



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 11 February 2026

by H Nicholls MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/Y3940/W/25/3372971

Whitley Farm, Low Bridge Crossroads South East C118 To Whitley Brake, Whitley SN11 9HD

- 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 Sue Telfer against the decision of Wiltshire Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/2025/03085.
 - The development proposed is conversion of barn to residential use.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for conversion of barn to residential use at Whitley Farm, Low Bridge Crossroads South East C118 To Whitley Brake, Whitley, SN11 9HD, in accordance with the details submitted pursuant to Schedule 2, Part 3, Paragraph Q.2 (1) of the GPDO through application PL/2025/03085. The approval is also 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.

Preliminary Matters

2. Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q (a) 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 Class C3 use (dwellinghouse). This provision also includes, at (b) development referred to in Paragraph (a) together with any building operations reasonably necessary to convert the building.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would be permitted under Article 3(1), Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the GPDO, specifically whether the building was part of an established unit on the required date to comply with Paragraph Q.1(a) of the GPDO.
4. Under Paragraph Q.1(a) (i), the required date is the 24 July 2023 following a change to the GPDO which took effect in May 2024. The appeal application was made after these changes took effect.
5. Based on the submissions of the main parties, there is no reason for me to believe that the other criteria of Class Q are not satisfied. Consequently, there is no need to give them further consideration in this decision.

Reasons

6. The barn subject of the application is constructed of stone on three sides and has an open frontage, separated into five bays by timber supports. It has a pitched slated roof and a small lean-to extension on one side. The barn is situated on a farm of around 50 hectares which largely focusses on producing crops, including forage crops and does so under agricultural holding number 45/014/0070. There are a high number of other barns on the wider farm of varying ages and construction. The evidence details that the barn has been and is used for the storage of agricultural equipment and machinery used for the ongoing farming activities. At the time of my visit, there were a few items of dated agricultural equipment within the barn.
7. The appellant's evidence refers to, but does not provide with the appeal submission, documents pertaining to the established agricultural unit from between 1936 and 2016, including a schedule of buildings describing the building as a tractor shed store and garage and details under the Rural Payment Agency scheme. The appeal evidence does however include evidence of transactions of wheat from the farm in 2022, 2024 and 2025. There are also statutory declarations from the appellant and someone who has been familiar with the appeal site for a period in excess of 30 years. Both statutory declarations confirm that the appeal building has always been used for agricultural equipment and machines and that it continues to be used in such a manner as part of the wider farming enterprise.
8. Though the Council indicate that the invoices are not expressly related to the building itself, but to the wider agricultural unit, the statutory declarations are specific to the building. Though a photograph embedded within a previously submitted structural report appears to show a vehicle parked within one bay of the building in September 2023, this is not itself decisive of the matter as to whether the entire building was part of an established agricultural holding on the required date.
9. In the absence of cogent evidence to the contrary, the evidence does not point to a material change of use of the building having occurred or the building no longer forming part of the established agricultural unit. As such, I have no reason to conclude other than that the appeal site was part of an established agricultural unit on the required date. Accordingly, I find the proposal to comply with Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q, Paragraph Q.1(a) of the GPDO.

Conditions

10. No further conditions are suggested by the Council that could otherwise be imposed under GPDO Paragraph W.(13) and I find no reason to impose any.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above, I allow the appeal.

H Nicholls

INSPECTOR