
Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 22 October 2025

by **Rachel Hall BSc MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 16 December 2025

Appeal A: APP/L3245/W/25/3369679

Barn at Walford Barns, Walford Barns, Walford, Baschurch, Shrewsbury SY4 2HL

- 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 “Whitrick” of RMW Facilities Management Company against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application reference is 25/00130/FUL.
 - The development proposed is described as ‘residential conversion/change of use’.
-

Appeal B: APP/L3245/Y/25/3369808

Barn at Walford Barns, Walford Barns, Walford, Baschurch, Shrewsbury SY4 2HL

- The appeal is made under section 20 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant listed building consent.
 - The appeal is made by “Whitrick” of RMW Facilities Management Company against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application reference is 25/00680/LBC.
 - The works proposed are described as ‘the change of use of converted barn into residential dwelling’.
-

Decision

Appeal A

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal B

2. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. The Council considers that the appeal barn is curtilage listed. The appellant’s Heritage Impact Assessment (by Winterburn Heritage and Planning, June 2025) and their Heritage Assessment (by Roger Parry & Partners, February 2025) also both identify the appeal barn as curtilage listed. The appeal is determined on that basis.
4. As the proposal relates to a listed building, I have had special regard to sections 16(2) and 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended) (the Act).

5. The appellant's evidence makes reference to a number of listed buildings in the vicinity of the appeal site¹. The Council did not identify harm to the significance of these or any their features of special architectural or historic interest as a result of the proposal. On the evidence before me, including my own observations, I am satisfied that the proposal would preserve the significance of those assets.
6. The appellant has only provided their surname on the application and appeal forms which means that no title could be attributed to this appeal decision.

Main Issues

7. The main issues are whether the proposal:
 - would preserve a Grade II listed building known as "2 Barns about 75 metres north west of farm at Walford College of Agriculture" (Ref 1255390) (the LB) and any features of special architectural or historic interest that it possesses;
 - would provide acceptable living conditions for its future occupants, with particular regard to privacy, outlook, noise and disturbance, and access to private outside space; and
 - would provide acceptable living conditions for neighbouring occupants, with particular regard to privacy.

Reasons

Listed Building

8. The LB comprises adjoining barns that are described as mid-late 17th century, extended in circa 18th century with remodelling and extensions in late 19th century. These timber framed buildings are infilled with brick and weatherboarding, with slate roofs and gable ends. These have the appearance of two storey buildings and have been converted to residential use but retain their historic form. The appeal building is situated in front of the barns, within the historic farmstead. It comprises a lower rise, single storey barn and is also timber framed. One long elevation and its two short elevations are comprised of brick. Its other long elevation is infilled with weatherboarding.
9. Internally, cast iron pillars are visible along this infilled elevation, supporting the timber framed roof structure. This indicates that this was historically an open sided barn and given its position and modest height, was likely used either as a cart shed or a shelter for cattle. Although much of the roof structure appears to have been renewed, the cast iron pillars and rafters appear historic. An historic internal brick wall separates one end of the barn from the other.
10. Therefore, insofar as it relates to these appeals the significance of the LB is primarily derived from the simple, functional form of the appeal barn and its historic materials which are characteristic of its role within the farmstead.
11. The proposal would see the appeal barn that is currently used for storage, being converted into a residential unit. This would involve the insertion of windows and doors on its weatherboarded elevation. Although the existing window and door

¹ Including the following grade II listed buildings: Milepost at NGR SJ 4334 2060; Walford Farmhouse; Farmhouse at Walford College of Agriculture; L-shaped barn approximately 30m north of Walford Hall; Section of garden wall approximately 15 metres south west of Walford Hall; Walford Hall and Garden Wall Attached to Rear Right Corner.

openings do not appear to be of historic value, they are modest and understated and provide the building with a basic, functional appearance. The extent of the proposed window and doors was reduced during the course of the Council's determination of the proposal. Also, the proposal would reduce the extent of the modern weatherboarding. Nonetheless, the extent of glazing in the proposed windows and doors would result in an overly domesticated appearance. This domestication would be emphasised by the proposed marking out of private amenity space and parking alongside this elevation. Together this would detract from the barn's functional appearance.

12. Roof lights are not typical features of open fronted sheds. Consequently, the insertion of roof lights into both planes of its roof, although modest in scale, would further detract from the functional appearance of the unbroken roof surface. The presence of roof lights in the already converted surrounding barns does not remove the harm from insertion of roof lights as proposed here. In addition, a door would be inserted into the internal brick wall to connect the two ends of the barn, resulting in the loss of historic fabric.
13. Within the building, the proposal is to isolate the loft space from the living space below. Although this is said to preserve the roof structure, it would diminish the ability to appreciate the historic, timber framed form of the roof that is characteristic of its historic use and would introduce an incongruent ceiling that would not have been present in the historic structure. Furthermore, it is unclear whether the cast iron pillars would be retained and remain visible following the proposed conversion, or whether they would be enclosed to provide internal walls. Consequently, insufficient information is before me to conclude that internal alterations to the building would not further diminish the ability to appreciate the historic form of the barn.
14. The appellant submitted a bin store drawing at appeal (Ref HP-WB-01) demonstrating that the proposed store would accommodate 20 wheelie bins. Therefore, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, I am satisfied that the proposal would make adequate provision for bin storage on the appeal site. Nonetheless, without further details of the materials to be used in construction of the store, I cannot be sufficiently certain that it would avoid harm to the setting of the LB.
15. Consequently, the proposal would result in unsympathetic alterations to the historic form and features of the building. Thus, it would fail to preserve the special interest of the LB. Paragraph 212 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024 (the Framework) advises that when considering the impact of development on the significance of designated heritage assets, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Paragraph 213 goes on to advise that significance can be harmed or lost through the alteration or destruction of those assets and that any such harm should have a clear and convincing justification.
16. Given the scope of the works, I find the harm to be at the lower end of less than substantial in this instance but nevertheless of considerable importance and weight. Where a proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of designated heritage assets, paragraph 215 of the Framework advises that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including, where appropriate, securing its optimal viable use.

17. The proposal would provide an additional residential dwelling through conversion of an existing building, thus contributing to the mix and supply of housing in circumstances where the Council is unable to demonstrate a five-year housing land supply. Economic and social benefits would flow from the proposal's construction phase, as well as from the occupation of the accommodation with any occupiers supporting local services and facilities. Bearing in mind that these benefits only relate to a single dwelling I give them limited weight.
18. I do not find that the public benefits are sufficient to outweigh the harm that I have identified in this instance and the great weight that should be given to the asset's preservation. I also note that the continued viable use of the appeal building is not dependent on the proposal as it has an ongoing use that would not cease in its absence.
19. Given the above and in the absence of public benefits that would outweigh the harm that would be caused, I conclude that, on balance, the proposal would fail to preserve the special historic interest of the LB.
20. This would fail to satisfy the requirements of the Act, paragraph 210(a) of the Framework and conflict with policies CS5, CS6 and CS17 of the Shropshire Local Development Framework: Adopted Core Strategy (March 2011) and policies MD7a and MD13 of the Shropshire Council Locations and Management of Development (December 2015). These seek, among other things, to ensure that harm is not caused to heritage assets, any harm that is caused is to be outweighed by public benefits and that rural building conversions contribute positively to its character.

Living conditions for future occupants

21. The appeal barn is located centrally within the hard surfaced area of the appeal site such that vehicular movement would take place in close proximity to three of its four elevations. However, given the limited space around the appeal barn, these movements would likely be at low speed. In addition, aside from two modest roof lights, no windows are proposed on long brick elevation and the short elevation forming the end wall of the proposed kitchen. This would considerably limit the extent to which noise and disturbance would be experienced by future occupants of the appeal barn. Furthermore, the proposed parking area for the appeal barn would result in a degree of separation between windows on that façade and the wider parking and circulation space. Consequently, I find that the living conditions of future occupants of the proposal would be acceptable with respect to noise and disturbance.
22. The east elevation of the appeal barn is directly opposite the west elevation of the already converted residential barns. The opposing facades are separated by circa 15 metres which is not uncommon in modern housing schemes. In any event, the window and door openings on the existing residential barns are moderate in size. Also, the proposed windows on the appeal barn are not extensive in size. Consequently, I find that any overlooking from windows on the western elevation of the existing barns would not be to the extent that it would create unacceptable living conditions for future occupants of the proposal. Although windows on the southern elevation of the existing barns would be closer to the appeal barn, those views would be sufficiently oblique as to create acceptable living conditions for future occupants of the proposal with respect to privacy within its internal living space.

23. The proposed outside space alongside the appeal barn would be conveniently located for future occupants of the proposal. Nonetheless, the space is shown to provide parking spaces for the appeal scheme. As such, the extent of usable private outside space for occupants of the appeal scheme would be very limited to the extent that it would not provide sufficient space for day-to-day activities, such as the drying of clothes. Furthermore, it would be positioned in very close proximity to windows on existing living accommodation in the converted barns immediately to the north. As such it would be overlooked at close range. Although there is said to be ample communal garden space for future occupants of the proposal, the lack of sufficient private garden space would be unacceptable in circumstances where it appears that all of the surrounding barns have good sized, private rear gardens.
24. Turning to consideration of outlook for future occupants of the proposal, the proposed bedroom window would look out on to the enclosed area shown to be used for parking by its future occupants. Consequently, in the absence of any other windows for that room, the outlook from that bedroom would be oppressive. In addition, the only natural daylight to the study/bedroom and the bathroom would be roof lights. Consequently, outlook from those rooms would be highly limited. The combined effect of this would be a highly constrained outlook that would result in unacceptable living conditions for future occupants of the proposal.
25. Concluding on this main issue, the proposal would achieve acceptable living conditions for its future occupants with respect to noise and disturbance and privacy within the building. However, in the particular circumstances of this appeal it would not achieve acceptable living conditions for its future occupants in relation access to private outside space and outlook. Accordingly, it would conflict with Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy, and SAMDev Policy MD2. These generally seek to ensure developments achieve high quality design.

Living conditions of neighbours

26. I have reasoned above that the proposal would provide acceptable living conditions for its future occupants with respect to privacy of its internal living space. Similarly, sufficient separation would be provided such that the proposed windows on the appeal barn would not lead to an unacceptable loss of privacy for existing occupants of the surrounding barns. However, the proximity of the proposed outside space for the appeal barn would result in overlooking of living space within the barns immediately to the north. This would be a such a close range as to be intrusive for occupants of those barns (labelled as The Grain and The Byre on the Proposed Block Plan). Therefore, with respect to this main issue the proposal would not accord with Policy CS6 of Core Strategy and SAMDev Policy MD2.

Other Matter

27. The Council advised at appeal that it can currently only demonstrate a 4.68-year housing land supply. As a consequence, policies that are most important for determining the proposal are out of date based on Framework paragraph 11(d) and footnote 8. However, I have found that the harm to a designated heritage asset would not be outweighed by the public benefits. Having regard to Framework paragraph 11(d)(i) and footnote 7, this provides a clear reason for refusing the proposal. Therefore, the presumption in favour of sustainable development would

not apply. The proposal would be contrary to the development plan which indicates that planning permission should not be granted.

Conclusions

28. For the reasons given and having regard to all other matters raised, the appeals are dismissed.

Rachel Hall

INSPECTOR