
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2025

by **N Robinson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 12th November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/P0119/W/25/3369789

Bramley Barn & Olive Tree, Homeapple Hill, Wick BS30 5QF

- 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 J McAlinden against the decision of South Gloucestershire Council.
 - The application Ref is P23/03066/F.
 - The development proposed is change of use of Bramley Barn from residential dwelling (class C3) to holiday accommodation (*sui generis*); and use of Olive Tree as ancillary holiday accommodation.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for change of use of Bramley Barn from residential dwelling (class C3) to holiday accommodation (*sui generis*); and use of Olive Tree as ancillary holiday accommodation at Bramley Barn & Olive Tree, Homeapple Hill, Wick BS30 5QF in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref P23/03066/F, subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application is retrospective in nature, and my observations during the site visit confirmed this to be the case. For the avoidance of doubt, I have determined the appeal on the basis of the submitted plans.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - whether the proposal would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, with due regard to the openness of the Green Belt and the purposes of including land within it; and
 - the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties with particular regard to noise and disturbance.

Reasons

Whether inappropriate development

4. The site comprises Bramley Barn, a dwellinghouse, and Olive Tree, an ancillary outbuilding. The site is bordered by dense, mature vegetation. The proposal seeks the change of use of Bramley Barn to holiday accommodation and the change of use of Olive Tree to ancillary holiday accommodation.
5. The site is located in the Green Belt. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) identifies that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent

urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The Framework states that inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved unless it falls within identified exceptions set out at paragraphs 154 and 155 except in very special circumstances. One such exception, set out in paragraph 154(h)(v), is the material change in the use of land provided the development preserves the openness of the Green Belt and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it.

6. Policies CS5 and CS34 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Core Strategy (2013) (CS) and Policy PSP7 of the South Gloucestershire Local Plan Policies, Sites and Places Plan (2017) (LP) aim to ensure that the Green Belt is protected from inappropriate development and require that development in the Green Belt complies with the provisions of the Framework. In these respects, the CS and LP policies are consistent with the Framework.
7. The proposal would not result in any increase in built form. The 2 properties accommodate approximately 33 guests (23 in Bramley Barn and 10 in Olive Tree), resulting in an increase in occupants, vehicular movements and parking demand compared to the site's consented use as a family dwelling house and ancillary outbuilding. The Council considers that the intensification of the use of the site results in harm to the openness of the Green Belt.
8. Vehicles parked would be temporary and transient in nature and would be located within the existing hardstanding area where they would be seen against the backdrop of the buildings and boundary treatment. There is no extension to the parking area proposed into the surrounding undeveloped land. The site is enclosed by fencing and mature planting and the properties, their amenity spaces and parking areas are not visible from the road, the public right of way or from beyond the site boundaries. Given this any increase in vehicles parked at the site would not result in a reduction in the spatial or visual openness of the Green Belt. Any uplift in activity from the increase in the number of occupants is most likely to be in and around the buildings within a relatively contained area which is screened from views beyond the site boundaries, and there is no substantive evidence that this would have a harmful effect on the openness of the Green Belt. Given this, the proposal would not result in a reduction in the spatial or visual openness of the Green Belt.
9. The purposes of the Green Belt are set out at Paragraph 143 of the Framework. As the proposal would not result in any increase in built form I do not consider that it would conflict with any of its purposes, including that purpose which seeks to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. Given this, I find that the change of use preserves the Green Belt's openness and does not conflict with the purposes of including land within it. The proposal therefore falls within the exception to inappropriate development set down at paragraph 154(h)(v) of the Framework.
10. For the reasons given, the proposal would not be inappropriate development in the Green Belt. Therefore, no material conflict arises with CS policies CS5 and CS34 and LP policies PSP7, the aims of which are set out above.

Living conditions

11. The eastern wing of Bramley Barn abuts the rear property boundary of Highfield Cottage. Visitors staying in short-term serviced accommodation are, by definition, more transient in nature than residents living in their permanent home and activity

generated could give rise to noise and disturbance that would be more intensive than that reasonably expected to be associated with a single household, in particular given the scale of occupation.

12. Consistent with the observations of the Inspector in the appeal decision at the buildings to the north of the site¹ which granted approval for the change of use of Hudson House and Homeapple to holiday accommodation and the change of use of the Workshop to ancillary on-site managers accommodation, I am satisfied that a Noise Management Plan (NMP), setting out, amongst other matters, the on-site supervision and control of outdoor spaces and noise outbreak from the properties, would contribute to limiting noise and disturbance generated by the development, in particular given the on-site supervision within the Workshop, which is closely positioned in relation to the site. I see no reason why a condition requiring the submission, approval and adherence to a NMP would not meet the tests set down in the Planning Practice Guidance. The measures set down in the NMP, in combination with the intermittent pattern of use, which limits the frequency and duration of potential noise and disturbance, and the siting of Highfield Cottage to the eastern part of its plot away from the boundary shared with Bramley Barn would contribute to minimising noise and disturbance experienced by the occupiers of this property.
13. Given the above, the development would not result in harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of neighbouring properties including Highfield Cottage. I therefore find no conflict with LP policies PSP8 and PSP28 which seek to ensure that proposals do not have an unacceptable impact on residential amenity.

Other Matters

14. Whilst not referenced in the reasons for refusal, the Council's submission refers to the effect of the proposal on the visual amenity and tranquillity of the area. The site is located in a predominantly rural area. As set out above, the proposal does not involve any alterations to the buildings and any increases in occupancy and car parking associated with the development would be screened in views from beyond the appeal site. Given this, there is no suggestion that the proposal would result in harm to the character of the area or alter the way in which the site is experienced from the public right of way to the south. There is no compelling evidence before me that the comings and goings associated with the site would harm the site's rural character, in particular noting the site's location close to a busy main road.
15. Concerns regarding the effect on highway safety and the sewerage system are noted. The Council raised no objections in relation to these matters and there is no evidence that the scheme's impacts would be unacceptable in these regards.

Conditions

16. In addition to the standard time limit condition, it is necessary to impose a condition that requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans for certainty.
17. I have attached conditions which require the submission of a Noise Management Plan and which limit on the number of guests occupying the holiday accommodation in the interests of neighbouring amenity. Given the retrospective

¹ Appeal Decision APP/P0119/W/25/3365052

nature of the development a further condition is necessary to ensure that the development can be enforced against if the required details are not submitted for approval within the period given by the condition, or if the details are not approved by the local planning authority or the Secretary of State on appeal, or if the details are approved but not implemented in accordance with an approved timetable.

Conclusion

18. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

N Robinson

INSPECTOR

Schedule of 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 following approved plans: ST – 103, BB – 101, BB – 102, BB – 101, OT – 101.
- 3.) Within 30 days of the date of this decision, a Noise Management Plan shall be submitted to the local planning authority for their written approval. The Noise Management Plan, to prevent disturbance to local residents resulting from the hereby permitted use, shall include undertakings and procedures for:
 - i. The name(s) of an on-site supervisor responsible for the behaviour of guests and for liaison with local residents;
 - ii. The control and use of outside areas;
 - iii. The control of noise break out from within the building;
 - iv. Access and egress to and from the property by guests including arrangements for taxi and coach parking;
 - v. Recording of complaints and response to those complaints;
 - vi. Deliveries and collections to and from the property;
 - vii. The annual review of the approved Noise Management Plan and, if necessary, the submission and approval of a revised Noise Management Plan; and
 - viii. Any other matters that are reasonably required by the local planning authority.

Upon implementation of the approved Noise Management Plan specified in this condition, that Noise Management Plan shall be followed and/or maintained.

- 4.) The use hereby permitted shall cease within 6 months of the date of failure to meet any one of the following requirements:
 - i Within 30 days of the date of this decision, a Noise Management Plan submitted in accordance with Condition 3 shall have been submitted for the written approval of the local planning authority and the scheme shall include a timetable for its implementation.
 - ii. If within 6 months of the date of this decision the local planning authority refuse to approve the scheme or fail to give a decision within the prescribed

period, an appeal shall have been made to, and accepted as validly made by, the Secretary of State.

iii. If an appeal is made in pursuance of (ii) above, that appeal shall have been finally determined and the submitted Noise Management Plan shall have been approved by the Secretary of State; and

iv. The approved Noise Management Plan shall have been carried out and completed in accordance with the approved timetable.

- 5.) The holiday accommodation hereby approved shall not exceed the following number of guests, other than through the provision of travel cots for infants: Bramley Barn – 23 guests, Olive Tree – 10 guests. For the avoidance of doubt, sofa-bed provision counts as a bed-space provision.

End of Conditions