



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 25 November 2025

by **Samuel Watson BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 December 2025

Appeal Ref: 6000815

Middleton Barn, Middleton Priors, Shropshire WV16 6UR

- 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 Messers Fern and Purkis against the decision of Shropshire Council.
- The application Ref is 25/01602/PMBPA.
- The development proposed is for the change of use from agricultural to one dwellinghouse.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and prior approval is not required under the provisions of 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 GPDO) for the change of use from agricultural to one dwellinghouse at Middleton Barn, Middleton Priors, Shropshire WV16 6UR in accordance with the application 25/01602/PMBPA and the details submitted with it and 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. I have altered the description in the header above in order to remove superfluous details and make the description clearer.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are:
 - Whether the scope of the proposed works is within that covered by Class Q, in particular Q.1(h); and,
 - Whether prior approval is needed as to the transport and highways impacts of the development.

Reasons

Scope of works

4. The appeal site covers a barn and an area of land immediately surrounding it. The barn is constructed of a framework on concrete blockwork with timber cladding on the upper portion of the walls. At the time of my visit the building appeared to be structurally sound and in an overall good condition.

5. The GPDO sets out those works that are covered by Class Q. These works include new or replacement exterior walls insofar as they are reasonably necessary for the conversion of the building and subject to them not protruding more than 0.2 metres beyond the external dimensions of the existing building.
6. As a result of the proposal, and amongst other works, the upper portion of the wall cladding would be replaced with a solid version. The drawings submitted with the planning application do not show in detail the existing cladding or its replacement. However, the drawings do show both existing and proposed claddings as having the same modest overhang to the blockwork below. Figure 1 of the appellant's statement shows the replacement in more detail and demonstrates that the proposed cladding would not protrude further from the building than the existing cladding.
7. Therefore, given the above, I consider that the proposal would not exceed the scope of the building operations covered by Class Q under Paragraphs Q.1(h) and (j).

Highway Safety

8. The appeal barn is located at the end of a shared driveway used by the barn, the remaining agricultural use and a small number of dwellings. Although I note some concerns as to whether the appellant has a legal right of way, this is a private matter outside of the scope of this appeal. The unnamed road running past the site is narrow and winding and, when taken with the significant number of accesses, it is very unlikely vehicles would be travelling at the national speed limit.
9. The appeal barn is likely to generate a degree of movements associated with its agricultural use. While the building may not currently be in use, there is no reason before me preventing this use restarting. Movements would also occur in association with the other dwellings and agricultural unit. By converting the appeal barn, the proposal would reduce the generation of agricultural movements but increase that of domestic movements.
10. It is likely that future occupiers would need to travel for work, education and to reach services and other facilities. Therefore, while replacing agricultural movements associated with the barn, the proposal would also result in some increase above this. Nevertheless, I am content that against the existing use of the driveway this increase would be modest.
11. During my site visit I observed the existing visibility at the driveway access. Visibility was fairly open to the left, when leaving the site, but was restricted in views to the right. As noted above it is very unlikely vehicles would be travelling at speed. Moreover, the proposal is likely to only result in a modest increase in movements. I therefore find that there would be no unacceptable increase in the risk to highway safety as a result of intervisibility at the drive access.
12. The submitted plans show two parking spaces at the front of the dwelling in an area of gravel. I am content from the information before me that this area is sufficient to provide parking and turning for two vehicles and that they would be able to access and leave the site in a forward gear.
13. In light of the above, the proposal would not result in any unacceptable highway safety impacts stemming from its vehicular access or parking and turning areas.

Therefore, prior approval of the Local Planning Authority is not required with regards to Paragraph Q.2(1)(a) of the GPDO.

Other Matters

14. While the appeal site and barn may have been sold with the agreement that they remain in agricultural use, covenants are outside of the remit of this appeal and would need to be dealt with separately.
15. Given the appeal site is already in a separate ownership to the rest of the agricultural holding and dwellings, there is already a potential for any comings and goings to be from those unknown to the neighbouring occupiers. I therefore find there would be no unacceptable change to the safety and security of the surroundings, or that there would be any noise or privacy harm. I similarly find that the conversion works themselves are unlikely to result in any unacceptable risk to the safety or neighbours or their property.
16. The nearby Hyde Farmhouse a Grade II listed building has been referred to by an interested party. Having regard to my statutory duty, I am satisfied that the relationship between the appeal proposal and this heritage asset would have a neutral effect upon its setting. Harm to the significance of the nearby heritage asset would therefore not occur. It is noteworthy that the Council did not raise any impact on the nearby heritage asset as a concern when it refused the prior approval.

Conclusion

17. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, and prior approval is not required.

Samuel Watson

INSPECTOR