



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 22 October 2025

by E Pickernell BSc MSC MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/W/25/3369735

Manor Farm, Westbury Road, North Bradley, Wiltshire BA14 0TW

- 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 R Spencer against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2025/02126.
 - The development proposed is Prior approval under Part 3 Class Q for the conversion of an agricultural building into a dwelling.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and prior approval is granted under the provisions of Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q (a) and (b) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (the GPDO) for Prior approval under Part 3 Class Q for the conversion of an agricultural building into a dwelling at Manor Farm, Westbury Road, North Bradley, Wiltshire BA14 0TW in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref PL/2025/02126, and the details submitted with it including drawing numbers 4276-01, 4276-02 Rev C and 4276-04 Rev B. The approval is subject to the condition that the development must be completed within a period of 3 years from the date of this decision in accordance with Paragraph Q.2(3) of the GPDO and the provisions specified in paragraph W.

Preliminary Matters

2. The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) England (Amendment) Order 2024 came into force on 21 May 2024. Transitional arrangements set out in Article 10 of the amending Order applied to applications submitted until the end of 20 May 2025. The appellant confirmed that the application would use the permitted development right as it stood prior to May 2024 and I have determined the appeal on this basis.

Main Issue

3. It is common ground that the appeal scheme meets the requirements of Q.1 of the GPDO such that it would constitute development permitted under Class Q, subject to the prior approval of certain matters. For permitted development under Class Q(a), namely a change of use from an agricultural building to a Class C3 dwellinghouse, prior approval is required in respect of a number of matters, including whether the location or siting of the development make it impractical or undesirable for the use of the building to change.

4. The main issue is whether the location and siting of the building make it impractical or undesirable for the building to change to a dwellinghouse, in terms of its effect on the living conditions of future occupiers of the proposed dwellinghouse, with particular regard to noise and disturbance.

Reasons

5. The GPDO does not define the terms 'impractical' or 'undesirable', however Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) states that a reasonable ordinary dictionary meaning should be applied in making any judgement. Such a proposal would be impractical if the location and siting would not be sensible or realistic and would be undesirable if it would be harmful or objectionable. Examples given in the PPG are where a building is on the top of a hill with no road access with no power source making its conversion impractical or where it is adjacent to other uses such as intensive poultry farming buildings, silage storage or buildings with dangerous machines or chemicals making its conversion undesirable.
6. When considering whether it is appropriate for the change of use to take place in a particular location, a local planning authority should start from the premise that the permitted development right grants planning permission, subject to the prior approval requirements.
7. The appeal site is located towards the east of a group of farm buildings at Manor Farm. To the east of the appeal building is an existing dwelling, Manor Farm House, which is outside of the appeal site and to the northwest is another dwelling, Manor Barn, occupied by the appellant.
8. The appeal building is accessed via the eastern spur off the access from Westbury Road. Other buildings which are accessed via the eastern spur include an unused grain store, two workshops referred to as buildings 2 and 3 on the appeal plans and the existing dwelling. The remainder of the buildings at the farm are accessed via the western spur.
9. The main openings to Building 3 are on the northwest elevation, well away from the appeal building. Building 2 had burnt down at the time of my site visit, however the plans indicate that it was accessed via openings on the west elevation. If it is rebuilt in the same form, vehicles accessing it would cross the yard to the north of the appeal building, however this would be a generous distance away from the openings in the north elevation of the converted building. Vehicular movements associated with the existing dwelling would be domestic in nature. As such the vehicular movements associated with the other buildings which use the eastern spur would not result in significant disturbance to future occupiers.
10. The workshop and storage buildings nearest to the appeal building (2,3 and 6) are subject to planning conditions limiting their hours of use to 07:30 – 18:00 Monday – Friday and 08:00 – 13:00 Saturday with no activity on Sundays and Bank Holidays. Whilst noisy activities could potentially occur during these hours, I am satisfied that given the separation between these buildings and the appeal building, the enclosed nature of the existing buildings and the position of the openings, any such noise would not be at such a level that it would result in unacceptable living conditions for future occupiers.
11. Buildings 7, 8 and 9 are located to the west and southwest of the appeal building, separated by the proposed garden area and a gated yard. These buildings are in

equestrian use with the nearest buildings to the appeal property comprising a stable block and a hay barn. Whilst these uses would undoubtedly result in some noisy activities and smells these would be intermittent and given the scale of the enterprise, the use would not be intensive. As such these uses would not be incompatible with a residential environment.

12. The farm is in relatively close proximity to other residential properties on Westbury Road and there is no evidence before me that the occupiers of these dwellings experience unacceptable levels of noise and disturbance from the uses which occur at the farm.
13. Overall, whilst the existing uses near to the appeal building are likely to result in a degree of noise, smell and disturbance to future occupiers at times, this would not be so intensive as to result in harmful living conditions. I therefore conclude that the location and siting of the building would not make it impractical or undesirable for the building to change to a dwellinghouse, in terms of its effect on the living conditions of future occupiers of the proposed dwellinghouse, with particular regard to noise and disturbance.

Conditions

14. Any prior approval granted under Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the GPDO is subject to the condition under Q.2 (3) which specifies that the development shall be completed within a period of 3 years, as well as the provisions of paragraph W., including paragraph W (12) which requires development to be carried out in accordance with the details submitted.
15. The Council have not suggested any conditions which it considers should be attached to any permission. I have given consideration as to whether a condition should be imposed limiting the occupation of the dwelling to an agricultural worker, however given my conclusions in respect of the main issue I do not consider this to be necessary.

Conclusion

16. For the reasons given, I conclude that the appeal is allowed, and prior approval is granted.

E Pickernell

INSPECTOR