
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 September 2026

by **H Smith BSc (Hons) MSc MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 October 2026

Appeal A Ref: 6012744

Grove Farm, Condover, Shrewsbury, Shropshire SY5 7BH

- 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 Tori McHale (Blackladies Investments Ltd) against the decision of Shropshire Council.
- The application Ref is 25/04065/FUL.
- The development proposed is barn conversion, link extension and change of use of land to domestic.

Appeal B Ref: 6011699

Grove Farm, Condover, Shrewsbury, Shropshire SY5 7BH

- 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 Tori McHale (Blackladies Investments Ltd) against the decision of Shropshire Council.
- The application Ref is 25/04066/LBC.
- The works proposed are barn conversion, link extension and change of use of land to domestic.

Decisions

1. **Appeal A** is allowed and planning permission is granted for barn conversion, link extension and change of use of land to domestic at Grove Farm, Condover, Shrewsbury, Shropshire SY5 7BH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/04065/FUL, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.
2. **Appeal B** is allowed and listed building consent is granted for barn conversion, link extension and change of use of land to domestic at Grove Farm, Condover, Shrewsbury, Shropshire SY5 7BH in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/04066/FUL, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

3. The decision notices utilise a different description of development / works to that found on the application form. The description given on the application form included superfluous information. In the interests of clarity, I have utilised the description of development / works as found on the decision notices.
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 two appeals concern the same scheme under different, complementary legislation. I have dealt with both appeals together in my reasoning.

6. A revised National Planning Policy Framework (Framework) was published on 17 August 2026 after the Council made its decision. In the interest of fairness, the parties were given the opportunity to comment on the Framework in relation to their respective cases. In determining the appeals, I have had regard to the revised Framework.

Main Issues

7. The main issues are:
- whether the proposal would preserve the setting of the Grade II listed building, known as Grove Farmhouse, or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses; and
 - whether the proposal would represent ancillary use to the host dwelling.

Reasons

Special interest and significance

8. Grove Farmhouse is a Grade II listed¹ building. The farmhouse is a three-storey building dating from the late 18th century or early 19th century. It is mainly constructed from coursed sandstone rubble with a dentilled brick eaves cornice, hipped slate roof and brick end stacks, two to each side. The front elevation, which faces south, has a small porch feature.
9. The Heritage Impact Assessment (dated 19 September 2025) states that the farmhouse was extended to the north and west during the 19th century. These additions comprise a stone-built extension to the north of the farmhouse, and a single-storey west range, which is constructed mainly from brick.
10. Traditional farm building ranges are positioned to the north of the farmhouse around a central courtyard. These appear to be mainly in residential use and separate ownership.
11. The listed building partly derives its significance from its historic agricultural use and architectural character, as well as its setting adjacent to a former courtyard farmstead surrounded by open countryside. This setting contributes positively to the understanding and the special interest and significance of Grove Farmhouse, along with the ability to appreciate it. I have had special regard to this matter in considering the appeals.
12. A modern agricultural barn is located within the curtilage of Grove Farmhouse. The barn has a large plan form with a low roof profile. It is enclosed on three sides with weathered boarding over a blockwork plinth and steel infrastructure. Its north elevation is fully open. The barn, which the evidence indicates was built in 1983, does not form part of the historic fabric of the listed farmhouse and is positioned separately from it. However, it does sit within the setting of the Grade II listed building.
13. The immediate setting in which Grove Farmhouse is experienced includes the driveway entrance, the modern agricultural barn, and the traditional farm building ranges to the north. The boundary of Condover Hall Park, a Grade II Registered Park and Garden, lies immediately east of the appeal site on the opposite side of

¹ List entry Number: 1176063.

Station Road. The evidence indicates that this is a heritage asset of high significance, to which I agree. It provides a rural context to Grove Farmhouse. As such, the listed building's immediate and wider setting contribute positively to its special interest and significance.

Proposal and effects

14. The proposed link extension would connect the single-storey west range of the farmhouse with the east wall of the modern barn. It would be a fully enclosed timber-framed glazed link with a lead flat roof. The width and depth of the link would be narrow, creating minimal additional floorspace, and its height would be lower than the adjoining buildings. It would also be set in from their north and south elevations. This would result in the link being seen as subordinate, due to its modest scale, proportions and recessed design.
15. The contemporary elements of the proposal, such as the glazing and lead flat roof, would be clearly distinguishable from the historic fabric of the listed building. The timber-framed elements would not appear excessive or prominent, especially when seen in the context of the modern barn. Consequently, it would not distract from the listed building's architectural interest.
16. Furthermore, the proposal would have limited visibility outside the appeal site due to the positioning and orientation of the existing buildings, and mature vegetation. I observed that it would not be visible from the road or the boundary of Condover Hall Park. While glimpses of it may be possible from the neighbouring courtyard development, these views would be in the context of the existing built form.
17. The Council argue that the link extension would artificially extend the historic linear range. However, the barn as existing is located at the south-western corner of the farmstead complex, and to the west of the farmhouse and separate from it. It is therefore peripheral to the historic farmstead. Moreover, while the farmhouse's existing west-range does have a linear form, it is not extensive and the footprint of the main farmhouse building stretches beyond it. The proposal would introduce a clearly contemporary, lightweight link between the farmhouse's west-range and the barn, which would remain legible as two separate and distinct buildings. It would maintain their individual form, character and historic identity, without competing visually with, or diminishing appreciation of, either building.
18. The appellant confirms that the link extension would not be physically attached to the listed building. Given the age of the barn, there is little before me to suggest that any historic fabric would be affected by the formation of the link extension. Subject to appropriate conditions to secure materials, the link extension would cause no harm to the listed building's significance.
19. The proposed external alterations to the modern barn, which would include external cladding, would be modest. Due to the barn's low roof profile, views of the proposed solar panels would be limited. As the barn is already present on site, its conversion would not create additional footprint or bulk to the farmhouse and would remain subordinate. In addition, views of the barn are partially screened by the adjacent buildings and a boundary brick wall.
20. Taking the above into account, I find that the proposal would not erode any of the elements which contribute positively to the special interest of Grove Farmhouse. I therefore conclude that the proposal would preserve the setting of Grove

Farmhouse and would not harm its significance. It would also preserve the setting of Condover Hall Park, Grade II Registered Park and Garden.

21. Accordingly, it would comply with Policies CS6 and CS17 of the Shropshire Core Strategy (Core Strategy) (adopted 2011), and Policies MD2 and MD13 of the Shropshire Council Site Allocations and Management of Development Plan (SAMDev) (adopted 2015). These policies, amongst other things, require heritage assets and their settings to be preserved, having regard to the special architectural or historic interest of its character, appearance and the contribution made by its setting. It would also comply with Policy HE4 of the Framework which requires heritage assets, as an irreplaceable resource, to be conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance.

Ancillary use

22. The Council is concerned that the proposal would facilitate activities and patterns of occupation that are not incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse, giving rise to the potential for intensified, independent or otherwise non ancillary use. However, the proposal would make use of an existing barn within the curtilage of the listed building.
23. The proposal includes a gym, wet room, workshop, storage areas and plant room, which would have a clear functional dependency on the main house. The barn would remain subsidiary to the farmhouse in terms of its size, form and ancillary use. The link extension would provide a functional and direct connection from the farmhouse's west wing to the converted barn. Indeed, the use of the linked extension demonstrates the appellant's intention to utilise the barn as ancillary accommodation to the farmhouse.
24. The occupancy of the barn is also capable of being controlled by condition, and any change of use to create a separate dwelling would require a further grant of planning permission. Therefore, such a condition would restrict its use to that of ancillary space linked to Grove Farmhouse.
25. The Council states that no substantive justification has been provided to demonstrate a genuine need for the facilities of this scale, nor why such requirement cannot be accommodated within the existing dwelling or elsewhere within the established curtilage. However, the barn is an existing building within the curtilage of the listed building. Furthermore, the proposal would secure the future of a redundant and dilapidated rural building, re-using and restoring the barn for a sustainable use.
26. For the reasons above, the proposal would represent ancillary accommodation to the existing farmhouse. Consequently, the proposal would accord with Policy CS6 of the Core Strategy and MD2 of the SAMDev.

Conditions

27. In addition to the standard time limit condition, I have imposed a condition that requires the development/works to accord with the approved plans. This is necessary in the interests of certainty.
28. I have also imposed a condition relating to external materials. This is necessary to ensure the external appearance of the development/works is satisfactory. Finally, a condition requiring the development to be used for purposes ancillary to the main

house is necessary to accord with the terms of the application and in the interests of certainty.

Conclusions

29. **Appeal A:** For the reasons given, the proposal would accord with the development plan as a whole and the Framework and therefore in accordance with Policy S3(c) should be approved. I therefore conclude that Appeal A should be allowed.
30. **Appeal B:** For the reasons given I conclude that Appeal B should be allowed.

H Smith

INSPECTOR

Schedule of Conditions

- 1) The development/works hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of these decisions.
- 2) The development/works hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans:
 - Location Plan – as existing, Drawing No: 1183-01-100-OS
 - Site Plan – as proposed, Drawing No: 101-PR.
 - Ground Floor – as existing. Drawing No: 110-EX.
 - Roof – as existing. Drawing No: 112-EX.
 - Elevation 1 – as existing, Drawing No: 120-EX.
 - Elevation 2 – as existing. Drawing No: 121-EX.
 - Elevation 3 – as existing. Drawing No: 122-EX.
 - Elevation 4 – as existing. Drawing No: 123-EX.
 - Ground Floor – as proposed, Drawing No: 110-PR.
 - First Floor – as proposed. Drawing No: 111-PR.
 - Roof – as proposed, Drawing No: 112-PR.
 - Elevation 1 – as proposed. Drawing No: 120-PR.
 - Elevation 2 – as proposed. Drawing No: 121-PR.
 - Elevation 3 – as proposed. Drawing No: 122-PR.
 - Elevation 4 – as proposed. Drawing No: 123-PR.
- 3) No development/works above ground level shall take place until details of the materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development 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 details.
- 4) The development hereby permitted shall not be occupied at any time other than for the purposes ancillary to the residential use of the dwelling known as Grove Farm, Condover, Shrewsbury, Shropshire, SY5 7BH.

End of Conditions