



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 March 2026

by A Tucker BA (Hons) IHBC

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19 March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/H1840/Y/25/3360771

4 Pansington Farm Barns, Worcester Road, Titton, Worcestershire DY13 9QX

- 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 Ms Tracy Arlott against the decision of Wychavon District Council.
 - The application Ref is W/24/00543/LB.
 - The works proposed are described as 'retrospective consent for unauthorised internal alterations, and enlargement of one existing window to create a door'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed, insofar as it relates to the enlargement of one existing window to create a door.
2. The appeal is allowed, insofar as it relates to internal alterations at 4 Pansington Farm Barns, Worcester Road, Titton, Worcestershire DY13 9QX, in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref W/24/00543/LB, dated 19 March 2024 and the plans submitted with it insofar as they relate to the internal alterations only.

Preliminary Matter

3. The works have already been carried out. Therefore, I am considering the works retrospectively.

Main Issue

4. The effect of the proposal upon the significance of the listed building.

Reasons

5. Section 16(2) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (LBCA) requires the decision maker to have special regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses.
6. The appeal building is part of an agricultural building that may have been built as a dairy and is thought to date from the 19th century. It is part of the historic farmstead of Pansington Farm. This is centred on the late 17th century grade II listed farmhouse¹. The oldest part of the farmhouse is timber framed and faces towards the yard and the end of the appeal building. Adjacent to the farmhouse and opposite the appeal building is a detached 18th century timber framed barn that is also grade II listed².

¹ List Entry Number: 1215684

² List Entry Number: 1288034

7. Together the three buildings form an attractive group and give a strong sense of their agricultural origins despite the conversion of the barns to residential use. For the barns this is not just derived from their interrelationship, but also their utilitarian appearance, blank areas of walls and retained historic openings. Thus, although the dairy range is of a later date and not listed in its own right, it has significance in terms of how the farmstead is experienced today and aids our understanding of how it functioned historically. Its yard facing façade contains a series of narrow ground floor openings that appear to be original. They are visually distinctive particularly as they are positioned below a solid area of brick work.
8. The rear elevation of the dairy appears to feature fewer original openings. This most likely reflects how the building was used. It suggests it largely turned its back on the surrounding landscape, and the focus was between the building and the yard. These characteristics of the building contribute to the significance of the wider farmstead, that includes the listed farmhouse and barn.
9. The large patio doors at the rear represent a significant change to the appearance of the rear of the building, replacing what was a modest window opening and in doing so altering the solid to void ratio of the building's rear façade. This has caused a degree of harm to the building's historic appearance, and shifted the focus of its openings which were historically towards the farmyard.
10. It is appropriate to compare the new doors with the historic opening towards the north end of the dairy's rear elevation, which is part of the rear of the neighbouring dwelling. The historic opening is a three centred arch that is carefully detailed and has considerable aesthetic value. The inserted glazing has been set in and is divided into four sections. This keeps the glazed area small, which responds positively to the building's solid appearance.
11. In contrast, a flat soldier course of brick has been used for the recently inserted opening. This is a modern and somewhat false detail where the brick is only decorative, unlike the shallow brick arches elsewhere that are functional and support the masonry in a traditional manner. Additionally, large areas of glass have been used that are at odds with the smaller scale of other openings on the building.
12. For these reasons the installation of the patio doors has had a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the building. It has eroded its historic form and appearance by introducing an opening that is not appropriately scaled or detailed, and shifting the focus of the building to the rear and away from the farmyard. It has however not altered any part of the yard facing elevation. On the basis that the yard elevation is more important to the significance of the farmstead and its 17th and 18th century buildings, the level of harm arising from this intervention is low.
13. The appeal also relates to the removal of a section of internal wall to create an open plan layout. The conversion introduced domestic scaled spaces and finishes and there is nothing internally to indicate its likely former use as a dairy. I am not satisfied that the section of masonry that was removed would have aided this understanding. A meaningful section of the wall is retained which maintains a sense of how the interior would have been originally divided. Its thickness suggests it represents an historic division of the space. Evidence suggests that portions of historic brickwork were removed, although the section of wall was already altered and included modern fabric. I am not satisfied that the removal of a

small volume of ordinary interior brickwork has caused harm, particularly as the significance of the interior of the building has been so heavily impacted by the conversion works.

14. The harm that arises from the works is therefore limited to the installation of the patio doors. In terms of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) the harms are at the low end of less than substantial. The harms are however of considerable importance and weight, and Paragraph 215 of the Framework establishes that any harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. The benefit of the patio doors is private to the occupants of the dwelling and does not therefore outweigh the identified harm.
15. In summary, the installation of the patio doors has harmed the significance of the listed building. In reaching this conclusion I have had regard to the requirements of the LBCA. Although development plan policies do not strictly apply to applications for listed building consent, the proposal would also conflict with the policies set out in the Council's decision, and those in the Council's emerging plan which is at an advanced stage of preparation.

Other Matters

16. The appellant submits that post decision correspondence with the Council infers that the principle of creating the opening in the rear wall can be deemed approved under a previous application. A full set of relevant drawings are not before me and in any case the Council correctly advises that without elevation drawings the full extent of what may have been approved is unclear. In any case, it is not for me to come to a view on this. I have assessed the appeal based on the application that was refused by the Council to retain the two interventions; whether either have received consent from the Council by alternative means is a matter that is outside the scope of this appeal and between the Council and the appellant.
17. Details of the Council's pre-application advice are before me, where the Council failed to point out the listed status of the building. On this basis the appellant carried out the work in good faith. This is an unfortunate situation, but it can have no bearing on whether the interventions have caused harm to the significance of the listed building.

Conditions

18. I have had regard to the conditions suggested by the Council. As the work has already been carried out a time limit condition is unnecessary, and an approved plans condition is not necessary for a grant of listed building consent. Therefore, I have not imposed any conditions.

Conclusion

19. For the reasons above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed insofar as it relates to internal alterations. However, in relation to the enlargement of one existing window to create a door it should be dismissed. The two elements of the application are both physically and functionally severable. I therefore consider a split decision to be the logical outcome.

A Tucker

INSPECTOR