



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 April 2026

by Andrew Fulford BSc MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 29 May 2026.

Appeal Ref: 6006406

Little Lyth Barn, Little Lyth, Shrewsbury, Shropshire SY3 0AX

- 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 Carl Griffiths against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/04345/FUL.
 - The development proposed is the reconstruction of dilapidated outbuilding to form a garage, workshop and garden room.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the reconstruction of dilapidated outbuilding to form a garage, workshop and garden room at Little Lyth Barn, Little Lyth, Shrewsbury, Shropshire SY3 0AX in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 25/04345/FUL, subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the Location Plan and Drawing No 1000.10 B.
 - 3) No development above ground level shall take place until samples of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the building hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved samples.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have taken the property address in the banner heading above from the Appeal Form as it more accurately sets out the postal address of the appeal property than that on the Application Form. Given that the location plan clearly outlines the appeal site I am satisfied that neither party is prejudiced by this course of action.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the surrounding area taking into account any effects on heritage significance.

Reasons

4. The appeal property, Little Lyth Barn is located within open countryside in close proximity to a small number of other dwellings, all of which were former agricultural buildings. The appeal proposal would be constructed on the site of a former barn

range which included a gin house which is located within the garden of Little Lyth Barn.

5. On my site visit it was apparent that the barn range were heavily dilapidated with no roof and in places only parts of the original walls were remaining. The proposal seeks to construct an outbuilding on a similar footprint that broadly reflects the form of the original rural buildings.
6. Neither the dilapidated barn range nor any of the surrounding converted buildings are statutorily listed and the site is not within a conservation area. However, they formed part of an historic farmstead dating back to the 18th Century and in their original form would have been of notable architectural merit that reflected historic land uses within rural Shropshire. I therefore consider the dilapidated barn and the surrounding converted rural buildings have a degree of heritage significance which makes them worthy of being treated as non-designated heritage assets. Paragraph 197 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) confirms that the effect on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset should be taken into account in determining an application. A balanced judgement will be required having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset.
7. The Council accepted within the Decision Notice that the former gin house is in a ruinous and heavily degraded condition, with very limited surviving historic fabric. Furthermore, there is an acknowledgement that substantial modern alteration and replacement during the late 20th century and more recently have further eroded its historic integrity and significance as a heritage asset.
8. The submitted Heritage Impact Assessment includes an aerial photograph from the mid 20th century of the original farmstead. The proposed replacement building would have a smaller footprint but would retain a similar layout and design to the original agricultural buildings. Whilst it is accepted that the scheme fails to incorporate the full height open bays seen in the original building such a feature would not be practical given the domestic nature of the proposed use. However, the brick columns framing the large windows serving the garden room would mimic the historic form of the original building. The new building would be primarily constructed in stone, slate and brick reflecting the materials used in the original building. I am therefore satisfied that the proposed outbuilding would not appear overly domesticated in this rural setting.
9. The structure by virtue of its more modest scale, would appear subservient to the main dwelling house. Also, with the use of matching materials the proposed building would appear complementary.
10. It has been suggested that the proposed building would not constitute a faithful or accurate rebuilding of the rural building. However, I have not been directed to any local policy that requires a like for like replacement of the building, especially given how little of the original remains. The key assessment is therefore the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area. As set out above, I have determined the impact to be acceptable.
11. Given that the original barn range would be lost in its entirety there would be harm to the remains of this non-designated heritage asset. However, the replacement building would broadly respect the appearance and form of the original barn range thereby re-creating the relationship with Little Lyth Barn and the other former

agricultural buildings that formed part of the historic farmstead. The proposal therefore has a positive impact on the remaining non-designated heritage assets. Within this context, the loss of the remaining elements of the original buildings can be accepted.

12. I conclude that the proposal represents high quality design which compensates for the modest loss of heritage significance arising from the demolition of the remains of the non-designated heritage asset. It would accord with Policies CS6 and CS17 of the Shropshire Council Adopted Core Strategy and Policies MD2, MD7b and MD13 of the Shropshire Council Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan. Amongst other matters, these policies require that development will be designed to a high quality which respects and enhances local distinctiveness, protects and enhances the diversity, high quality and local character of Shropshire's built and historic environment and where possible avoid the loss of non-designated heritage assets.

Other Matters

13. Concerns have been raised over whether the appellant is lawfully able to access the proposed outbuilding. However, this is a private matter between the relevant landowners.
14. I note the concerns from neighbours over a loss of privacy. However, the north-west elevation and the south-west gable end contain no windows. Also, given existing boundary treatments no overlooking could arise from the window in the north-east gable end. The proposal would therefore have no adverse impact on the living conditions of the adjacent occupiers in terms of a loss of privacy.

Conditions

15. In addition to the standard time condition, I have imposed a condition requiring that the development is carried out following the approved plans, in the interests of certainty. Given the architectural quality of the surrounding buildings the submission of samples of external materials is necessary to ensure that the character and appearance of the area is maintained.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the proposal would be in accordance with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations that indicate that the appeal should be determined otherwise than in accordance with it. Therefore, the appeal is allowed.

Andrew Fulford

INSPECTOR