

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (INQUIRIES PROCEDURES)
(ENGLAND) RULES 2000**

Appeal by: Boningale Developments Ltd

Appeal Site: Patshull Road, Albrighton, Shropshire, WV7 3BH, United Kingdom

Against: The decision by Shropshire Council to refuse planning permission for:

Outline application to include access for a mixed-use development comprising up to 800 no dwellings, a care home of up to 80 units, a secondary school and local centre with associated access, infrastructure, landscaping and drainage.

**SHROPSHIRE COUNCIL
ADDENDUM TO
PROOF OF EVIDENCE ON PLANNING MATTERS**

LYNN PARKER BA (Hons) MA

Planning Inspectorate Appeal Reference:	6007402
Shropshire Council Planning Application Reference:	24/02108/OUT
Shropshire Council Appeal Reference:	26/03479/REF

Date: 3rd September 2026



CONTENTS	Page
1.0 INTRODUCTION	2
2.0 DEVELOPMENT PLAN POSITION	3
3.0 OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS	3
3.1 Presumption in favour of sustainable development	3
3.2 Green Belt	4
3.3 Heritage Assets	5
4.0 CONSIDERATION OF THE MAIN ISSUES	6
4.1 Main Issue 1	6
4.2 Main Issue 2	7
4.3 Main Issue 3	7
4.4 Main Issue 4	8
4.5 Main Issue 5	8
4.6 Main Issue 6	9
4.7 Main Issue 7	9
4.8 Main Issue 8	10
4.9 Main Issue 9	10
5.0 PLANNING BALANCE	11
6.0 CONCLUSION	11
6.2 Updated Planning Balance Assessment Table	12

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This Addendum has been prepared by Lynn Parker as the author of the Council Planning Proof submitted to PINS on 18th August 2026.

- 1.2 A revised National Planning Policy Framework came into force the day before the Proof's submission on Monday 17th August 2026. The revised Framework introduces a new policy-based structure which supersedes the section and paragraph references in my Proof and activates a review of its content following the re-structure. Therefore, in this Addendum I address whether there are any changes to the Council's position expressed in my Proof as a result of the Framework now operative for the determination of the Appeal.

- 1.3 The national decision-making policies in the 2026 Framework remain a material consideration in decision-making to be read alongside the policies in the Development Plan. The policies of the 2024 Framework have ceased to be a material consideration.

2.0 DEVELOPMENT PLAN POSITION

- 2.1 The Council is unable to demonstrate a deliverable five-year housing land supply and therefore under the 2024 Framework the Development Plan policies most important for the determination of the application which involve the provision of housing, were deemed out-of-date by virtue of footnote 8. The weight that could be given to Development Plan policies was therefore dependent on their consistency with the 2024 Framework.
- 2.2 The 2026 Framework sets out the relationship with Development Plans in Annex A: Implementation. Paragraph 2 notes that policies which are materially inconsistent with the 2026 Framework should be given 'very limited weight' - the exception identified does not apply here.

3.0 OTHER MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Presumption in favour of sustainable development

- 3.1.1 In comparison with the 2024 Framework for which the presumption in favour of sustainable development engaged the paragraph 11 'tilted balance' where relevant policies were out-of-date, the 2026 Framework routes decisions by place under Chapter 4: Achieving sustainable development. Policy S5: Principle of development outside settlements would be most relevant for the determination of this Appeal, however caveats at S5.5 that this policy does not apply to development proposals in the Green Belt.
- 3.1.2 Nevertheless, Policy S3: Presumption in favour of sustainable development, instructs that decisions on development proposals should apply a presumption in favour of sustainable development. This means in all locations, development proposals that accord with both an up-to-date development plan and the

decision-making policies in the Framework should be approved without delay (c.) (in addition to b. where Policy S5 should be applied).

3.2 Green Belt

3.2.1 Chapter 13 of the 2026 Framework relates to protecting Green Belt land and continues the core grey-belt route of the 2024 Framework, however the protected areas or assets of particular importance exclusion previously identified in relation to paragraph 11d)i. and footnote 7 is removed. The Council's evidence is that the proposed development site does not constitute grey belt land.

3.2.2 The categories of development which are not inappropriate in the Green Belt are identified in Policy GB7 and are generally commensurate with those in the 2024 Framework other than for residential or mixed-use development where a new transit-oriented route applies. Policy GB7.1.g. identifies that development is not inappropriate if all the sub-categories apply: grey belt is utilised; there is an evidenced unmet need or the type of development proposed; it is in a sustainable location; the Golden Rules in Policy GB8 are complied with.

Nor is residential or mixed-use development inappropriate which would (h.):

- i. Be within a reasonable walking distance of a well-connected station (applying the definitions in the glossary at Annex B);
- ii. Be physically well-related to the station or the settlement within which the station is located;
- iii. Be of a scale which can be accommodated taking into account the existing or proposed availability of infrastructure; and
- iv. Not prejudice any proposals for long-term comprehensive development in the same location.
- v. In the case of proposals for major development, comply with Policy GB8.

3.2.3 The implications of the above 2026 Framework policies are set out in the Consideration of Main Issues section of this Proof. At Policy GB6.2 the 2026 Framework retains that 'very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other

harm resulting from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

3.2.4 I maintain that as the proposed development site is for residential and mixed-use and would not utilise grey belt land, would not be in a sustainable location, nor does it constitute any of the other exceptions to inappropriate development in the Green Belt identified in Framework, it is 'inappropriate development' in the Green Belt and 'very special circumstances' would need to be demonstrated to outweigh the harm to the Green Belt resulting from the proposed development. Therefore the 2026 Framework does not alter the consideration of Main Issue 9 in my Proof.

3.3 Heritage Assets

3.3.1 The term 'less than substantial harm' applied to the harm on the identified designated heritage assets from the proposed development is not present in the 2026 Framework. Chapter 20: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment specifies in Policy HE5.2: Assessing effects on heritage assets, that if proposals would be likely to result in harm to the significance of a heritage asset or its setting, the degree of harm should be identified. It then describes how substantial harm would occur.

3.3.2 Policy HE6: Proposals affecting designated heritage assets, maintains the stance of the 2024 Framework, that substantial weight should be given to the Asset's conservation (1.), and that where a development proposal would harm the significance of a designated heritage asset the effect on the asset and its significance should be weighed against any public benefits resulting from the proposal (4.)

3.3.3 The conclusion reached in consideration of Main Issue 7 in my Proof is maintained as it accords with the 2026 Framework. That is, the harm from physical and visual negative impacts from the proposed development on the identified Assets' significance could be appropriately mitigated for. However, that whilst there are gains included in the proposed development which would be worthy of consideration as public benefits, I have identified restricted benefits from those which are not required to meet a local need or would mitigate the

impact of the proposed development itself.

4.0 CONSIDERATION OF MAIN ISSUES

4.1 Main Issue 1: whether the proposed development would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt having regard to the development plan and the Framework.

4.1.1 The evidence provided within my and Mr Hossack's Proofs that the proposed development site is Green Belt, is in line with the 2026 Framework as the definition of grey belt remains the same. The proposed development site contributes strongly to Green Belt purpose a) and does not comprise previously developed land. Annex 3 clarifies that villages should not be considered large-built up areas in relation to purpose a), and Albrighton is a 'Town' within the Shropshire Council jurisdiction. I also refute throughout my Proof and in this Addendum that the proposed development site would in a sustainable location. It therefore does not meet two of the criteria listed in 2026 Framework Policy GB7.1. g. where all points would need to be satisfied for the proposed development to be considered 'not inappropriate' in the Green Belt.

4.1.2 With regards to Policy GB7.1.h. relating to residential or mixed-use development in the Green Belt, I consider that the proposed development would not be in accordance with points i, or ii of that policy, which again requires all points be satisfied. The table provided under point 17. of the Accessibility SoCG confirms that of the fourteen facilities identified, only three of those are within 800m of the closest parcel of the proposed development site. Albrighton Railway Station is cited as 1510m from the closest parcel of the proposed development site, 1840m from the centre, and 2490m from the furthest parcel. Currently, the weekday train service east to Birmingham New Street and west to Shrewsbury stopping in Albrighton operates hourly. Therefore the proposed development site is not within a reasonable walking distance of a well-connected station (GB7.1.h.i.) as set out in the definitions at Annex B of the 2026 Framework. Nor is it physically well related to the station or settlement within which the station is located (GB7.1.h.ii.) as the proposed development would result in an incongruous pattern of development

projecting out into Green Belt away from the station and town. The Annex B definition of reasonable walking distance includes that where only part of the site falls within reasonable walking distance, the sub-paragraphs of Policy GB7 (amongst others) only apply to the area of the site within that reasonable walking distance. For the proposed development site, the reasonable walking distance of within 800m is limited to its northern parcel.

4.1.3 I consider the proposed development to be 'inappropriate', and therefore harmful to the Green Belt as defined in Policy GB6.2 which directs the decision-maker to give **substantial weight** to this harm. There is no change in this weighting from my original Proof.

4.2 Main Issue 2: if the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt, it's effect on the openness of the Green Belt.

4.2.1 2026 Framework Policy GB6.2 also directs that in making the assessment as to whether 'very special circumstances' exist to outweigh the harm of inappropriateness in the Green Belt, that substantial weight to be given to the harm, should include harm to its openness.

4.2.2 The consideration of harm to the openness of the Green Belt from the proposed development as set out at paragraph 7.2 of my Proof is not changed by the 2026 Framework, as the objective of its Green Belt policies is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The **Substantial weight** which I attributed to the overall harm to the openness of the Green Belt from the proposed development is therefore retained.

4.3 Main Issue 3: whether the proposal would accord with the spatial strategy in the development plan.

4.3.1 As this issue relates specifically to the Council's Development Plan, there is no update to this section of my Proof as a result of the 2026 Framework.

Considerable weight remains apportioned to this factor through the magnitude of conflict with the spatial strategy resulting from this proposed speculative major

development on land which is outside, and not adjacent to the development boundary of Albrighton.

4.4 Main Issue 4: the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

4.4.1 I defer to Mr Kirkpatrick in relation to this issue, however I do not consider that the policies within the 2026 Framework change his stance that development of the proposed site would result in significant harm to the character and appearance of the landscape. **Significant weight** remains afforded to this harm.

4.5 Main Issue 5: whether future occupiers of the proposed development would have adequate access to a range of facilities and services.

4.5.1 The conclusion on this issue at paragraph 7.5.9 of my Proof is assured by the 2026 Framework's introduction of definitions for 'connectivity', 'reasonable walking distance' and 'well-connected station' within Annex B. As I have noted in paragraph 4.1.2 above, the proposed development is not within a reasonable walking distance of a well-connected station. The train service through Albrighton does not operate throughout the daytime by at least four trains per hour, or at least two trains per hour in any one direction and therefore does not comply with the 2026 Framework Appendix B definition of a well-connected station. In addition to the Green Belt policies set out in Chapter 13 of the 2026 Framework, these three definitions apply for achieving sustainable development outside settlements (Policy S5), and for making efficient use of land (Policy L3).

4.5.2 At paragraph 1.a. of Policy TR3: Locating development in sustainable locations, it is specified that a development proposal location should limit the need to travel, particularly by private car, and offer a genuine choice of transport modes for residents and users. I re-iterate (for the reasons set out in the Council's evidence) that for many of the proposed development's future occupiers the private car would be the likely mode of transport choice for the majority of journeys due to the lack of a well-connected station, the walking distances of over 800m into Albrighton for the majority of the site, and the significant number

of trips generated from a development of the scale proposed.

- 4.5.3 The proposal is therefore not in accordance with the aim of paragraph 1, Policy TR3 of the 2026 Framework to locate development where it can support sustainable patterns of movement, enable good accessibility for different users and make the most of existing and proposed transport infrastructure. As the 2026 Framework is now prescriptive in the definitions which contribute to a location being sustainable, and the lack of support from the proposed development for active and sustainable modes of travel to a range of facilities and services adversely contributes to its potential sustainability, I now attach **significant weight** to this harm rather than the considerable weight attached in my Proof.
- 4.6 Main Issue 6: the effect of the proposal on best and most versatile (BMV) land.
- 4.6.1 The 2026 Framework retains the requirement for decision-makers to take the quality of agricultural land, including BMV land, into account and for significant development to use areas of poorer quality land where possible (Policy N2). Therefore my assessment of Main Issue 6 in my Proof is unchanged and **moderate weight** remains attributed to the harm of loss of BMV land as a result of the proposed development.
- 4.7 Main Issue 7: the effect of the proposal on the Boningale Conservation Area (CA) and the Grade II listed buildings of Lea Hall and barn.
- 4.7.1 As noted above in paragraph 3.3.4, identified harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset should still be weighed against any public benefits from the proposal (Policy HE6 of the 2026 Framework). In the 2026 Framework, Policy HE6.1 requires that when considering the potential effect of a development proposal on the significance of a designated heritage asset, substantial weight should be given to the Asset's conservation. The 2024 Framework required rather that great weight should be given to the setting of designated heritage assets. Nevertheless, I acknowledge that the physical and visual negative impacts on the significance of the Assets from the proposed

development could be appropriately mitigated for.

- 4.7.2 The two examples of public benefits provided in Policy HE6.4 do not relate to the proposed development, and my assessment of the public benefits put forward for the proposed development in my Proof is retained. I apportioned **significant weight** to the genuine social benefits put forward: the provision of a significant number of market and affordable homes and a care facility; POS with a neighbourhood play area; the CIL contributions which would be generated by the proposed development; economic benefits from job creation during construction and operation; increased expenditure in local centres. **Limited weight** was given each to: BNG; provision of a Local Centre and active travel routes; the local impact of highway improvements.
- 4.7.3 The conclusion remains as in my Proof that on balance I afford **moderate weight** to the public benefits put forward by the Appellant to overcome the harm to the Designated Heritage Assets, as I do not consider that these public benefits outweigh the substantial weight required in Policy HE6 of the 2026 Framework to be given to Assets' conservation.
- 4.8 Main Issue 8: whether the proposal would make adequate provision for affordable housing, sports and playing pitch facilities, highway improvement works, sustainable transport, education, healthcare, open space, ecology, sustainable drainage systems and biodiversity net gain (BNG).
- 4.8.1 There is no change from the 2026 Framework to my assessment of the provisions provided under Main Issue 8 of my Proof.
- 4.9 Main Issue 9: if the proposal is inappropriate development in the Green Belt, whether the harm by reason of inappropriateness and any other harm is clearly outweighed by other considerations so as to amount to the very special circumstances necessary to justify the development.
- 4.9.1 I have evidenced in my Proof that the proposed development site is high performing Green Belt, and that the proposed development is inappropriate in

the Green Belt. The proposed development does not comply with 2026 Framework Policy GB7.g.i. as it is not within reasonable walking distance of a well-connected station. My assessment of whether the ‘very special circumstances’ put forward by the Appellant clearly outweigh the harm from the proposed development, and any other harms to the Green Belt set out in Table 1 of my Proof remains unchanged in relation to the 2026 Framework policies.

- 4.9.2 I do not agree that the combined benefits of the proposed development amount to the ‘very special circumstances’ required to overcome the inappropriateness of the proposed development and to release the site from the Green Belt. As in my Proof, **substantial weight** is assigned to the high level of harm to the local area that would result from the loss to the proposed development of this Green Belt countryside.

5.0 PLANNING BALANCE

- 5.1 In my Proof, I have assessed the benefits and harms and afforded weight accordingly. There are no alterations to my assessment of the benefits set out at paragraph 8.1 of my Proof as a result of 2026 Framework policies. With regards to the assessment of harms from the proposed development at 8.2, **significant weight** (rather than considerable) is now attached to the harm in relation to accessibility as the definitions in Appendix B of the 2026 Framework confirm the proposed development site is not within a reasonable walking distance of a well-connected station and therefore not in a sustainable location.

6.0 CONCLUSION

- 6.1 The table below is an updated version of Table 2 at paragraph 9.2 of my Proof, with adjustment made for the significant harm now attached to Accessibility in response to the 2026 Framework decision-making policies:

6.2 Table 2: Updated Planning Balance Assessment Table.

Category	Description	Weight	Positive/Negative/Flat
Housing Supply	Delivery of 800 dwellings	Significant	Positive
Affordable Housing	35%, policy compliant	Significant	Positive
Other Social Benefits	Care facility, POS, CIL Contributions.	Significant	Positive
Economic Contributions	Construction phase activity, Council Tax revenue, local expenditure.	Significant	Positive
Biodiversity Net Gain	Gain of 15.50% area habitat units, 10.92% linear habitat units and 23.06% watercourse habitat units.	Limited	Positive
Inappropriate Development in the Green Belt	Makes a strong contribution to purpose a) and is therefore not grey belt.	Substantial	Negative
Effect on the openness of the Green Belt	Permanent visual and spatial change to this undeveloped countryside parcel.	Substantial	Negative
Effect on the character and appearance of the area.	Protrusion of the built form into agricultural countryside. Change to compact form of Albrighton	Significant	Negative
Accessibility	Definitions in Appendix B of the 2026 Framework confirm the proposed development site is not within a reasonable walking distance of a well-connected station and therefore not in a sustainable location. Provision of bus service not evidenced. Walking	Significant	Negative

	distances from majority of the site to Albrighton greater than 800 metres. Future occupiers would be car reliant.		
Accordance with the Development Plan spatial strategy.	Out-of-date policies remain in conformity with the Framework. Speculative site in the countryside outside of the development boundaries.	Considerable	Negative
Effect on BMV land	Grade 2 and 3 Agricultural land present. No ACL Report submitted. Not PDL, 'brownfield' or under-utilised land.	Moderate	Negative
Effect on Designated Heritage Assets	I consider the public benefits put forward do not outweigh the 'less than substantial harm' identified.	Moderate	Negative

6.3 There is no change to paragraph 8.4 of my Proof.

6.4 In accordance with Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, this Appeal must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. While the Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing land and the presumption in favour of sustainable development is engaged, the identified adverse effects of granting permission would substantially outweigh the benefits when assessed against the national decision-making policies in the 2026 Framework. The proposal is in clear conflict with the most important policies of the adopted Development Plan, its age alone not reducing the weight afforded to it, and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to justify a decision other than in accordance with the Plan. Accordingly, I still respectfully recommend that the Appeal be Dismissed.