

Clerk to the Council/RFO: J Hodgkiss
Chairman: Cllr R Ruscoe

Minutes of the Full Council Meeting held at 7:15pm on **Monday 18th August 2025** in The Memorial Hall.

Present: T Clarke (TC), T Markham (TM), T Osenton (TO), A Price (AP), R Ruscoe (RR) – Chair, C Shaw (CS), P Stevens (PS), M Underwood (MU)

In attendance: Julie Hodgkiss – Clerk (JH)

FC32.25/26 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES AND REASONS FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Cllr Parkhurst – personal appointment, Cllrs Clode, Engler, K Turner, N Turner, Jones – holiday.

FC33.25/26 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

FC34.25/26 PUBLIC SPEAKING/QUESTIONS AT COUNCIL MEETINGS

None

FC35.25/26 MINUTES

RESOLVED: MU proposed to approve the minutes of the Full Council held on 14th July 2025. (Date error on original agenda), seconded by CS and agreed by all members present.

FC36.25/26 LYTH HILL REDROW DEVELOPMENT

REOLVED: MU proposed to approve the following statement (or a slight variation of) to be read at Shropshire Council Northern Planning Committee on 19th August by Cllr Ruscoe, seconded by AP and agreed by all members present.

Bayston Hill to date within the current Shropshire Local plan has had planning permission granted for 95 houses, an increase of 35 over the higher limit set in the current local plan. This application would increase this figure to 149. The committee report you have sets out our objections so we will not repeat these.

Page 37 raises the point made by Paragraph 11(d) of the National Planning Policy Framework which requires the decision maker to apply less weight to policies in the adopted Development Plan, and more weight to the presumption in favour of sustainable development as a significant material consideration. Known as the tilted balance, there is case law that confirms that tilted balance is not a green light for approval. Where adverse impacts significantly and demonstrably outweigh benefits, refusal remains justified. We believe there is adverse impact here that outweighs the benefits.

Signed:..... Date:.....

Shropshire Council will have to consult again on allocated sites for the new Local Plan so it is not in our opinion correct to assume that this would be an allocated site in the new Local plan.

Sustainable Location

The Primary School is full, the Medical Practice is under significant pressure, car parking for the shops and for the library is at a premium. We do not have a regular bus service for this proposed development. Public Rights of Way demonstrated in the travel plan cannot be assumed fit for use all year round and the walking distance from the development to the shops is in excess of the maximum that should be permitted.

Ensure that it makes efficient use of land

2.3 hectares (40%) of best and most versatile agricultural land will be lost if this development proceeds this is a significant proportion of land and should not be sacrificed for this development.

Secures well designed places

We do not believe that this development is in keeping with the local distinctiveness of the area, the actual density of the development is significantly more than for Bayston Hill as a whole.

Traffic

Section 4.1.13 page 46 of the committee report talks about introducing localised parking restrictions along Lyth Hill Road, we do not believe that it is fair or right to remove this amenity from the residents of Lyth Hill Road to overcome a problem highlighted for this development.

General Observations

It concerns us that several significant conditions will have to be included in a section 106 agreement which suggests that the application is not fit for purpose. Any 106 agreement will be open to amendments and would need to be monitored closely which may prove difficult for a Council with limited resources. Surely an application should be fit for purpose before it is approved and not rely on a formal agreement to do this.

Signed:..... Date:.....