

**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.

POST CMC CLARIFICATION NOTE

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

Date: 12th June 2026



This Clarification Note provides additional information as requested in the Inspector's Inquiry Case Management Conference Summary Note following the CMC held at 10:00 on Friday 5th June. The information is set out under the four points identified for further clarification.

1.0 Green Belt Purposes a), c) and d).

- 1.1 The Council regard the proposed development site an inappropriate development in the Green Belt as it would not utilise grey belt land (first part, NPPF paragraph 155a). This position is informed by the independent Shropshire Council Green Belt Assessment (SCGBA) (LUC, September 2025) commissioned during the course of planning application ref: 24/02108/OUT to assess the associated Green Belt land which concludes that the proposed development site makes a strong contribution to Green Belt purpose a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas.
- 1.2 The SCGBA found that the proposed development site makes a weak contribution to both Green Belt purposes b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another and d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. As the NPPG Green Belt and NPPF Annex 2 require consideration of whether a site makes a strong contribution to Green Belt purposes a), b) or d), to ascertain if it would utilise grey belt land in accordance with NPPF paragraph 155a, the Council's position is that as the proposed development site has been assessed to make a strong contribution to purpose a) only, this indicates that it would not fall within the definition of grey belt.
- 1.3 The second part of NPPF paragraph 155a. notes that development should not be regarded as inappropriate in the Green Belt if it would not fundamentally undermine the purposes (taken together) of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan. This consideration is relevant only as a further step if the site is regarded as grey belt. Nevertheless, the Council consider the release or development of the proposed site would not affect the ability of the remaining Green Belt across the area of the plan from serving all five of the Green Belt purposes in a meaningful way. The Council is not putting case a forward in relation to the second part of NPPF paragraph 155a.
- 1.4 However, the SCGBA identified that the proposed development site makes a strong contribution to Green Belt purpose c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. This will be a matter to be weighed under 'other harms' to the Green Belt resulting from the proposed development weighed against other considerations. (NPPF, paragraph 153)
- 1.5 In summary, the Council do not regard the area of Green Belt land proposed for development as grey belt as it has been assessed as making a strong contribution to Green Belt purpose a).

The proposed development site has also been assessed as making a strong contribution to Green Belt purpose c) which will be included in the Council's

consideration of 'other harms' to the Green Belt weighed against other considerations ('very special circumstances').

2.0 Whether future occupiers of the proposed development would have adequate access to a range of facilities and services (main issue 5).

2.1 In consideration of whether The Council's case will include Main Reason 5) of the CMC Summary Note (whether future occupiers of the proposed development would have adequate access to a range of facilities and services) the following points are considered:

- It is considered the proposed development site is not well-related to the existing town of Albrighton as from its tip adjacent to a southern point of Albrighton it would extend southwards widening as it projects into the countryside to reach its maximum width along the A454 at its southern boundary and away from Albrighton. Therefore, the majority of the proposed development is considered to have a generally poor relationship with the existing urban form of Albrighton, which is likely to reduce the credible prospect of future residents accessing the town's existing range of services and facilities via walking or cycling. However, this aspect will be taken into account under Main Issue 3) of the CMC Summary Note in relation to whether the proposal would accord with the spatial strategy in the adopted Development Plan.
- The benefits of the transport and active travel routes are as yet to be fully formed, however access to current public transport from the proposed development site is considered to be acceptable by the LHA.
- A proposal to provide 'new or re-routed bus services to travel through the site and link with key facilities in Albrighton' was presented in the Appellant's document TN04 (CD7.12). However, it is currently considered what has been presented by the Appellant lacks a level of detail or certainty of the approach of its delivery to allow positive weight to be given to it at this stage.
- That the LHA consider access to current public transport from the proposed development site is acknowledged. Nevertheless, travel distances to a range of facilities and services within Albrighton itself would be much greater from the southern extent of the proposed development site. Travel distances from the southern extremities of the proposed residential development to Albrighton Station would be over 2km.
- The facilities and services proposed as part of the proposed development would not be unique to this site and are understood to mitigate the needs of the development itself. These 'public benefits' will be weighed against the 'less than substantial harm' identified to Designated Heritage Assets adjacent to the site and assessed as to whether they form 'very special circumstances' that would outweigh the inappropriateness of the proposed development in the Green Belt.

2.2 Having taken these points into account, the Council consider that whether future occupiers of the proposed development would have adequate access to a range of facilities and services falls within Main Issues 3), 7), 8) and 9), and/or can be confirmed through the topic-based SoCGs already identified to be produced.

3.0 Education Position.

- 3.1 The proposed development lies within the catchment area of Idsall School. An evaluation of current enrolment data, projected housing yields, and regional demographics clearly shows that existing secondary school infrastructure possesses sufficient capacity to accommodate future growth and building a new school would be a massive over correction and is unwarranted.
- 3.2 There is significant capacity surplus at Idsall School. Idsall School has a net capacity of 1,300 pupils. Currently the school has vacancies in all year groups, the school operates with around 10% surplus with approximation. The anticipated development of 800 new residential homes is projected to generate a yield of approximately 112 secondary school pupils. This influx can be entirely absorbed by the existing vacancies at Idsall School without requiring infrastructural expansion. Furthermore, approximately 32% of the current student body resides outside the Shropshire local authority area, originating from Telford & Wrekin and Staffordshire. As catchment area demand increases, places will be prioritised for pupils residing in the catchment area as per the schools determined oversubscription criteria.
- 3.3 The data conclusively demonstrates that a residential development of 800 homes does not generate the threshold of demand required to justify the construction of a new secondary school. Through a combination of current vacancies within the school and the prioritisation of catchment applicants over out of area applicants, the existing school is fully equipped to meet future demand sustainably. There is no requirement for a secondary school within this area.

4.0 Healthcare Position.

- 4.1 Consultee comments from the Integrated Care Board (ICB) were submitted on 8th December 2025, and reported to the Southern Planning Committee within the Schedule of Additional Letters document of 16th December 2025. The ICB comments are as follows:
- 4.2 This is a significant development and will greatly impact the GP surgery in the town which is already over capacity in terms of available space and there are discussions ongoing for an extension to the current premises to accommodate this need for additional space. This development has not been factored into the current discussions and so will necessitate revisiting the current proposals with a view to increasing the size of the planned extension.

Using our standard calculator against the proposed housing numbers (800x) and care home beds (80x) gives a figure for a healthcare contribution from this development of 717,256 for the housing element and an additional 59,771 for the care home element so 777,027 in total.