



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 21 February 2023

by Matthew Jones BA(Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 25 April 2023

Appeal A Ref: APP/H1840/W/22/3294103

Moat Farm, Moor End, Tibberton WR9 7NS

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Tom and Ellie King against the decision of Wychavon District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01857/HP, dated 16 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 2 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is demolition of single storey lean-to; two storey side extension; conversion of outbuilding to ancillary residential use including glazed link to extension; demolition of front porch and construction of new front porch; replacement windows; internal alterations including a new staircase and partition walls.
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/H1840/Y/22/3294104

Moat Farm, Moor End, Tibberton WR9 7NS

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Tim and Ellie King against the decision of Wychavon District Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01858/LB, dated 16 July 2021, was refused by notice dated 2 February 2022.
 - The works proposed are demolition of single storey lean-to; two storey side extension; conversion of outbuilding to ancillary residential use including glazed link to extension; demolition of front porch and construction of new front porch; replacement windows; internal alterations including a new staircase and partition walls.
-

Decisions

1. The appeals are dismissed.

Main Issue

2. Moat Farmhouse is a Grade II listed building. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the special architectural and historic interest of Moat Farmhouse.

Reasons

3. The significance of the listed building primarily derives from its 17th Century construction and plan. A fair amount of original fabric was removed during 19th Century renovation work, but the 'L' layout of the historic plan is well preserved. The plan and massing of the building together with the remaining areas of original timber framing are therefore of critical importance to its significance as a good example of the small farmhouses being erected in Worcestershire in the 17th Century in the domestic timber-framed tradition.
4. The proposed two-storey extension would replace a Victorian single storey lean-to. It would be a sizable intervention which would largely fill the right

angle of the existing building and therefore diminish legibility of its original plan. Moreover, in almost directly abutting the return of the west range of the house, a preserved area of 17th Century frame would be obscured. Despite its slightly lower ridge, therefore, the extension would compete with the historic massing and dimensions of the listed building, particularly as viewed from its former historic foldyard directly to the south and from the land to the east.

5. The point is made that these elevations of Moat Farmhouse are well concealed from the public. Nonetheless, listed buildings are safeguarded for their inherent architectural and historic interest irrespective of the extent to which public views of the building can be gained. Consequently, our understanding of the building's original form would be reduced, and its significance would be harmed.
6. There are benefits the scheme would deliver¹, such as the reuse of the shed, internally the greater exposure of historic fabric and plan form, and externally the re-expression of the southeast corner of the original house. However, the existing lean-to is obviously subservient to the original building, and opening up the southeast corner would be a limited benefit compared to the harm the far larger extension would cause. A smaller extension may produce internal spaces which are far less practical, but this does not serve to justify the harm that would arise when the proposal is considered on its own individual merits. In my view, the totality of the works/development proposed would result in less than substantial harm to the significance of the listed building overall.
7. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the Planning Practice Guidance explain that great weight should be given to the conservation of designated heritage assets and require decision makers to weigh any less than substantial harm to a designated heritage asset against the public benefits of the scheme, including securing its optimum viable use. That exercise must take place in the context of s.16(2) and s.66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, which set a strong presumption against a grant of planning permission or listed building consent for development or works that would harm the special interest of a listed building.
8. The public benefits of the proposal are in the individual heritage gains that would be made at the site. However, it seems to me that most of these benefits could be delivered independent of the harmful two storey extension, and these benefits must carry limited weight as part of a scheme that would cause less than substantial harm to Moat Farmhouse overall. They thus fall decisively short of justifying the harm that would be caused; harm that must be given considerable importance and weight in the balancing exercise.
9. That conclusion also brings the proposal into conflict with the relevant Policies SWDP6 and SWDP24 of the South Worcestershire Development Plan (adopted 2016) insofar as they seek for schemes to conserve the historic environment.
10. Consequently, in relation to Appeal A, the proposal would conflict with the development plan read a whole. There are no other considerations which direct me to make my decision other than in accordance with the development plan. For these given reasons, and taking all other matters raised into account, I conclude that the appeals should be dismissed.

Matthew Jones
INSPECTOR

¹ As identified in the appellants' Heritage Statement (July 2021)