
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: 6004659

Yewbank, Woodseaves, Market Drayton, Shropshire TF9 2AW

- 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 Lorac Healthcare Limited against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/02672/FUL.
 - The development proposed is for a change of use from Class C3 (Dwellinghouse) to Class C2 (Residential Institution) to facilitate the provision of care to children with emotional and behavioural needs. The home will provide short- and medium-term placements for children aged 7 to 16 years, with a maximum of three resident children at any one time.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. In the banner heading above, I have used the description of development taken from the appeal form, as opposed to the application form, as it more accurately and succinctly describes that for which permission is sought. However, I have also had full regard in my reasoning to the description on the application form.
3. The address on the application form includes reference to 'Sutton Grange Junction To A529 Junction Four Alls'. This is a description of the location, rather than part of the address. For this reason, I have omitted it from the banner heading above.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposal on highway safety, with regard to parking.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a four-bedroom detached house located along Sutton Lane, a narrow lane within the open countryside. The property is one of three newly constructed houses that are accessed off the lane via a shared driveway. The shared driveway is a small, paved area, serving each property.
6. The three houses are located at the end of a small, linear row of properties that extend along the lane, in an otherwise rural landscape. The properties along the lane each have off road parking at the front, accessed off the lane.
7. The appeal property has a single detached garage to the side, as do the two neighbouring properties. In addition to the detached garages, the three houses each have designated parking spaces and turning areas to the side and front, accessed via the shared driveway.

8. The proposed site plan shows two tandem parking spaces in front of the garage and one space to the front of the dwelling. Even though the garage would provide a parking space, the use of that space would be hindered by staff members parking in front of the garage. Indeed, with two staff members at night and two in the day, during shift change over times there could be four vehicles at the property at the same time. As such, any of the two staff members parked in the tandem spaces or the garage would need to leave before arriving members of staff could park in front of the garage.
9. As a four-bedroom family house, there would be vehicle movements and activity on the site frontage during certain times of the day and in the evening period, as residents attend school, appointments and activities. The use of the parking spaces throughout the day and in the evening would also be similar. However, although movements during shift change over times would be predictable, they would not be comparable to the movements of a family. In particular, although as a family home the tandem parking arrangements would require one vehicle to let the other vehicle out, during shift change over times, vehicle movements at the site would be greater.
10. While the appellant suggests that vehicle movements would be carefully managed, no further details have been provided. As a consequence, I am not persuaded that during the two staff change over periods vehicles would not impede the shared access driveway or have to park on the lane.
11. As a narrow country lane with tall hedgerows, opportunities to park a vehicle safely on the road are limited. Existing driveways and field entrances also restrict safe parking along the lane. Indeed, larger vehicles, in particular those associated with nearby agricultural enterprises could be frequent and would be impeded by vehicles parked on the road. Likewise, vehicles parked on the highway would impede visibility from the shared driveway and / or the access and parking areas of other neighbouring properties. In these circumstances, even though the instances would be for a relatively short period and no recorded accidents have occurred to date, the access arrangements and parking provision for the proposal would not be suitable and safe. As a result, unacceptable highway safety implications would arise.
12. Based on the evidence before me, planning conditions limiting the number of children to two would not overcome those concerns to an acceptable degree. Furthermore, without a management plan before me, there is no certainty that a suitably worded planning condition would secure appropriate measures to control and manage parking during shift change overtimes.
13. Consequently, for the above reasons, I conclude that the proposal would have an unacceptable impact on highway safety, with regard to parking. Therefore, it would not accord with Policy CS6 of the Shropshire Local Development Framework: Adopted Core Strategy 2011, which seeks, amongst other things, to create sustainable places, ensuring that all development is safe with appropriate car parking provision. It would also be contrary to Paragraphs 115 and 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), which seek to ensure safe and suitable access to the site for all users, that prevents unacceptable impact on highway safety.

Other Matters

14. The proposed development would make an efficient and appropriate use of an existing residential property to meet an identified local social need by providing safe, inclusive, and accessible accommodation for two young people in the community. The proposal would also avoid the need to create a new care facility elsewhere and it would add to the range and mix of homes in the area, to meet the needs of present and future generations. The appeal scheme would also support the local economy through the creation and retention of employment for care staff, as well as ongoing engagement with local service providers and suppliers. However, I have no substantive evidence before me that this site is the only option available, and that there are no alternative sites which would have a less harmful impact on highway safety. In these circumstances I only attach modest weight to the benefits of the scheme.
15. The development respects and preserves the character and quality of the local built environment, and it would safeguard the living conditions of neighbouring properties. Nevertheless, these are requirements of planning policy and taken together they carry neutral weight.
16. My attention has been drawn to a previous appeal decision¹ elsewhere in England, also for a children's home. However, that scheme related to a six-bedroom home in a residential area. In that case, the Inspector found no conflict with the policies of the development plan. Inevitably, it is the detail and specific context of any development which determines whether it is acceptable in practice. As such, that previous appeal decision is not comparable to the scheme before me for a four-bedroom house, located within the open countryside with unacceptable parking provision. Given this, it does not add weight in favour of the development. Accordingly, as I am required to do, I have determined the case before me on its own merits.
17. Overall, taking all other matters into consideration, for the reasons set out, the benefits of the scheme would not outweigh the harm to highway safety that would result from the proposed development.

Conclusion

18. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

N Bromley

INSPECTOR

¹ Appeal Ref: APP/B0230/W/25/3367033 - 21 Swan Mead, Luton LU4 0YP