



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 June 2026

by Andrew Fulford BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 20 July 2026

Appeal Ref: 6008564

Sunbreak, Annscroft, Shrewsbury, Shropshire SY5 8AN

- 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 Marc Fisher against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 26/00245/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the demolition of a dwelling (Sunbreak) and erection of 2no. semi-detached houses and parking.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have taken the site address in the banner heading above from the Decision Notice as it more accurately sets out the property address than that on the application form. Given that the site is clearly defined on the location plan I am satisfied that neither party is prejudiced by this course of action.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - The effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area;
 - The effect of the proposed development on the living conditions of the occupiers of Hillcrest and No. 1 Oak Terrace with regards to light and privacy; and
 - The effect of the proposal on the local highway network with regards to visibility and inclusive parking provision.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. Annscroft is characterised by linear residential development in a rural location to the south-west of Shrewsbury. Dwellings vary in terms of appearance and age consisting of red brick or rendered properties and are no more than two storeys in height. Low walls and soft landscaping enclose front gardens. There is a substantial drop in land levels at the rear of properties.

5. On my site visit it was apparent that the majority of the appeal property had been demolished except for part of the front elevation. The front boundary of the appeal site is bound by a low-level wall with hedgerow above and metal gates.
6. The appeal scheme proposes the erection of a pair of semi-detached dwellings which would be finished in a white render with a tiled roof. They would be positioned notably deeper into the site than the dwellings either side thereby disrupting the building line within the street. This would therefore appear incongruous given the level of uniformity within the street.
7. Due to the need to provide parking for two dwellings the frontage would consist of almost entirely of hardstanding and no front boundary treatment. This would provide a bland, unattractive setting for the dwellings. The excessive amounts of hardstanding and lack of enclosure would be at odds with the pattern of the development locally.
8. The scheme would appear as a modest pair of two-storey semi-detached dwellings when viewed from the street but this would not be the case at the rear. The dwellings would have a substantial three-storey form that would have a significant scale and massing that would appear overly dominant and obtrusive. The incorporation of screening walls either side of the balconies would add to the dominance of the proposed dwellings when viewed from properties either side.
9. I conclude that the proposal would adversely harm the character and appearance of the area. It would be contrary to Policy CS6 of the Shropshire Council Adopted Core Strategy (March 2011) (SCCS) and Policy MD2 of Shropshire Council Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan (2015). Amongst other matters, these policies require development to be designed to a high quality which respects and enhances local distinctiveness through responding appropriately to the form and layout of existing development reflecting locally characteristic architectural design and building details.

Living conditions of existing occupiers

10. The appeal site is located between two dwellings, Hillcrest and No. 1 Oak Terrace. The proposed dwellings extend significantly beyond the rear elevation of both neighbouring properties. Given the scale and massing of the proposed rear projection, exacerbated further by the screening walls, the development would adversely impact on the levels of light received by both neighbouring properties. This would therefore result in the rear facing ground floor habitable rooms becoming darker and more oppressive for the current occupiers.
11. Concerns have been raised over a loss of privacy due to the positioning of windows on the side elevation. However, given that these windows would either be secondary windows or serve bathrooms they could all be obscurely glazed. On that basis I am satisfied that any concerns over a loss of privacy could be addressed via a suitably worded condition.
12. I conclude that by virtue of a loss of light the proposal would have a significant adverse impact on the living conditions of the occupiers of Hillcrest and 1 Oak Terrace. The proposal therefore conflicts with Policy CS6 of the SCCS. The policy seeks to ensure that developments contribute to the health and well-being of communities, including safeguarding residential and local amenity.

Highway safety

13. The appeal property is located on a country lane which accommodates relatively fast moving traffic, given the lack of speed restrictions. Heading north towards the appeal site there is slight bend in the road which would impact on visibility to a certain degree.
14. The scheme proposes off-road parking on the site frontage, with two spaces provided for each dwelling. The four spaces would be directly adjacent to each other meaning that the site frontage would be entirely open creating a wide area where cars would be able to enter and exit the site. This would be much less restrictive than the current situation where there is only a single access point due to the front boundary wall.
15. No visibility splays have been demonstrated by the appellant. Given the increased intensity of use, the increase in the number of egress points, the nearby bend and the speed of passing traffic it is not possible to confirm that there would be sufficient visibility for vehicles exiting the appeal site. As such, it is likely that the proposal would increase the risk of road traffic collisions resulting in an adverse impact on highway safety.
16. Concerns have been raised that the appeal scheme would not be able to accommodate inclusive parking provision. The plot is sufficiently wide so that there would be additional hardstanding areas adjoining the northern most and southern most parking spaces. This would provide additional access space for wheelchair users. Given that the Council have not referred to any local parking standards I am satisfied that the scheme would provide acceptable inclusive parking provision.
17. In conclusion, the appellant has failed to demonstrate that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on highway safety. This is contrary to paragraph 116 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) which indicates that development should be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety. Neither development plan policy referenced by the local planning authority address matters of highway safety and therefore I am unable to conclude against these policies.

Other Matters

18. The appellant's statement sets out a series of changes that they would be willing to make to try and address the concerns of the Council but no amended plans have been provided. To ensure fairness to all parties the changes suggested by the appellant will not be considered further.

Planning Balance

19. The proposal would deliver two dwellings, contributing to housing supply and supporting the Framework's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes. The development would also provide economic benefits during both the construction phase and in future occupation. However, given the proposal is for just two dwellings, the benefits would be modest.
20. The appellant states that if allowed, the development would enable his son to take his first step on the property ladder. However, I have not been provided with evidence, financial or otherwise, as to why the son needs to live on the appeal site. I therefore attach limited weight to this benefit.

21. It has been suggested that due to the poor quality of materials used the appeal property, Sunbreak was not suitable for modern living and needed to be demolished. It is accepted that the replacement dwellings would be constructed using better quality materials, be more energy efficient and would provide a higher standard of living for the proposed occupiers. These betterments are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms and therefore only limited weight can be placed on them.
22. The appeal scheme would have no adverse impact on protected species. However, the lack of harm is a neutral factor in the planning balance.
23. The scheme would also deliver a minimum 10% biodiversity net gain. However, given this is a statutory duty I can only attach limited positive weight to this benefit.
24. I have found the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area, adversely impact on the living conditions of adjoining occupiers and have an adverse impact on highway safety. These are major shortcomings of the appeal scheme, and I attach significant weight to this harm.
25. Taking all matters into account, the adverse impacts of the proposal would significantly outweigh the benefits.

Conclusion

26. The proposal conflicts with the development plan and material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is dismissed.

Andrew Fulford

INSPECTOR