

Land to the East of Tilstock Road, Tilstock, Shropshire

URBAN DESIGN SUMMARY PROOF OF EVIDENCE CD 1.12

Planning application ref: 24/04176/FUL
Appeal Ref: APP/L3245/W/25/3362414

Prepared by Pegasus Group on behalf of
Boningle Developments Limited
P24-1425 | September 2025



*“The creation of **high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places** is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities...”*

(§131, Framework 2024)

Expertly Done.

DESIGN | ECONOMICS | ENVIRONMENT | HERITAGE | LAND & PROPERTY | PLANNING | TRANSPORT & INFRASTRUCTURE

Pegasus Design

Since 2003, we've been solving planning and development problems for our clients successfully, and we're really proud of that. Even though our work is complex, what we deliver for our clients is very simple: we deliver results.

Expertly Done sums up our approach. We listen and learn from our clients, working as true partners who are passionate about delivering excellence and expertise on every step of the journey.

Everything we do is Expertly Done.

Contents

1. Qualifications and Experience	5
2. Summary and Conclusion	6



Pegasus Group
21 Ganton Street
London
W1F 9BN
www.pegasusgroup.co.uk | T 01285 641717
Prepared by Pegasus Design on behalf of Boningale Developments Limited.

Pegasus Design is part of Pegasus Group Ltd

May 2025 Project code P24-1425

© Copyright. The contents of this document must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part without the written consent of Pegasus Planning Group Ltd.
Crown copyright. All rights reserved, Licence number 100042093.

♻️ Printed material produced by Pegasus Design is printed on paper from sustainably managed sources and all parts are fully recyclable.

NOTE: THIS DOCUMENT IS DESIGNED TO BE VIEWED AS
A3 DOUBLE SIDED

01

Qualifications and Experience

Colin Pullan BA hons Dip UD

- 1.1 My name is Colin Michael Pullan. I am a Senior Design Director at Pegasus Group. I hold a Bachelor of Arts Degree in Planning and a Post Graduate Diploma in Urban Design. I am a member of and former Chair of, the Urban Design Group, a membership charity established in 1978 open to all who care about the quality of life in our cities, towns and villages and believe that raising standards of urban design is central to its improvement.
- 1.2 I have over 35 years' experience as an urban designer in the private sector, covering all design matters. I studied at the Oxford Polytechnic JCUD (now Oxford Brookes), one of the most distinguished urban design universities before moving into private practice as an urban designer/masterplanner at Thamesmead Town Ltd from 1987. From Thamesmead Town Ltd I moved into a private consultancy at Town Planning Consultancy in 1995 and then Chapman Warren Associates in 1999, during which time my experience broadened to take on national projects and more general planning and urban design issues.
- 1.3 From 2000 until 2011 I worked at RPS, a multidisciplinary practice where my responsibility as Urban Design Director was to provide sound urban design advice to public and private sector clients, with an awareness of both current and emerging best practice. In February 2011 I joined Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners (Lichfields). In January 2019 I joined LSH to head up their Urban Design Team. In August 2023 I joined Pegasus Group as a Senior Design Director.
- 1.4 I estimate that I have given evidence at approximately 120 planning inquiries / hearings over some 20 years. In many, if not most of these cases, I gave evidence on the same basis that I do here.
- 1.5 I have experience of designing and given evidence on numerous sites which are greenfield extensions to settlements.
- 1.6 I was instructed by Boningale Developments Limited in June 2024 to prepare the design submission for the application, including the design layout and the Design and Access Statement. I was

subsequently appointed to prepare this Urban Design Proof of Evidence ("**PoE/Evidence**") and present evidence at the hearing.

- 1.7 I am familiar with the site and surrounding area and I have studied the relevant national, regional and local plan policy background.
- 1.8 My Evidence is confined to design related matters.
- 1.9 I confirm that, insofar as the facts stated in my evidence are within my own knowledge, I have made clear what they are, and I believe them to be true; and that the opinions I have expressed represent my true and complete professional opinion irrespective of by whom I am instructed. I have presented urban design evidence at appeal covering issues that are pertinent to this appeal, including matters of height, density, layout and appearance.

02

Summary and Conclusion



Summary

- 2.1 This PoE has been prepared on behalf of Boningale Developments Limited (the “Appellant”). It considers urban design matters relating to the appeal against the non-determination of planning permission for:
“Residential development of 70 dwellings including access, open space, landscaping and associated works” (the “appeal scheme/scheme”).
- 2.2 From February 2024 until March 2025 the Appellant’s design team engaged with Shropshire Council (the “Council”) Officers, statutory and non-statutory consultees, the local community, local ward members and the Parish Council on the design of the scheme as explained in the Statement of Community Involvement (“SoCI” CD 5.4).
- 2.3 The planning application was validated 31st October 2024. An appeal against non-determination was made March 2025 (CD 1.1).
- 2.4 The Council’s Statement of Case (“SoC” CD 3.2 at §2.1) states that had it been in a position to determine the application under delegated powers, permission would have been refused for 4 no. putative reasons for refusal (“rfr”).
- 2.5 Rfr2 will not be defended by the Council (as understood by email from the Council as of 22nd August 2025).
- 2.6 Rfr 1 and part rfr 3, reproduced below with my emphasis, relate to urban design matters:
“1. The proposed development is of such a scale that is disproportionate to the existing built form, rural character and appearance, and available services and facilities of Tilstock; and is inappropriately located so as to not respect the rural street pattern and urban grain, will adversely impact upon the settlements rural function, character and vitality, and result in encroachment to the open countryside, contrary to adopted Policies CS1, CS4, CS5, CS6, MD1, MD2 and MD7a, and NPPF paras 82, 83 and 135 (a)(c)(d)(e)(f).”

Refusal Reason 3:

The planning application, as submitted, has failed to adequately demonstrate that a safe and suitable highways access for vehicles to the site can be achieved. Additionally, the site is in an unsustainable location in relation to access to key facilities with an over-reliance on private car use, due to the limitations of public transport services and wider walking and cycling connectivity, whereby the impacts of the proposal in walking terms have not been adequately demonstrated and nor does the internal street arrangement and layout demonstrate priority-first for sustainable modes. The proposed development is contrary to adopted Policies CS6, CS7 and MD2, and NPPF paras 110 and 117 (a) and (c). Scope and Purpose of this Urban Design Proof of Evidence

- 2.7 With regard to rfr3, insofar as it relates to a suitable access from Tilstock Road, it is understood that the highways authority (Highways Statement of Common Ground “SoCG” CD 4.3) have confirmed that the vehicular access is acceptable.

Scope and Purpose of this Urban Design Proof of Evidence

- 2.8 This evidence addresses matters of urban design. Having regard to rfr3 and rfr5, the identification of main issues from the Case Management Conference (“CMC”); the Council’s SoC (CD 3.2); and the SoCG (CD 4.1); I consider that the principal urban design matters to be addressed by this appeal are:
- The appropriateness of the proposed scale of development (specifically number of dwellings as opposed to density) having regard to the character of Tilstock (*rfr1, Council’s SoC §7.3–7.18 CD 3.2; CMC note 3. The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area, including consideration of urban design matters*); and
 - Whether the appeal scheme is appropriately ‘pedestrian led’ in terms of accessibility (*rfr2, SoC §7.17 CD 3.2*).
- 2.9 Having regard to the Council’s SoC (CD 3.2) I would consider that the simpler issue is that the Council considers that the development is of too greater *number of dwellings* for the character of the village. Neither the Council’s rfr nor SoC cite harm with matters of amenity, outlook, sunlight / daylight, spatial standards and parking – all matters usually associated with development that is overly dense for its site.
- 2.10 Overall, the quantum of housing proposed is considered entirely appropriate for this site; the development on the land is optimised in line with the Framework; and it gives rise to no material harm. The scheme is in accordance with adopted policies for density given the site’s sustainable location. This PoE demonstrates that the scheme would be a high quality development, appropriate to the character and appearance of the surrounding context; and would be inclusive and accessible, having regard to the sustainability of Tilstock, with regard to national, local planning policy and guidance.

Surrounding Context

- 2.11 A description of the appeal site (“**appeal site/site**”) and scheme is set out in the SoCG (CD 4.1); Design and Access Statement (“**DAS**” CD 5.5), Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (“**LVIA**” CD 10.1) and the Heritage Assessment (CD 11.1). The DAS (CD 5.5) and LVIA (CD 10.1) also collectively describe the surrounding context and appraise the effects of the scheme upon it.
- 3.12 As accepted in the Council’s SoC (CD 3.2) at §7.2 and §7.15 and affirmed at §6.18 of the SoCG (CD 4.1), Tilstock is a sustainable location for growth:
- “7.2... is an identified settlement for growth within the adopted development plan... (CD 3.2)*
- 7.15...a sustainable location for new development in accordance with the adopted development plan (CD 3.2)”*
- 2.13 The appeal site is not within a National Landscape, a conservation area or the setting of heritage assets, wherein the design quality and expectation for design is high.
- 2.14 There is no identified particular characteristic or feature that may pre-determine matters of appropriate character, density or scale (such as may be expected of a Conservation or setting of heritage assets and/or recognised landscapes or as may be provided within a neighbourhood plan or village design code).
- 2.15 As acknowledged by the Council’s SoC (CD 3.2) at §7.7:
- “7.7 The built form of Tilstock is very varied, with no single common vernacular, which reflects its modest expansion over time, whilst also contributing to its rural character”*
- 2.16 As described by the DAS (CD 5.5) and explained in this PoE, the pattern of urban growth within the village includes ribbon development, infilling and expansion determined by the field pattern, with development densities typically over 20dph.

The Appropriateness of the Proposed Scale of Development having regard to the Character of Tilstock

- 2.17 The imperative for seeking to secure contextually appropriate and integrated design is set by the National Planning Policy Framework (“**Framework**” CD 2.1) at Sections 11 and 12, and in the context of this appeal, underlined by the Shropshire Core Strategy Development Plan Document (CD 2.2): Policy CS4: Community Hubs and Community Clusters; CS6: Sustainable Design and Development Principles; Policy MD1: Scale and Distribution of Development Policy; MD2: Sustainable Design; and Policy MD3 Delivery of Housing Development of the Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan (CD 2.3); and the National Design Guide (“**NDG**” CD 2.10).
- 2.18 The Framework at §132 seeks development that is: “grounded in an understanding and evaluation of each area’s defining characteristics”; at §133, reflects “local character and design preferences”; and at §135 (c): “sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting, while not preventing or discouraging appropriate innovation or change (such as increased densities); and (d) “establish or maintain a strong sense of place, using the arrangement of streets, spaces, building types and materials to create attractive, welcoming and distinctive places to live.” Policy CS6 seeks development that “is designed to a high quality using sustainable design principles, to achieve an inclusive and accessible environment which respects and enhances local distinctiveness.”
- 2.19 The NDG at §64 states that well-designed new development makes efficient use of land with an amount and mix of development and open spaces that optimises density; relates well to and enhances the existing character and context; and that built form is determined by good urban design principles that combine layout, form and scale in a way that responds positively to the context.
- 2.20 The Appellant’s position is that the scheme demonstrates a positive approach to placemaking and regard to the surrounding character. The scheme will undoubtedly be a

02

change to the existing context. However, I consider this a positive one. The scheme proposes an appropriate edge to the village, reinforcing existing characteristics of the transition from urban to rural context.

- 2.21 Informed by the surrounding context and character to achieve the optimum use of the site, the scheme achieves a density of circa 17dph (comparable to the general density of new developments at around 20 dph).
- 2.22 Having regard to the specifics of the character and context of the appeal site, the density of built form is feathered to reduce to the outer edges – characterised by the transition from the two terraced groups and semi-detached dwellings to the centre and south east of the layout adjacent to the existing village edge, to detached dwellings in large plots set behind green buffers and within a more open setting (see Figures 1 and 2). Along Tilstock Road the widened landscape buffer, which incorporates an existing tree group) screens and buffers and reduces the visual effects of the development behind, such that the existing characteristics of the lane with its high hedgerow and planting framing the viewpoint south to the village remain. Whilst there may be a 'hint' of development behind, and the access road – these are not incongruous features of the approach to the village.
- 2.23 The pattern of development is no greater in density than that found in the village. Overall, the proposed dwellings have an open setting, with greater openness to the countryside western edge addressing Tilstock Road.
- 2.24 By design, the appeal scheme would reflect a natural extension to the village from its original core along one of the principal routes and within/contained by a field boundary adjacent to existing built development and consistent with the accepted recent pattern of development at the edge of the village on Tilstock Lane.



Figure 1: Drwg No: P24-1425_DE_002_D_02 Site Layout FV. CD 6.23. Landscaped edge to Tilstock Road

Whether the Appeal Scheme is Appropriately 'Pedestrian Led' in terms of Accessibility

- 2.25 It is understood from rfr3 that the Council have cited no harm in terms of inclusivity or integration of the new residents and existing. The concern is expressed in terms that the layout is not pedestrian led. Further, at §7.17 the Council's SoC (CD 3.2) asserts that the provision of a footpath link to the village centre would not make the appeal site sustainable:

"7.17 Tilstock does not have the everyday services and facilities to support the everyday needs of residents, including no shop, no secondary school, no GP, no post office, no petrol station and no employment opportunities (a number of which are considered as primary services/facilities that are essential to everyday life). To introduce 70 new dwellings in this location, at one time, would create an imbalance and place undue pressures on local services and infrastructure, negatively affecting community well-being and sustainability. The proposed development would provide a new footpath connection to the village centre, but this is only limited in its function and to what services/facilities it serves. The footpath link does not result in making the appeal site 'sustainably located', and its inclusion is assumed to be in recognition of the unsafe pedestrian alternative, along Tilstock Road.

- 2.26 I address each point in turn.

'The footpath link does not result in making the appeal site 'sustainably located'

- 2.27 As described by the DAS (CD 5.5), Tilstock provides a wide range of local services and within 3.6km of the appeal site, Whitchurch is accessible by bus from stops 5-10 minutes walking distance of the appeal site (450m).
- 2.28 Tilstock is part of a cluster with shared facilities – as defined by the Shropshire Council site Allocations and Management of Development (SAMDev) Plan (Adopted December 2015) (CD 2.3) Policy MD1 Scale and Distribution of Development. Whitchurch is defined as a key settlement/service centre, within the adopted Core Strategy 2006-2026 (adopted 2011). As a service centre, Whitchurch has additional facilities to



Figure 2: Appeal Scheme. Pattern and grain relative to village and context of recent developments

Tilstock, including two nurseries, a junior school, two primary schools and a secondary school. Whitchurch also provides 5 supermarkets, discount stores, various pubs and restaurants, a hospital, GP, and rugby club.

- 2.29 The bus stops and services within the village are accessible from the footpath link. Having regard to the above and the availability of services, the appeal scheme would be in accordance with §83 ‘...Where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby’ and §98 of the Framework... ‘planning policies and decisions should: e) ensure an integrated approach to considering the location of housing’. And, in accordance with the objectives of §109 of the Framework which states that ‘significant development should be focused on locations which are sustainable, through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes...’

Footpath Link

- 2.30 In accordance with §109 of the Framework, transport issues have been considered from the earliest stages of formulating the development proposals to deliver well-designed, sustainable place. The internal layout is highly permeable. A network of footpaths and connected shared spaces enable residents to enjoy safe, pedestrian movement through the site, connecting to the proposed footpath link which as the Council accept at §7.17 would provide connection to the village centre. Within 450m of the appeal site (via the footpath link) are wider connections afforded by the bus routes 511 and 512. See Figures 2 and 3 overleaf).
- 2.31 Further in accordance with §109 of the Framework, b) and e) the layout has been designed such that:
- The pattern of movement, streets, parking and other transport considerations are integral to the design of scheme, and contributes to making a high quality places; and
 - e) Opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public

02

transport use are integral to the layout – the footpath link is direct and legible from within the scheme (See Figure 3).

2.32 And consistent with §117 of the Framework the structure of the layout to direct residents to Tilstock Road:

- Priorities pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and to the village and so far as possible facilitating access to public transport to encourage public transport use;

2.33 And by design:

- Creates a place that is safe, secure and attractive – which minimises the scope of conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles.

2.34 As explained at Section 3 of this PoE and the DAS (CD 5.5) the layout:

- Has a compact form of development that is walkable and promotes walking;
- Has recognisable streets and spaces with their edges defined by buildings, making it easy for anyone to find their way around, and therein promoting safety and accessibility; and
- Is structured to direct movement towards the south east corner, linking routes and spaces from where the footpath link connects to the wider village local public transport services.

The footpath Inclusion is Assumed to be in Recognition of the Unsafe Pedestrian Alternative, along Tilstock Road

2.35 I reject the above assertion for the reasons identified above.

2.36 The inclusion of the footpath link affords residents (proposed and existing) integration and inclusivity. The movement between



Figure 3: Movement Plan. DAS CD 5.5

the appeal scheme and village along the footpath connects the nearby village hall, primary school and the play area and open spaces within the appeal scheme. This connection of activity encourages people to meet and integrate.

Conclusion

2.37 In my opinion, the scheme is a well-designed and contextual proposed.

2.38 What is proposed is not just a variety of housing but significant landscaping, open space and tree planting. The scheme proposes the optimum amount of development within a strong landscape setting that provides a positive, attractive edge to the village having regard to the surrounding context.

2.39 The scheme will undoubtedly be a change to the existing context. However, I consider this a positive one, providing a well-designed residential scheme which retains the characteristics of Tilstock and built development at the edge of the village. By design, the scheme retains the characteristic built and landscape qualities of the village with an attractive residential building that responds to the architectural qualities of the area, the landscape and topography of the site and relates well to its neighbours.

2.40 Through an appraisal of the scheme in its context I conclude that:

- The requirements of relevant national and local urban design policies and guidance have been met. This is a well-designed and attractive scheme;
- The approach to the layout would create an attractive framework for the development areas; the accessible area of open space that informs the sense of place; and
- The density of development is appropriate having regard to the accessibility of the appeal site, surrounding built and landscape context and the features, constraints and opportunities afforded the site. The proposed development is of an appropriate layout and built form determined by good design principles.



2.41 And for the reasons identified above, the scheme would positively relate to the character and appearance of Tilstock.

Figure 4: Street Scenes. DAS CD 5.5

Office Location

21 Ganton Street
London
W1F 9BN

london@pegasusgroup.co.uk

Offices throughout the UK and Ireland.

Expertly Done.

DESIGN | ECONOMICS | ENVIRONMENT | HERITAGE | LAND & PROPERTY | PLANNING | TRANSPORT & INFRASTRUCTURE

 All paper sourced from sustainably managed forests.

Pegasus Group is a trading name of Pegasus Planning Group Limited (07277000) registered in England and Wales
Registered Office: 33 Sheep Street, Cirencester, GL7 1RQ
We are ISO certified 9001, 14001, 45001


[Pegasus_Group](#)


[@pegasusgroup](#)


[Pegasus_Group](#)

PEGASUSGROUP.CO.UK