TCA	13 Darwin Gardens Shrewsbury Shropshire SY3 8QB	Remove one small diameter branch from the east side of the main stem (as indicated in picture) from 1no. Birch within Shrewsbury Conservation Area	No Objection
2	26/02795/TCA	The Works Broome Place Shrewsbury Shropshire SY1 2DS	Fell (and replace with alternative species) 1no. evergreen tree within Shrewsbury Conservation Area	No Objection
3	26/02713/TPO	Ivy House 37 Kennedy Road Shrewsbury Shropshire SY3 7AA	Fell (and replace) 1no. Yew (T140) protected by The Borough of Shrewsbury (Kingsland No 2) Tree Preservation Order 1969 (SA/34)	No Objection
4	26/02843/TCA	1 Quarry Place Shrewsbury Shropshire SY1 1JN	Reduce and shape by 20% 1no. Holly (T1) within Shrewsbury Conservation Area	Representation

Whilst the Town Council do not object to this application per se, no information has been provided to state the size of the tree or the length of the reduction. Could the SC Tree Officer place conditions on the application?

5	26/02838/TPO	11 Ridgebourne Road Shrewsbury Shropshire SY3 9AA	Fell 4no Willow and cut to 5.5m in height 5no Willow protected by The Borough of Shrewsbury (Ridgebourne Road) Tree Preservation Order 1968 (Ref: SA/34)	No Objection
----------	---------------------	---	--	--------------

Whilst the Town Council raises no objections to this application there is no mention of replacement planting in the application

6	26/02839/TCA	14 Belle Vue Gardens Shrewsbury Shropshire SY3 7JG	Crown reduce by 2m 1no Bean Tree within Belle Vue Conservation Area	No Objection
7	26/02846/TCA	Acorn Cottage Red Barn Lane Shrewsbury Shropshire SY3 7HR	Fell 1no Conifer (A) & 1no Whitebeam (B) within Shrewsbury Conservation Area	No Objection
8	26/02900/TCA	2 Swan Hill Gardens Shrewsbury Shropshire SY1 1NT	Crown reduce to previous pruning points by approx. 30% of 1no Silver Birch within Shrewsbury Conservation Area	No Objection
9	26/02911/TCA	123 Harlescott Lane Shrewsbury Shropshire SY1 3AR	Crown reduce by up to 2m and crown lift up to 4.5m of 1no Oak (T1) & crown reduce by up to 30% 1no Pine (T2) within Harlescott Conservation Area	Objection

The Town Council object to this application as no information has been provided to state the size of the tree or the length of the reduction for the Pine tree. Could the SC Tree Officer place conditions on the application?

10	26/02968/TCA	27 Kennedy Road Shrewsbury Shropshire SY3 7AB	Fell 1no. Cherry (14T), 1no. Ash (18T) and 1no. Lime (12T) within Shrewsbury Conservation Area	Objection
-----------	---------------------	---	--	-----------

Whilst there is no objection to works on trees: 14T & 18T, there is not enough information supplied regarding the felling of the Lime Tree 12T. It would have helped if photos showing the problem would have been supplied and the plan provided has no scale on it, which would have assisted. There is no mention of the species of the other trees it will affect. There is also no mention of replanting. Can the SC Tree Officer visit the site to assess before a decision is made.

11	26/02975/TPO	6 Lonsdale Drive Shrewsbury Shropshire SY3 9QJ	To crown reduce by up to 1 metre all- round 1no. Magnolia soulangeana (T1) protected by the Shrewsbury & Atcham Borough Council (Meole Brace) Tree	No Objection
-----------	---------------------	--	---	--------------

			Preservation Order 2002 (SA/354)	
12	26/02980/TCA	3 Oakley Manor Gardens South Hermitage Shrewsbury Shropshire SY3 7NT	Reduce to 5-6ft in height 3no Privet & trim back by 1m away from driveway 1no Cherry (See Photos) within Belle Vue Conservation Area	No Objection
13	26/03001/TCA	10 College Hill Shrewsbury Shropshire SY1 1LZ	Prune back to old growth points (approx. 20% reduction) 1no. Beech (T1) and 1no. Walnut (T2) within Shrewsbury Conservation Area	No Objection
14	26/02982/TPO	Prestfelde Preparatory School, London Road, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, SY2 6NZ	Reduce by approx. 25- 30% 1no Holly & 1no Yew protected by the Shropshire Council (Land at Prestfelde School, London Road, Shrewsbury) Tree Preservation Order 2021 (Ref: SC/00479/21)	Objection

The Town Council object to this application as no reason has been given for the works apart from "request from Neighbour" -why? Is it a 25-30% a height reduction or an overall crown reduction? What length of branch removal is the 25-30%. The trees are on the North side of the property boundary. A full and clear specification has not been provided as required for works to a TPO tree.

15	26/03025/TCA	Sandhurst New Street Shrewsbury Shropshire SY3 8JF	Selective crown reduction of 2no Deodar Cedars (T001&T002) (See Report) & fell and remove stumps of group of 3no Lawsons Cypress (G003) within Shrewsbury Conservation Area	No Objection
-----------	---------------------	--	--	--------------

Whilst the Town Council raises no objections the Town Council would like to know if the three trees that are to be felled need replacing?

Councillor Jephcott queried why the Town Council did not object to application Number 7 on the list and requested reasons were provided.

RESOLVED:

That the Committee Officer would provide members with a reason for not objecting application Number 7 and would notify members by email