
LAND AT PATSHULL ROAD, ALBRIGHTON, SHROPSHIRE
EDUCATION STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND
BETWEEN THE APPELLANT AND SHROPSHIRE COUNCIL

PINS Reference: 6007402

Application Reference: 24/02108/OUT

Prepared on behalf of Boningale Developments Ltd

CONTEXT

- 1.1** An outline planning application was submitted to the Local Planning Authority in 2024 for a residential-led scheme with up to 800 dwellings, up to 80-bed care home, a secondary school and local centre, with associated infrastructure on a site known as Land at Patshull Road in Albrighton.
- 1.2** A consultee response was received from Education Officers at Shropshire Council (“the Council”) in July 2024. The response requested contributions for early years, primary, secondary, post-16 and SEND education. The final contributions requested now exclude early years.
- 1.3** Any contributions for the construction of education places will be funded from the Community Infrastructure Levy.
- 1.4** The planning application was refused in December 2025. The reasons for refusal did not relate to education infrastructure.
- 1.5** The Officer report contained some references to education and additional representations were made in consultee comments to the viability of a secondary school within the Proposed Development.
- 1.6** The Appellant has confirmed their commitment to offering land for a secondary school within the Proposed Development.

- 1.7** In advance of the upcoming planning inquiry, the Appellant and the Council are engaged in direct dialogue to narrow any points of disagreement relating to education. Both parties are committed to continuing this dialogue, developing Section 106 drafting that clearly captures the positions of both parties and ensuring that inquiry time is used wisely.

2.0 MATTERS OF AGREEMENT ON EDUCATION

- 2.1** The parties, including the Appellant and the Council, agree that the development will generate additional school place demand and that some mitigation is necessary.
- 2.2** The parties agree that the Council has adopted CIL and any education contributions will be funded from CIL for the Proposed Development, except for SEND Transport.

Secondary Education

- 2.3** It is agreed that by applying the DfE Pupil Yield Dashboard figures for Shropshire, the Proposed Development may generate up to 112 additional secondary age pupils and 40 post-16 learners over time, as the Proposed Development is completed.
- 2.4** It is agreed that there are no secondary schools within three miles of the Proposed Development within the Shropshire Local Authority area.
- 2.5** It is agreed that the nearest secondary school in the Shropshire Local Authority Area is Idsall School. Idsall School is an independent, state-funded academy operated by The Marches Academy Trust and is the catchment school for the proposed development site. Idsall School is located six miles from the Proposed Development and is in Shifnal.

- 2.6** It is agreed that Idsall School has a current PAN of 216 places into Year 7 and has sixth form provision.

SEND Education

- 2.7** It is agreed that there are no state-funded SEND specialist schools in the east of the Shropshire Local Authority Area.
- 2.8** It is agreed that the nearest state-funded SEND specialist school in Shropshire Local Authority Area is Severndale Specialist Academy in Shrewsbury and it is twenty miles from the Proposed Development.

3.0 MATTERS OF DISGREEMENT ON EDUCATION

- 3.1** At the time of drafting this statement, there are matters in dispute relating to the justification for the Appellant offering land for a secondary school.

School Capacity

- 3.2** The Council considers that Idsall School has available capacity to cater for the majority of pupils from Proposed Development.
- 3.3** The Council has recorded the capacity of Idsall School to be 1,300 pupils of which 220 are sixth form pupils. The Appellant notes that published information records the school capacity to be 1,080 pupils for secondary pupils.
- 3.4** The Appellant believes that public statements from Idsall School and their Multi-Academy Trust operator do not support a view that Idsall School can, or is willing, to expand to accommodate forecasted demand. The Council does not agree with the Appellant's position on this.

Forecasted Demand

- 3.5** The Council considers that a Secondary School Site is not required as the Proposed Development would generate insufficient demand for a new secondary school to be viable.
- 3.6** The Appellant's position is that pupil yield from all consented developments, site allocations and pending applications with the realistic prospect of delivery, and that are located within three miles of Idsall School or the Proposed Development, should be considered in terms of forward planning for secondary school place demand
- 3.7** The Council's position is that the projected pupil yield from the proposed development together with recently consented developments in the secondary school catchment area which includes the proposed development site, does not justify the provision of a new secondary school.
- 3.8** The Appellant's position is that there is a realistic prospect for between 2,800 and 3,900 additional dwellings being delivered in the local area that these could generate demand for 2.5 to 3.5 additional forms of entry at secondary level. This is in addition to the impact from the Proposed Development.

Secondary Education Impact and Mitigation

- 3.9** The Council does not believe that any additional land for a secondary school is needed to accommodate pupils generated by new housing at the proposed development site.
- 3.10** The Appellant considers that the provision of a Secondary School Site is necessary to enable the Council to have a viable solution for Secondary School Place demand, including SEND education. The Appellant considers that without such a site there is a risk that the Council may not be able to comply with their Sufficiency Duty.

3.11 The Council's position is that a secondary school at the Proposed Development would not be viable or deliverable.

3.12 The Appellant's position is that there are a range of options for secondary provision that could deliver sustainable, high-quality provision and reduce home to school travel obligations. This includes combinations of post-16, mainstream secondary and secondary SEND provision.

SEND Education Pupil Yield

3.13 The Council has applied a pupil yield figure of 0.01 SEND pupils per dwelling to estimate the number of pupils generated by the Proposed Development that will require a place at a SEND or Alternative Provision (AP) specialist school. The Council has calculated that this will generate 8 SEND pupils.

3.14 The Appellant disagrees with the pupil yield approach for SEND pupils and that it is not compliant with the tests of Regulation 122(2) of the CIL Regulations 2010. Their position is that the underlying data in the pupil yield dashboard is sparse for SEND pupils and the yield is very low, which necessitates the application of at least three decimal places for the SEND yield and a figure of 0.007 SEND pupils per dwelling. This would result in a pupil yield of 5.6 SEND pupils, rounded to 6 pupils.

This Statement of Common Ground is agreed by Flinders Chase on behalf of Boningale Developments Ltd, (the “Appellants”) and Shropshire Council.

Signed on behalf of the Appellant

... ..

Name: Kerrie Norman (Director – Flinders Chase)

Date 05 August 2026

Signed on behalf of Shropshire Council

.....

Name: Lynn Parker

Date: 5th August 2026