



Appeal Decisions

Site visit made on 10 December 2025

by Jane Smith MA MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 19th January 2026

Appeal A Ref: APP/R3650/W/25/3374483

Barnett Farm, Norley Lane, Shamley Green, Guildford, Surrey GU5 0TP

- 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 K Whybrow against the decision of Waverley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is WA/2025/00114.
 - The development proposed is the replacement of The Old Dairy and adjoining ancillary residential Barn and a garage with a new dwelling and garage (subsequent to granting of planning consent for extensions and alterations to existing dwelling with link to Barn, reference: WA/2024/02121).
-

Appeal B Ref: APP/R3650/W/25/3374669

Barnett Farm, Norley Lane, Shamley Green, Guildford, GU5 0TP

- 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 K Whybrow against the decision of Waverley Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is WA/2025/01503.
 - The development proposed is the replacement of The Old Dairy and adjoining ancillary residential barn with a new dwelling and extension to the garage (subsequent to granting of planning consent for extensions and alterations to existing dwelling with link to Barn, reference: WA/2024/02121).
-

Decisions

1. Appeal A is dismissed.
2. Appeal B is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

3. There are two appeals, both relating to replacement of the same existing dwelling, known as The Old Dairy. Different designs are proposed, and the Appeal A proposal includes a replacement detached garage, whereas the Appeal B proposal would retain and extend an existing garage. Both applications were refused for a similar reason, relating to the effect on the setting of an adjoining Grade II listed building known as Barnett Farm House. I have considered each proposal on its individual merits. However, to avoid duplication I have dealt with the two schemes together, except where otherwise indicated.
4. In the banner heading above, I have used the description of each proposed development as given on the front cover of the relevant Design, Access and Planning Statement (DAPS)¹, as indicated on the planning application form.

¹ Michael Conoley Associate Design, Access and Planning Statements ref 1845, dated December 2024 (Appeal A) and July 2025 (Appeal B).

Main Issue

5. The Council found that both appeal proposals would be inappropriate development in the Green Belt, having had regard to relevant Development Plan policies and the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework). They also found that both proposals would harm the openness of the Green Belt. However, having taken into account an extant planning permission for extension of The Old Dairy², they concluded in both cases that there were very special circumstances outweighing the Green Belt harm. That conclusion has not been contested by any party through the appeal process, and I have no reason to reach a different view based on the evidence before me.
6. Against that background, the main issue is the effect of the proposed developments on the setting of Barnett Farm House.

Reasons

7. The Old Dairy is a single storey dwelling, forming a U-shaped courtyard. It is largely of brick construction, with some weatherboarded elements. The narrow footprint is spanned by a modest pitched roof of clay tiles, which appears to be a modern addition, dating from an approved conversion to residential use in 2007. The site also includes modern agricultural barns, several smaller sheds and shipping containers and a detached garage. All of these are now apparently used for storage related to the dwelling, and there has been no agricultural activity on the site for several years. The rest of the plot is laid out with a variety of gravelled areas and loose hardstanding, lawns and shrubs.
8. Immediately to one side of the appeal site, but within the same ownership and accessed from a shared private drive, is Barnett Farm House. This Grade II listed building is a more imposing, two storey timber framed dwelling, with a modern extension at the front. It stands in a substantial, open garden, including ponds to either side of the driveway.
9. Although there are villages nearby, the site and its immediate surroundings have a decidedly rural character, with the wider holding also including additional ponds, small, grassed fields and wooded shaws typical of the surrounding countryside.

Setting and Significance of Barnett Farm House

10. The significance of the listed building primarily derives from its historic status as a dwelling of 16th century origins, with evidential value arising from the surviving local vernacular timber framed architecture of that period. The HCUK Group Heritage Advice Note also acknowledges some historic value pertaining to its role as an early domestic building associated with rural agricultural practices, which is still evoked by the rural approach and surroundings. However, the extent to which the listed building's relationship with the former agricultural buildings on the appeal site contributes to an understanding of its significance is disputed.
11. There is little or no evidence of agricultural buildings or activity dating back to the 16th century. However, there is a surviving former cart shed or cattle shed between Barnett Farm House and The Old Dairy, which is described by the Surrey Domestic Buildings Research Group as likely to date from the early 1700s. There is also evidence of a loose range of agricultural buildings having stood to the west

² Planning permission ref WA/2024/02121, granted 23 December 2024

of the dwelling in the 1800s. Those farm buildings no longer exist, but the dairy range was introduced in a similar position in the early 1900s, and the modern barns were added later in the 20th century.

12. The Heritage Statements include descriptions of agricultural activities at Barnett Farm in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, including references to cattle being milked in the 1920s. While The Old Dairy has been much altered and potentially substantially rebuilt, it originates from that period. It appears that agricultural activities were already separately tenanted by that time and had a separate access from Barnett Farm House. Nevertheless, there is clear evidence of agricultural use of the land and buildings around the listed building having formed a meaningful phase in its history, as would be expected for a dwelling of this nature, in a rural location standing outside any defined village or settlement.
13. Barnett Farm House, The Old Dairy and the other buildings form a coherent and closely related group of buildings. In relation to the fairly imposing listed dwelling, The Old Dairy has a more subservient scale and low key appearance, resulting from its single storey form, narrow span with modest pitched roof and low key, weatherboarded elevations facing the listed building. Its residential use stems from planning permissions for change of use of redundant farm buildings. Despite photographic evidence indicating that the buildings may actually have been substantially rebuilt and that the original dairy buildings were of more utilitarian appearance with a flat roof, the design and external appearance of the converted building is easily understood as a former agricultural building. Therefore, it continues to reflect that history.
14. The barns beyond The Old Dairy are modern structures, currently clad in plywood sheet, which have no architectural merit. However, they also retain a typically agricultural appearance, despite no longer being used for that purpose.
15. The concept of setting is distinct from that of curtilage, and it has not been suggested that The Old Dairy is curtilage listed or otherwise has heritage value in its own right. Equally, the setting of a listed building is not limited to land owned or managed by those occupying it, either now or in the past. Importantly, the definition of setting in the Framework and Historic England guidance on the setting of heritage assets³ both make clear that settings of heritage assets may change over time. While settings which have been little altered since the building was constructed may make a particularly strong contribution, those which have been subject to a history of change can still enhance significance.
16. In this case, although there are very few surviving features of any historical farmyard, the position, layout, scale and appearance of The Old Dairy and its associated buildings mean that the relationship between the listed building and various incarnations of associated farm buildings can still be understood. That in turn helps to connect Barnett Farm House with its rural surroundings, which have been used productively during its history. Consequently, notwithstanding its current residential use, The Old Dairy and barns on the appeal site make a positive contribution to the setting of the listed building, by enabling a continued understanding of its significance as an historic rural dwelling, and how it has related over time to its evolving rural and agricultural context.

³ Historic England: The Setting of Heritage Assets, Historic Environment Good Practice Advice in Planning Note 3 (Second Edition)

Effect on Setting of Listed Building

17. In both proposals, The Old Dairy and barns would be demolished and replaced with a new dwelling. Their current, positive contribution to the setting of the listed building would therefore be lost. Recording of the former farm buildings would not adequately compensate for the loss of opportunity to experience the listed building in the context of buildings which support an understanding of its significance.
18. In the case of Appeal A, the proposed dwelling would depart significantly from the footprint and layout of the existing buildings. It would provide a greater level of separation from the listed building, with the new dwelling being on a more consolidated footprint. However, that is of minimal advantage from a heritage point of view, since the listed building is already set at an angle to The Old Dairy, in its own open garden, which provides enough space for the heritage asset to be viewed and appreciated very clearly on all sides.
19. Notwithstanding the use of external materials and detailing drawing on the local vernacular, the proposed dwelling would have a more unashamedly domestic character than the existing range of buildings. It would be a modern dwelling of some status, not untypical of such dwellings in rural Surrey, but offering no clear indicator of the role which the appeal site has played within the history of Barnett Farm. That would be materially harmful to the setting of the listed building and its significance as a designated heritage asset.
20. The design proposed in Appeal B differs significantly, having a different form and reduced footprint and volume. It aims to draw on pre-application advice from the Council and more clearly acknowledges the earlier evolution of the site. In particular, the dwelling would have two main ranges with a single storey link, reflecting the footprint of The Old Dairy and former farm buildings. The design of the west wing draws on the design and materials of historic threshing barns in this part of southeast England. A low, single storey element would be retained closest to the listed building, with a quiet, brick elevation, thereby retaining something of the subservient character of the existing Old Dairy courtyard.
21. There would, however, also be some substantial two storey elements around the courtyard, stepping up towards the central link. The west wing would have a complicated roof form, with several elements. Neither wing would truly reflect the simpler, more utilitarian form characteristic of a range of agricultural buildings. The central link would be relatively substantial, so the dwelling would read as a single sizable domestic property, albeit one with a rather sprawling layout. Although it would be an improvement over the design proposed in Appeal A, the design would not adequately support an understanding of the relationship between the listed building and its historical agricultural context. Consequently, it would also be harmful to the setting of the listed building, albeit to a lesser degree.
22. Both proposals would consolidate built development, removing the modern barns and other sheds and clutter. Taking into account the current appearance of the barns, the overall quality of external materials and detailing throughout the site would be improved. That would not, however, outweigh the harm to the setting of the listed building through the erosion of the remaining indicators of agricultural use. There would be little clear advantage in terms of management or landscaping of the site, since it already appears very well maintained and cared for and the

areas of gravel and loose hardstanding are neither unsightly nor inappropriate to their surroundings.

23. For the reasons given above, I conclude that both the proposed developments would have an adverse effect on the setting of Barnett Farm House. Both would conflict with relevant requirements in Policies HA1 and TD1 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan (Part 1) 2018 and Policy DM20 of the Waverley Borough Local Plan (Part 2) 2023. Those policies collectively require, amongst other things, that development should preserve or enhance the setting and significance of listed buildings. Policy DM20 goes on to require that a heritage balance is applied, in line with the approach in the Framework, and that is considered further below.

Fallback Position

24. As noted above, planning permission was granted in December 2024 for extensions to The Old Dairy, incorporating and upgrading the existing barns and integrating them with the dwelling. The planning permission is extant and there is no dispute that it is a realistic scheme and capable of implementation. As such, the extant permission provides a fallback position relevant to the appeal proposals.
25. The approved plans would have a less consolidated built form than the Appeal A proposal. In common with the Appeal B proposal, they would provide a substantial single dwelling with contrasting wings connected by a central link. However, The Old Dairy would be retained in its current low key, single storey form without addition of two storey elements. Although the barns would have a more domestic appearance by virtue of the insertion of glazed openings, they would be more clearly understood as converted agricultural buildings than the equivalent range on the Appeal B design. The link would be below the roof lines to either side, more clearly separating the two contrasting wings.
26. For those reasons, the extant planning permission would more successfully retain and incorporate features which contribute to the setting of the listed building. Consequently, the approved plans do not have a similarly harmful effect. As such, while the fallback position has been judged to provide very special circumstances outweighing the Green Belt harm, it does not overcome the harm to the significance of the heritage asset.

Heritage Balance

27. In both cases, the harm to the setting and significance of the listed building would be less than substantial. Taking into account the degree of previous change, including the cessation of actual agricultural use many years ago, the level of harm would be at a no more than moderate level within the less than substantial range. The harm associated with Appeal B would be less than that arising from Appeal A. Nevertheless, I have attached considerable importance and weight to the desirability of avoiding such harm, in accordance with the statutory duty under s66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
28. Paragraph 212 of the Framework also requires that great weight is given to conservation of designated heritage assets, including where the level of harm to their significance is less than substantial. However, paragraph 215 requires that the harm to the heritage asset is weighed against any public benefits of the proposals, and Policy DM20 includes a similar test.

29. There would be some minor economic benefits from construction of the replacement dwellings. Energy efficient construction, including renewable energy generation, is proposed, although the extent to which those measures offer benefits over and above the requirements of the Local Plan and current Building Regulations is not clearly articulated. Ecological enhancements may provide some public benefit, although an exemption from biodiversity net gain has been claimed. All the above benefits are of a generally routine nature for a development of this nature, and I have afforded them only modest weight.
30. There may be some minor benefit from delivery of a single self-build dwelling. A self-build proforma supporting Appeal B states that the dwelling would become the appellant's home, which is relevant to whether the proposals would be self-build as defined in the 2015 Act⁴, and relevant exemptions from biodiversity net gain and the Community Infrastructure Levy have been claimed. The Council proposes that provision of a self-build dwelling could be secured by a planning condition. Nevertheless, even if I were to agree that adequate mechanisms were in place to secure delivery of a self-build dwelling as defined in the Act, the contribution to the supply of housing for people seeking to build their own homes would be extremely modest and I have also given that potential benefit only modest weight.
31. Other issues, including flood risk and the effect on protected species were considered by the Council at the time of the applications and no harm was alleged subject to the imposition of conditions. While I have noted other concerns raised by interested parties, the Council did not allege any harm to the wider rural landscape or living conditions for occupiers of any neighbouring properties. In any case, these are at best neutral factors, not weighing in favour, so there is no need for me to consider them further in the heritage balance.
32. Overall, while there are some public benefits, they are individually of modest value. Even when considered collectively, I conclude that the weight attributed to the public benefits falls well short of the considerable importance and weight attached to the harmful effect on the setting of the listed building, from either appeal proposal. Consequently, the public benefits do not outweigh the harm to the significance of the designated heritage asset. The proposed developments would conflict with Policy DM20 of the Part 2 Local Plan and the approach in the Framework to conserving and enhancing heritage assets.

Conclusion

33. The proposed developments would conflict with the development plan and there are no material considerations in either case which indicate that a decision should be made otherwise than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeals should be dismissed.

Jane Smith

INSPECTOR

⁴ Self Build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 (as amended)