



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 April 2026

by N Bromley BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 22 April 2026

Appeal Ref: 6004401

2 Woodcote Way, Shrewsbury, Shropshire SY2 5SJ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr. Gary Llewellyn against the decision of Shropshire Council.
- The application Ref is 25/04230/FUL.
- The development proposed is construction of new driveway which would necessitate a dropped kerb.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The effect of the proposed development on highway safety.

Reasons

3. The appeal site comprises a two-storey semi-detached dwelling which fronts Woodcote Way. Woodcote Way has a residential character, as does the surrounding area. The road serves the wider residential area and traffic flow along it is frequent.
4. Many of the houses along the road benefit from frontage parking spaces, which is a common feature of the area. However, the appeal property is set behind a low fence, with a small garden to the side, and it does not benefit from frontage parking.
5. The appeal site is located close to a large roundabout and directly adjacent to a splitter island, a traffic-calming feature that narrows the carriageway and channels traffic into designated lanes on the approach to the roundabout. A pavement and grass verge separate the appeal site from the road and there is a preponderance of street furniture around the roundabout and within proximity of the site. With frequent traffic flow along the road, the street scene is a busy environment.
6. Due to the juxtaposition of the proposed driveway to the splitter island, vehicles leaving the proposed parking area would not be able to safely turn right and head northwards along Woodcote Way. Likewise, vehicles leaving the roundabout would not be able to directly turn right into the driveway. Indeed, it is not clear how access to the driveway would be achieved from that direction. In both of these circumstances, inappropriate vehicle manoeuvres could take place on the highway which would lead to unacceptable highway safety implications. These movements would be uncontrolled and unpredictable.

7. While it is suggested that a “left in and left out approach” would enable vehicles to access and egress the spaces, which could include possible reversing manoeuvres into the driveway, I am not persuaded that it is a common manoeuvre across the highway network and even if it was, how it would be secured and controlled.
8. As a domestic driveway the number and frequency of vehicle movements in and out of the proposed access would be low. Suitably worded planning conditions would ensure acceptable visibility splays, parking dimensions, surfacing and drainage, and I am also told that the proposed driveway could be constructed to comply with the Shropshire Council’s Vehicle Access Crossing (Dropped Kerbs) Guidance. Even so, for the reasons identified above, the inability to turn right into and out of the driveway would not ensure safe and suitable access arrangements for the appeal property, which would significantly increase the risk to the safety of highway users.
9. Although there are other driveways along the road, including the adjoining house, the safety of an access is a site-specific matter. Indeed, those driveways are located further away from the roundabout and splitter island and vehicle manoeuvres into and out of those driveways would not be similar to the proposed development. Therefore, those other examples have not eased my concerns that the appeal scheme would result in unacceptable highway safety implications.
10. Reference has been made to Section 184 of the Highways Act 1980. However, this legislation relates to requests to a highway authority to carry out works. It has no bearing on the factors to be considered in the determination of a planning application or appeal.
11. For the reasons outlined above and on the evidence before me, I conclude that the proposed development would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety. Accordingly, it would conflict with Policy CS6 of the Shropshire Local Development Framework: Adopted Core Strategy 2011 (the CS), Policy MD2 of the Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan, December 2015 and Paragraphs 115 and 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which together and amongst other things, seek sustainable design and development that achieves safe and suitable access for all users, that prevents unacceptable impact on highway safety.
12. My attention has been drawn to Policy CS17 of the CS that relates to environmental networks and assets. However, the proposal would not conflict with this policy which does not relate to highway safety implications.

Other Matters

13. The existing parking arrangements for the property are unknown, but the proposal would provide designated off-road, frontage parking for the appeal property and make efficient use of land, providing private benefits for the occupants of the property. There would also be associated economic benefits from the construction of the driveway, particularly for local contractors and tradespeople. I am also mindful that no concerns are raised with the appearance of the proposed works, or the effect on neighbouring properties, with no objections received from the local community, including Shrewsbury Town Council. Nonetheless, owing to the small-scale nature of the proposals, I only attach modest weight to these matters, which

would not outweigh the harm to highway safety that would result from the development.

Conclusion

14. The proposal would conflict with the development plan taken as a whole. There are no material considerations to lead me to find otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Bromley

INSPECTOR