



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 August 2025

by **B Astley-Serougi BA(Hons) LLM MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/H1705/W/25/3367007

Coopers Farm Barn, Bell Lane, Ellisfield , Basingstoke RG25 2QU

- 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 Mr Adrian De Ferranti against the decision of Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/00449/GPDADW.
 - The development proposed is described as a change of use of agricultural building to 5 no. dwellinghouses (Class C3) and for associated operational development.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. On 21 May 2024, Statutory Instrument 2024 No. 579 (SI No. 579) came into force amending Article 3(1), Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (the GPDO). Due to the transitional arrangements, I have proceeded to determine this appeal in accordance with the GPDO provisions that were in force prior to 21 May 2024. All references to the GPDO in this decision therefore relate to the version that was in force at that time.
3. I have used the description of development contained in the Decision Notice and Appeal form and I have removed words not related to acts of development for clarity.

Background and Main Issue

4. Class Q of the GPDO permits development consisting of a change of use of a building and any land within its curtilage from a use as an agricultural building to a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouse) of the Schedule to the Use Classes Order, together with building operations which are reasonably necessary to enable the conversion of the building. This is subject to limitations and conditions as set out in paragraph Q.1 and Q.2 of Class Q.
5. The Council contends that the siting and location of the building would result in an impractical and undesirable change of use to 5 no. dwellinghouses and thereby it would not meet the requirements of Class Q due to the limitations specified under Q.2(1)(e).
6. The main issue is therefore whether the proposal would be permitted development under Schedule 2, Part 3, Q.2(1)(e) of the GPDO having regard to:

- whether the location and siting of the building make it impractical or undesirable for the building to change to 5 no. dwellinghouses, in terms of the appropriate provision for the living conditions of future neighbouring occupants and future occupants with particular regard to privacy.
7. There is no dispute between the main parties that the other criterion of Class Q are satisfied, I have no reason to conclude otherwise. Consequently, there is no need to give them further consideration in this decision.

Reasons

8. Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) outlines that impractical or undesirable in this context are not defined in the relevant regulations. Consequently, that a reasonable, ordinary dictionary meaning should be applied. It further highlights that impractical reflects that the location and siting would “not be sensible or realistic”, and undesirable reflects that it would be “harmful or objectionable”¹.
9. Given the above, it is not unreasonable to consider whether the amenity space provided by the appeal scheme and its relationship with the proposed dwellings would result in the proposed development being impractical or undesirable.
10. Coopers Farm Barn (the Barn) is an agricultural barn and is located near to other residential dwellings including the Grade II listed Coopers Farmhouse². The proposed development would result in the provision of five dwellings with a shared amenity space located at the rear of the barn. The proposed bedroom windows for House Four would be directly visible from the shared amenity space and would therefore result in a harmful effect upon its future occupants regarding privacy. Accordingly, the appeal scheme would be impractical and undesirable.
11. Whilst the appellant has stated that the internal layout of the House Four could be re-arranged as per a snapshot provided in their statement of case, there is no formal plan submitted demonstrating this layout. Moreover, even if there was, the procedural guide for planning appeals advises that the appeal process should not be used to evolve a scheme as it is important that what is considered by the Inspector at appeal is essentially the same scheme that was considered by the local planning authority and by interested parties at the application stage.
12. Additionally, the appellant’s proposed condition requiring one-way privacy glass for the bedroom windows of House Four would not adequately mitigate the perceived sense of overlooking, particularly given their ground floor position facing the shared amenity space. As such, I do not consider the condition to be satisfactory in safeguarding residential privacy and thus prevent the appeal scheme from being impractical or undesirable.
13. Furthermore, I do not have the full circumstances regarding the appeal decisions at either Moor Field or Pumpfields Farm, I therefore cannot be certain that they are wholly comparable to the appeal before me and each application is determined on its own merits.
14. Notwithstanding this, regarding the appeal at Moor Field, the PPG provides examples of what could constitute impractical or undesirable however, these are not exhaustive.

¹ Paragraph: 109 Reference ID: 13-109-20150305

² List Entry Number: 1339530

15. Considering, the appeal at Pumpfields Farm, I acknowledge that there is no requirement under Class Q to include a curtilage. However, the appeal decision at Pumpfields Farm was in relation to a proposed singular dwelling house and the Inspector nonetheless assessed the amenity space in this context.
16. Given I have identified above that there is not an exhaustive list nor strict definition of 'impractical' or 'undesirable' in this context, to my mind it is reasonable to assess the functionality of private amenity space in this case. In the appeal before me, the occupants of the proposed five dwelling houses would share one amenity space which would be relatively small with an approximate depth of six metres and likely require significant boundary treatments to provide privacy. Thus, in my judgement, given that the appeal scheme is for five houses, the amenity space would be impractical.
17. Regarding a previous Class Q approval³ at the appeal site for the appeal barn, it was for one dwelling rather than five. Therefore, whilst there is a greater than theoretical possibility that this would be implemented, it would be less harmful than the appeal scheme before me, due to the reasons I have identified above regarding privacy and amenity space. It therefore does not lead me to a different conclusion.
18. I acknowledge, that the purpose of Class Q of the GPDO is generally considered to be to increase the supply of housing as was outlined by the Inspector in an appeal decision relating to Luffincott Farm. However, it remains that the appeal scheme would result in harm to the living conditions of future occupants of House Four of the appeal scheme with regard to privacy and would provide impractical amenity space for the proposed five dwellings.
19. Given all of the above, I conclude that in this case the location and siting of the appeal barn for the proposed number of dwellings is impractical and undesirable for conversion. It therefore would not comply with paragraph Q.2(1)(e) of Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q.

Other Matters

20. The appeal site is immediately adjacent to the Grade II Listed Coopers Farmhouse. Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 sets out the duty to, in considering whether to grant planning permission for development which affects a listed building or its setting, have regard to the desirability of preserving the building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. However, it is not directly relevant for prior approval applications because planning permission is granted by Article 3(1) of the GPDO. Nevertheless, the impact upon the setting of listed buildings does need to be taken into account.
21. Given the built form which separates Coopers Farmhouse from the appeal barn, in my judgement, the appeal proposal would preserve the setting of the Grade II listed Coopers Farmhouse. A lack of harm in this respect, however, does not alter my overall conclusions.
22. Matters regarding housing land supply are not relevant to Class Q and therefore do not attract weight.

³ Planning Application Reference: 23/00248/GPDADW

Conclusion

23. Given I have found the appeal site to be impractical and undesirable for the proposed number of dwellings, the appeal proposal would not be permitted development. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

B Astley-Serougi

INSPECTOR