

6007402 - Patshull Road, Albrighton, Shropshire, WV7 3BH

Consultation on Supplementary Plans

The consultation was hosted online at albrightonsouth.co.uk, running from the 7th to the 28th August 2026.

17 responses were received via the feedback form on the website. One response was received via email, which was a duplication of a response submitted via the online feedback form (comment 17).

No comments were received by post.

The comments are listed in full below, with any personal information removed:

Comment reference	Comment
1	Albrighton doesn't have the infrastructure to cope with this influx of people. Vets, gps, dentist etc. Albrighton is a peaceful beautiful village and the idea of it becoming overpopulated so that the rich can get richer is very frustrating. Along with the majority of Albrighton residents, I will do everything I can to stop this being approved. Frankly it makes me sick to my stomach. Other than the developers, Who does this benefit?
2	The additional information has not caused me to change my view that this application is totally inappropriate, involving as it does prime agricultural land. I have no objection to developments in other parts locally, including, currently, on fields directly opposite to me, and, according to a previous plan from Shropshire Council, on fields behind my land in the future. I respect the need for growth, but this is the wrong plan in the wrong area. I should add that one further reason for registering a response is to play my part in preventing the prospective developers from arguing that no one is sufficiently concerned about the plan to bother about it.
3	A development of this size, which destroys a large area of greenbelt land of significant habitat for wildlife and area of natural beauty, would destroy and overwhelm the infrastructure of the small village of Albrighton. The traffic congestion itself would be so detrimental to this area in particular. This must not be allowed to happen. Build on brown field sites instead!
4	I strongly object to the proposal to build 800 homes south of Albrighton. This development is completely out of proportion with the size of our village. Albrighton is not designed to accommodate growth on this scale, and adding hundreds of new homes would permanently change the character of the community that residents have chosen to live in. Traffic is already a major concern. Roads through the village regularly become congested, particularly during school runs and peak commuting hours. Adding hundreds of additional households will inevitably increase vehicle movements, resulting in longer delays, increased pollution and reduced road safety for pedestrians and cyclists. Local services are already under significant pressure. Residents often

Comment reference	Comment
	struggle to access GP appointments, school places and other essential services. While the application refers to new facilities, these cannot be assumed to fully offset the additional demand, particularly if they are delivered after people move into the development. Existing residents should not be expected to accept a decline in access to essential services. The proposal would also result in the loss of valuable Green Belt land. The purpose of the Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl and protect the identity of settlements. Approving a development of this scale would permanently erode that protection and fundamentally alter the setting of Albrighton. Once this land is built on, it is lost forever. There are more appropriate locations for large-scale housing growth that do not require sacrificing protected countryside or placing such a significant burden on an established village. This proposal is simply too large, too intensive and in the wrong location. For these reasons, I urge the application to be refused.
5	I live in Albrighton, and am mostly in favour of this development. I would like to see more information made available about the current land use and land value (farming and green/blue), in comparison to what is being proposed. Some further information on the BNG assessment would also be valuable for public review. I work in for an environmental consultancy focussing on freshwater habitats and would be keen to know more about the impacts on those habitats, and see the Flood Risk Assessment made available too. Kind Regards, (name redacted)
6	I don't believe that that SUDS system is viable given the amount of water that will be running off the land. These also create local areas of flood risk and danger for young children and are not suitably controlled - the are floods and a small child slips and drowns in a SUD. The outlining of the area the with a "wall of green" destroys Community cohesion and create a separate town, Albrighton South, that draws on the services of the main village whilst effectively being a separate self enclosed town. It seems parasitic. The secondary school also seems to have been downgraded, with less outdoor space - given the number of pupils expected to attend this is wholly unsuitable. In all, this is ill thought out lip service to attempt to mitigate the original concerns, which they don't, while introducing a host of others.
7	I live in Patshull Road and I don't understand your plans for the road itself. How can you have a road allowing fire engines, ambulances, oil tank deliveries and septic tank vehicles access and stop other through traffic? Will it remain an adopted road under your plans? I will be blocked in by your development and have huge flooding and property value drop concerns. I would welcome a discussion as someone greatly impacted by your plans.

Comment reference	Comment
8	I believe the development of the village of Albrighton will have a significant impact on the village and surrounding communities. The current infrastructure of the area does not allow for such a substantial development. This proposed development will directly impact the quality of the lives of those who live in the vicinity. It's terrible for the environment and will reduce the quality of peoples lives. Our family does not support this development. We collectively feel saddened by the proposal as we all feel it will have a negative effect on our lives.
9	Horrendous plan and purely looking at profit over what is best for the village. It is almost laughable to suggest 800 homes plus an 80 unit care home. Not ok and not a sustainable approach to development
10	I object to this development purely for the impact it had on the traffic for Holyhead Road. The road is fast and noisy enough - you do not need to add to that. It will affect my home on the Holyhead Road particularly with noise pollution. Also there is enough strain on the services for Albrighton, particularly the doctors following the Millfields development. Albrighton doesn't need to become the size of Perton.
11	Absolutely nothing has changed. Still green belt, still far too big, still too much load on village infrastructure and roads. No
12	I formally object to the updated design proposals for the Albrighton development. Although these are described as updated design proposals rather than a revised planning application, my fundamental concerns regarding the development remain unchanged. Green Belt My principal objection is that the proposed development would involve the use of Green Belt land. Changing the design or layout of the proposed development does not address the fundamental planning concern regarding the development of protected Green Belt land. The Council should therefore consider whether the updated proposals continue to result in harm to the openness and purposes of the Green Belt and whether there are sufficient planning grounds to justify allowing development on this site. Pressure on existing village infrastructure I am also extremely concerned about the additional pressure that the development would place on the existing infrastructure of the village. The existing village infrastructure was not designed to accommodate unlimited additional development. Further housing will inevitably increase demand on roads, drainage, sewerage, schools, healthcare, parking and

Comment reference	Comment
	other essential services. The impact should not be considered in isolation. The Council should take into account the cumulative effect of this development together with other existing, approved and proposed developments within and around the village. Highways and traffic Additional housing will result in additional vehicle movements and increased pressure on the existing road network. I ask the Council to ensure that the highway implications have been properly assessed, including the cumulative impact of additional traffic, road safety, parking and pedestrian movements. Character and openness of the village The development would also have an impact on the existing character and rural setting of the village. The remaining open land around the village provides an important contribution to its character and helps maintain the distinction between the village and the surrounding countryside. I am concerned that continued development will gradually erode this character and place increasing pressure on the village's limited infrastructure. Updated design proposals Whilst I acknowledge that the developer has produced updated design proposals, I do not believe that changes to the appearance, layout or design of the development resolve the fundamental concerns regarding: * the loss/use of Green Belt land; * the impact on the openness of the Green Belt; * pressure on existing village infrastructure; * increased traffic and highway pressures; * the cumulative impact of development; and * the effect on the character and rural setting of the village. I therefore respectfully ask the Council to consider these objections when assessing the updated proposals and the wider planning application. I would ask that particular consideration is given to whether the development can be adequately supported by the existing infrastructure of the village, and whether the cumulative impact of development in the area has been properly assessed. For these reasons, I continue to object to the proposed development and respectfully request that planning permission is refused.
13	None of this changes the fact that you will be destroying valuable productive farming land forever. Only for personal family owned company greed.

Comment reference	Comment
	Increasing a Village by a phenomenal percentage. There are plenty of unused commercial sites around - of course less profit. This is a sad state of affairs.
14	The additional cosmetic changes do not change the fact that the proposal is to build on green belt farmland. The local infrastructure cannot cope and the doctors cannot deal with all the extra people let alone yet another care home. This is a misguided application
15	I do not see any improvement to the planned development. A development of this size will put an impossible strain on already stretched medical services in the community along with additional traffic. The occupants of these houses will undoubtedly be employed elsewhere, probably Telford where there are already proposals for massive new housing developments. Surely this should render this over development unnecessary.
16	Cross Road is already a race track & dangerous. Used as a cut through for HGV/boy racers/cars to M54, Newport, bypass, Shifnal & beyond. this will become horrific with yet more housing. Any development will destroy this historical, characterful, beautiful village with listed buildings, where the majority of people (incl. myself & husband) have moved here to be in a smaller community, near open countryside for a peaceful more rural way of life. More housing & people will destroy our agricultural farming land, cause more flooding on land that already floods, more traffic/noise/fumes, & cause suffering to our mental & physical health due to massive impact on our wonderful village doctors, lack of green spaces, crowded conditions, dangerous busy roads etc. We DO NOT want to live in a town. GREEN BELT land should NEVER be used for housing. From experience, once permission has been granted any promises made by the developers will be "forgotten & changed" leaving the residents & businesses to suffer greatly. Albrighton has already had its share of housing, it SHOULD NOT be made to give up any more land or forced to become a town by massive building which eventually merges with surrounding districts. We CANNOT keep destroying our history/countryside/unique villages just for pure greed.
17	Albrighton Development Action Group Response: Albrighton Development Action Group has reviewed the modified plans and can confirm that the developer has not listened to any community concerns and all the 1157 written objections - fundamental in Shropshire Council delivering a unanimous refusal in December 2025 - still stand. The proposals are still unsustainable overdevelopment and will be challenged again by the Albrighton community at the upcoming Public Inquiry.