BAYSTON HILL
PARISH COUNCIL

'protecting and improving the quality of life for all Bayston Hill residents'

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

Minutes of the Full Council Meeting held at 7:15pm on **Monday 27th October 2025** in Christ Church

Present: Cllrs T Clarke (TC), D Engler (DE), M Jones, E Markham (EM), T Osenton (TO), A Price (AP), R Ruscoe (RR) – Chair, C Shaw (CS), K Turner (KT), N Turner (NT), M Underwood (MU)

In attendance: Julie Hodgkiss – Clerk (JH), Cllr T Trickett – Shropshire Councillor, approx. 40 MOP, M Wilson – Planning Director, Marrons

FC77.25/26 TO RECEIVE APOLOGIES AND REASONS FOR ABSENCE
Apologies were received from Cllrs Teckoe – work commitments, Clode – holiday, Stevens and Parkhurst – family commitments.

FC78.25/26 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST
None

FC79.25/26 PUBLIC SPEAKING/QUESTIONS AT COUNCIL MEETINGS
4 members of the public spoke against the proposals to build houses to the land to the west of Hereford Road (off the A49), item FC80.25/26.

FC80.25/26 MARRONS – LAND TO THE WEST OF HEREFORD ROAD, BAYSTON HILL
M Wilson introduced the outline of the proposed development from Gleeson Land to develop land to the west of Hereford Road (A49). MW explained that work had been undertaken with Shropshire Council for pre-application advice and discussions had taken place with National Highways, Shropshire Highways, the flood team as well as technical surveys undertaken (this list is not exhaustive). MW said that Bayston Hill is a sustainable area for growth. Biodiversity net gain would be achieved on site. Section 106 and/or CIL funds would be levied in order for Shropshire Council and the health board to manage demand on school places and the GP surgery.

Members raised the following points;

RR pointed out that he and CS had met recently with Oakmeadow School and there are currently only 2 spare places in the whole school. RR thanked MW for attending the meeting.

MU pointed out the NPPF Paragraph 12 makes it clear that:

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

The presumption in favour of sustainable development does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision-making. This development would mean a population increase between 600 and 800, 11-15% increase for Bayston Hill not taking account of the potential 350 increase for the Lyth Hill Development (top end a 22% increase in population).

How will Shropshire Council provide the infrastructure for this increase? This is not just about this proposed development but the cumulative impact that other developments will have.

Bayston Hill has to date exceeded the upper limit of the current local plan by 35 houses and potentially this could be 143 if the Lyth Hill development was to get approval. It should also be pointed out that the developer of the recent Treetop development in Bayston Hill was not able to sell all the houses and has had to resort to renting a number. Is there a demand for this housing?

Connectivity is of real concern the distances quoted in the planning statement to local facilities are far greater than the actual distances when checked using Google earth and ideally should be stated as a range. There is no sustainable all year-round footpath into the village or currently along the A49. Using cars to access the village is not sustainable. Bus services are not regular and there is no current footpath to the bus stop on the A49.

This land is high grade agricultural land and is not allocated for housing in the Shropshire Local Plan. There is only a small section of boundary where there is not a green stand off with existing properties; this would be of benefit to existing residents.

RESOLVED: MU proposed that in light of information about the communication with Shropshire Council and developers which BHPC have not been party to, that a senior Shropshire Councillor and/or a senior Planning Officer be asked to attend a Full Council meeting, seconded KT and agreed by all members present.