
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 February 2026

by **O Marigold BSc DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 09 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/E3335/W/25/3373168

Dutch Barn, Cinnamon Lane, Glastonbury BA6 8BN

- 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 Robert Durston against the decision of Somerset Council.
 - The application Ref is 2025/0671/PAA.
 - The development proposed is Prior Approval for a proposed change of use of agricultural building to 3no. dwellings (Class C3).
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. I have used the description of the proposal as set out in the Council's Decision Notice, which is more accurate and concise than that used in the application form. The appellant has used this revised description in the appeal form and so I am satisfied that no party would be prejudiced as a result.

Background and Main Issue

3. Class Q of the General Permitted Development Order (GPDO) permits development consisting of a change of use of a building from agricultural use to a dwelling or dwellings, and any building operations reasonably necessary to undertake the conversion. The proposal seeks to convert an existing building into three dwellings.
4. GPDO Class Q paragraph Q1 only permits a change of use in certain circumstances. Under Q.1(a), if the building is part of an established agricultural unit, it must have been so on 24th July 2023, or where a period of ten years has elapsed from the date that development begins. Conversely, under Q.1(b)(ii), if the building is no longer part of an established agricultural unit, this must have ceased more than ten years from the start of development. In addition, under Q.1(b)(iii), since ceasing to be part of an established agricultural unit, it must not have been used for any non-agricultural purpose.
5. These are matters of dispute between the Council and the appellant. Accordingly, the main issue is whether the proposal accords with these requirements and therefore the description of permitted development under Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the GPDO.

Reasons

6. An established agricultural unit is defined as agricultural land occupied as a unit for the purposes of agriculture on or before 20th March 2013, or for 10 years before the date the development begins. The application included confirmation from the Rural Payments Agency that a County Parish Holding number was issued for what has become the appeal site in 2010. A copy of a 1985 covenant confirms association of the site with nearby Honeysuckle Farm. As such, I have little reason to doubt that the site was once part of an established agricultural unit.
7. However, the site was sold in June 2024 to the appellant. It continued to be used for agricultural purposes afterwards, apart from some equestrian use. Letters from the current and former owners, and from a local farmer, have been provided to support this position.
8. Even so, the application form (dated April 2025) states that whilst the site was part of an established agricultural unit on 24th July 2023, it is not currently part of such a unit. On this basis, Class Q.1(b) is engaged. The form also states that it has been at least 10 years since the site was part of an established agricultural unit, but in 2025 or 2026 this cannot be consistent with it having been part of such a unit in July 2023. Nor is it consistent with the sale date of June 2024. Class Q.1(b)(ii) is not therefore met.
9. Furthermore, Class Q.1(b)(iii) makes clear that development is not permitted if the site has been used for any non-agricultural purpose. There is no dispute that part of the appeal building has been used for equestrian purposes following its sale. This use may not have been the subject of a planning application or enforcement action, and so may not have become lawful. It may well have been of limited duration and scale, without requiring physical changes to the building.
10. Nevertheless, on the evidence before me, the acknowledged equestrian use does constitute use of the building for non-agricultural purposes. Consequently, Class Q.1(b)(iii) is not complied with. It follows that the proposal does not accord with the requirements of Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the GPDO, and so does not constitute permitted development.

Other Matter

11. The Council's reasons for refusal also refer to whether the proposal would accord with Class Q.2(1)(e), namely whether the location of the building means that the change of use would be impractical or undesirable. However, as I have found that the proposal does not comply with the description of permitted development, I do not need to consider this matter further.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

O Marigold

INSPECTOR