

**Appeal Reference 6007402 - Patshull
Road, Albrighton, WV7 3BH**

**Will Hossack on behalf of
Shropshire Council**
**Green Belt Summary Proof
of Evidence**

Final report
Prepared by LUC
August 2026



Contents

Chapter 1	
Professional Credentials	1
Will Hossack	1

Chapter 2	
Introduction and Scope of Evidence	2

Chapter 3	
Local and National Policy Context	3

Chapter 4	
Whether the Development is Inappropriate Development within the Green Belt	4

Chapter 5	
The Impact to the Openness and Remaining Purposes of the Green Belt	5

Chapter 6	
Conclusions	6

Chapter 1

Professional Credentials

Will Hossack

- 1.1 This Summary Proof of Evidence (PoE) has been prepared on behalf of Shropshire Council in relation to appeal of application 24/02108/OUT.
- 1.2 The evidence which I have prepared and provided for appeal reference 6007402 (in my proof of evidence – CD1.21) is true and is given in accordance with guidance of my professional institution, irrespective of whom I am instructed. I can confirm that the opinions expressed are true and professional opinions.
- 1.3 Paragraphs 1.1 – 1.5 detail my professional experience within the planning sector.
- 1.4 Paragraph 1.6 confirms the extent of my involvement with the appeal site and wider Green Belt assessment in Shropshire prior to this PoE.
- 1.5 Paragraph 1.7 confirms I have visited Albrighton and the Appeal Site.

Chapter 2

Introduction and Scope of Evidence

- 2.1** This summary and my main Proof of Evidence address the Green Belt considerations relevant to the appeal. This proof and summary should be read in conjunction with the cited Planning proof of evidence(s) (CD1.22 and CD1.24) which discusses matters beyond the scope of my proof (Criteria b – d) of Paragraph 155 of the Framework and whether Very Special Circumstances exist).
- 2.2** Paragraphs 2.1 – 2.6 seek to confirm my scope for the appeal.
- 2.3** CD2.21 only seeks to address whether the appeal site makes a strong contribution to purpose A and whether it could be considered 'grey belt' on this basis (accepting it makes a weak contribution to purposes B and D). It is also accepted that development of the appeal site would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan.

Chapter 3

Local and National Policy Context

- 3.1 Paragraphs 3.1 – 3.19 provide an overview of Development Plan Documents and their relevance to Albrighton, I specifically highlight policies that will assist in the determination as to whether Albrighton can be considered a large built-up area (LBUA).
- 3.2 Paragraphs 3.0 – 3.26 highlight relevant aspects of the Framework (NPPF), including the Draft Consultation version (CD2.34).
- 3.3 Remaining paragraphs (3.27 – 3.47) highlight relevant parts of other documents which are not part of the Development Plan, this includes the site specific Green Belt Assessment (CD5.11) considered in the determination of the application, which considered the appeal site to make the following contribution(s) to Green Belt purposes:

Purpose A	Purpose B	Purpose C	Purpose D	Purpose E
Strong	Weak	Strong	Weak	Moderate (Equal)

Chapter 4

Whether the Development is Inappropriate Development within the Green Belt

- 4.1** This section provides an assessment as to whether the proposed development would comprise inappropriate development within the Green Belt (by whether the land could be considered ‘grey belt’ and utilise paragraph 155 of the NPPF – subject to compliance with its other criteria beyond the scope of my proof).
- 4.2** Paragraphs 4.7 – 4.29 consider whether Albrighton would be considered a ‘town’ or a ‘village’ in relation to ONS classifications and previous assessments (as if a village it should not be considered a LBUA). It is concluded that it is a town and requires further assessment of the particular local circumstances to see if it would then fall to be considered a LBUA.
- 4.3** Whilst consideration of local circumstances is required (as outlined by the SoS in paragraphs 4.8 and 4.9 of the PoE), paragraph 4.25 reiterates in the Shropshire context, the finding that a settlement is a ‘town’ is in itself likely indicative of it also being a LBUA (due to its rural context).
- 4.4** Paragraphs 4.30 – 4.53 consider Albrighton’s place in the spatial strategy and its comparative services and facilities offering to other Shropshire settlements.
- 4.5** Paragraphs 4.54 – 4.73 consider the size of Albrighton, in terms of its physical built form and comparative size to other Shropshire settlements.
- 4.6** Paragraphs 4.74 – 4.77 conclude Albrighton to be a LBUA in the Shropshire (particularly Green Belt) context.
- 4.7** In finding that Albrighton is a LBUA, paragraphs 4.78 – 4.159 consider the appeal sites contribution to purpose A. Namely, it finds the site makes a ‘strong’ contribution as it is free of existing development and would not be restricted and contained; its development would result a significantly incongruous form of development and there are no other features (such as urbanising influence) that weakens the role it plays in checking the unrestricted sprawl of Albrighton.

Chapter 5

The Impact to the Openness and Remaining Purposes of the Green Belt

- 5.1** Paragraphs 5.1 – 5.7 consider that the site makes a ‘strong’ contribution to Purpose C
- 5.2** Paragraphs 5.8 – 5.10 find the site makes no greater or lesser contribution than any other sites in the Green Belt to Purpose E advocating for an equal/moderate contribution.
- 5.3** Paragraphs 5.11 – 5.24 deliberate that impacts to spatial openness.
- 5.4** Paragraphs 5.25 – 5.39 deliberate that impacts to visual openness.
- 5.5** Paragraphs 5.40 – 5.44 deliberates the permanence and activity arising from the development.
- 5.6** Overall, it is considered (paragraphs 5.45 – 5.47) that substantial harm is caused to the openness of the Green Belt.

Chapter 6

Conclusions

- 6.1 Paragraphs 6.1 – 6.7 summarise that:
- 6.2 The appeal site makes a strong contribution to purposes A and C, and that due to the former the appeal site cannot be considered 'grey belt'.
- 6.3 Therefore, the appeal development cannot be 'not inappropriate' development, and I attach **substantial weight** to this harm.
- 6.4 I also attach **substantial weight** to the harm to the openness of the Green Belt and its harm to Purposes A and C (with lesser harms for other purposes).