



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 June 2025

by **A Tucker BA (Hons) IHBC**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/C1625/W/25/3360670

Slade Farm, 137A Summer Street, Stroud, GL5 1PH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Sarah and Richard Kingdom against the decision of Stroud District Council.
 - The application Ref is S.24/1805/P3Q.
 - The development proposed is Conversion of a former milking parlour within the farmyard cluster of buildings to a dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended (the GPDO), planning permission is granted for a change of use of (i) a building that is part of an established agricultural unit and any land within that building's curtilage, or (ii) a former agricultural building that was (but is no longer) part of an established agricultural unit and any land within that building's curtilage, together with building operations reasonably necessary to convert the building, subject to limitations and conditions.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - 1) Whether the site is part of an established agricultural unit,
 - 2) Whether the existing building, including any proposed building operations, would not be capable of complying with the nationally described space standard¹, and
 - 3) Whether the location or siting of the building makes it otherwise impractical or undesirable for the building to change from agricultural use to a dwelling.

Reasons

Whether part of an established agricultural unit

¹ Issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government on 27th March 2015

4. The appeal building is part of a small agricultural holding that is managed in a low intensity manner for nature recovery and biodiversity. The use of the wider site as an established agricultural unit is not disputed by the Council.
5. The appeal building is currently used for storage. The parties disagree over whether the current storage relates to the agricultural unit. A large part of the ground floor is occupied by stacked floorboards and other board materials. Whilst these are not required for the functioning of the wider agricultural unit the appellant suggests that they are for the repair of the building. It is reasonable for me to accept that keeping the working buildings of the agricultural unit in good repair is part of the ongoing use of the site. Insulation boards are also stored in the building. These are beyond what is necessary for the building to continue to function for agricultural storage, however they are limited in number and take up a smaller area of the building than the floorboards.
6. At my visit I also saw that the building was used for storing water pipe, fuel containers, tree tubes and materials for fencing. These relate to the wider agricultural unit.
7. In summary, whilst some materials stored in the building are not directly related to agriculture, I am satisfied that there is enough evidence to demonstrate that the building is mainly used for storage that is reasonably related to the wider established agricultural unit, and that the building has not been put to a more general construction or residential storage use. It would therefore accord with paragraph Q. (a) – (c) of Schedule 2 Part 3 of the GPDO.

Nationally described space standard

8. The proposal would provide two rooms at the top of the staircase. One is identified as a bedroom, with a double bed, and wardrobe shown on the plans. The other room is smaller and referred to as a study/box room. It is however large enough for a single bed and otherwise well suited to function as a small bedroom with direct access to the stairs and the ground floor bathroom. Simply naming it as something else does not get away from the facts of the proposed layout as presented on the drawings, and the likely way that the dwelling would be occupied in the future. Additionally, the appellant's case in respect of this matter is further undermined by the fact it was referred to as a bedroom in an earlier scheme.
9. As a two bedroom three person two storey dwelling the proposal would fall short of the nationally described space standard, and would therefore fail to accord with paragraph Q1. (o) of Schedule 2 Part 3 of the GPDO.

Impractical or undesirable

10. The Planning Practice Guidance establishes that Impractical reflects that the location and siting would “not be sensible or realistic”, and undesirable reflects that it would be “harmful or objectionable”².
11. The existing building faces towards the front entrance of the recently built farmhouse. Apart from a small opening on the east end and a small opening at the rear, the ground floor living room and the two bedrooms would face out to the front and towards the farmhouse. The distance between the front of the two buildings is modest and certainly less than would normally be desirable between two dwellings

² Paragraph: 109 Reference ID: 13-109-20150305

to secure adequate privacy. The door of the existing building and the generous glazed entrance door of the farmhouse would roughly align which would allow a clear line of sight between the two dwellings. On the basis that the proposed dwelling would be independently occupied the relationship that would be created would be harmful.

12. The domestic curtilage would be modest, which I accept it needs to be to accord with the GPDO. However, the arbitrary line to the front of the building would be difficult to successfully define. If left open the converted building would have no defined or properly enclosed outdoor space, which would not be sensible for a small family sized dwelling. If enclosed to provide privacy to a small garden both buildings would be hemmed in alongside their front elevations. In any case, the small strip of land would be to the north of the building and would be shaded by the building for much of the day.
13. Taking these matters together I find that the building is not suitably sited to serve as a dwelling, given its close relationship to the farmhouse opposite. The proposal would therefore be impractical and undesirable, and would not therefore accord with paragraph Q2. (1) (e) of Schedule 2 Part 3 of the GPDO.

Conclusion

14. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

A Tucker

INSPECTOR