RIDGE

Thornbury House
18 High Street
Cheltenham
GL50 1DZ

01242 230066
www.ridge.co.uk

8th November 2019

South Holland District Council
Council Offices
Priory Road
Spalding
Lincolnshire
PE11 2XE

Dear Sir/Madam

Prior Approval Notification: Proposed Changed of Use of Agricultural Building to A Single Dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) And Associated Operational Development at Existing Storage Barn, Eaugate Road, Spalding

This letter accompanies an application for Prior Approval for the change of use of an agricultural building to C3 (dwellinghouse) use at the above site address in accordance with Class Q of Part 3, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order (2015) (GPDO).

This letter assesses the proposal against the requirements of Class Q. It should be read in conjunction with the plans prepared by Remway Design Ltd., as well as the accompanying Structural Appraisal Report prepared by J C Consultancy Ltd.

Site and Surrounding Area

The existing building is a single storey, modern agricultural shed which is made up of blockwork and corrugated sheeting, set on a substantial concrete floor slab. The building has a footprint of approximately 240 square metres and is currently used for general agriculture storage.

The site is situated along Eaugate Road where there are a number of scattered residential properties and farm buildings fronting the road, surrounded by agricultural fields. Beyond the site are agricultural fields in all directions. Given the flat topography of the site and surroundings, views across this agricultural landscape are extensive.

The site is located approximately 1 mile to the south-east of the village of Moulton Chapel and is within the administrative boundary of South Holland District Council.

Planning History

An application for prior approval was submitted in 2015 for the change of use of the agricultural building to residential use (reference H13-0446-15). This submission was supported by plans and a covering letter, although no further structural information was submitted.

Ridge is the trading name of Ridge and Partners LLP. A Limited Liability Partnership registered in England No. OC309402
Registered office: The Cowyards, Blenheim Park, Oxford Road, Woodstock, OX20 1QR.

The application was subsequently refused in May 2015 and the decision notice is enclosed with this letter. A summary of the refusal reasons are:

1. The curtilage shown on the drawings was significantly larger than allowed under the provisions of Class Q and therefore is not permitted development.
2. The works to convert the building to a dwelling go beyond those deemed reasonably necessary by Class Q (e.g. the whole new first floor and staircase). There was also doubt as to whether the building is structural sound to enable it to be converted. As such, the proposal was contrary to Class Q (b) and cannot be considered permitted development.

This application is considered in full later in this letter

Proposed Development

The proposed development is for the change of use of the agricultural shed at Eugate Road to a single residential dwelling.

The accompanying Structural Appraisal Report concludes that the existing building is structurally stable and robust and could continue to perform adequately following a change of use without the need for any significant structural strengthening or rehabilitation. Additionally, the existing building's open plan arrangement provides scope for various uses, and if desired it could lend itself for conversion into a habitable dwelling. Due to its simplicity in construction, there is not likely to be any loss of original structural elements during conversion.

In terms of the proposed conversion, the proposal includes an entrance area where there is existing access to the barn. This continues to a main hall whereby access to the proposal's 4x bedrooms (including 1x en suite); a store; and a large open plan living space is obtained. A utility room including a W.C and store is also proposed and can be accessed via the open plan living space or the proposed dwelling's rear entrance. Only minor changes are proposed to the barn's existing elevations, which includes modifications to the existing entrance; a new entrance at the left flank, and the addition of windows.

Assessment of The Proposal Against the Requirements of Class Q, Part 3, Schedule 2 Of The GPDO

The following section assesses the proposal against the criteria set out in Class Q, Part 3, Schedule 2 of the General Permitted Development Order (GDPO), including any restrictions (Q.1) and conditions (Q.2).

Q. Development Consisting of –
(a) a change of use of a building and any land within its curtilage from a use as an agricultural building to a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouse) of the Schedule to the Use Classes Order; and
(b) building operations reasonably necessary to convert the building referred to in paragraph (a) to a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses) of that Schedule.

Paragraph Q.1 – Development is not permitted by Class Q if -

RESTRICTIONS	ASSESSMENT
a) the site was not used solely for an agricultural use as part of an established agricultural unit— i) on 20th March 2013, or	The building is part of the wider Woodgate Farm. It has been in agricultural use which has been the case since its construction and is currently used for agricultural storage. This was agreed as part of the last application.

ii) in the case of a building which was in use before that date but was not in use on that date, when it was last in use, or iii) in the case of a site which was brought into use after 20th March 2013, for a period of at least 10 years before the date development under Class Q begins;	
b) in the case of— i) a larger dwellinghouse, within an established agricultural unit— (aa) the cumulative number of separate larger dwellinghouses developed under Class Q exceeds 3; or (ba) the floor space of any dwellinghouse developed under Class Q having a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses) of the Schedule to the Use Classes Order exceeds 465 square metres (bb) the cumulative floor space of the existing building or buildings changing use to a larger dwellinghouse or dwellinghouses under Class Q exceeds 465 square metres;	The building subject to the change of use has an existing floorspace of 208m², the proposal does not extend beyond this existing floorspace. The proposal is for a single 'larger' dwellinghouse. It is therefore under the threshold of 465m².
c) in the case of— i) a smaller dwellinghouse, within an established agricultural unit— (aa) the cumulative number of separate smaller dwellinghouses developed under Class Q exceeds 5; or (bb) the floor space of any one separate smaller dwellinghouse having a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses) of the Schedule to the Use Classes Order exceeds 100 square metres;	The proposal is for a large dwelling, this criterion therefore does not apply.
d) the development under Class Q (together with any previous development under Class Q) within an established agricultural unit would result in either or both of the following— i) a larger dwellinghouse or larger dwellinghouses having more than 465 square metres of floor space having a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses) of the Schedule to the Use Classes Order;	The proposal results in a single larger dwelling house of 208m² below the identified threshold of 465m².

ii) the cumulative number of separate dwellinghouses having a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses) of the Schedule to the Use Classes Order exceeding 5;	
e) the site is occupied under an agricultural tenancy, unless the express consent of both the landlord and the tenant has been obtained.	There is no agricultural tenancy.
f) less than 1 year before the date development begins— i) an agricultural tenancy over the site has been terminated, and ii) the termination was for the purpose of carrying out development under Class Q, unless both the landlord and the tenant have agreed in writing that the site is no longer required for agricultural use	N/A
g) development under Class A(a) or Class B(a) of Part 6 of this Schedule (agricultural buildings and operations) has been carried out on the established agricultural unit— i) since 20th March 2013; or ii) where development under Class Q begins after 20th March 2023, during the period which is 10 years before the date development under Class Q begins;	N/A
h) the development would result in the external dimensions of the building extending beyond the external dimensions of the existing building at any given point;	The conversion is to be carried out within the existing confines of the building.
i) the development under Class Q(b) would consist of building operations other than— i) the installation or replacement of— (aa)windows, doors, roofs, or exterior walls, or (bb)water, drainage, electricity, gas or other services, to the extent reasonably necessary for the building to function as a dwellinghouse; and	Externally the conversion will only require the installation/replacement of doors and windows as the Structural Appraisal Report highlights that the existing building is structurally stable and robust and could continue to perform adequately following a change of use without the need for any significant strengthening or rehabilitation. The development would also require building operations to allow services necessary for the

ii) partial demolition to the extent reasonably necessary to carry out building operations allowed by paragraph Q.1(i)(i);	building to function as a dwellinghouse, as allowed by this criterion. The internal walls as part of the development proposal are not generally considered development. This criterion is considered further below.
j) the site is on article 2(3) land;	The site is not located on article 2(3) land.
k) the site is, or forms part of— i) a site of special scientific interest; ii) a safety hazard area; iii) a military explosives storage area;	None of these criteria apply to the site.
l) the site is, or contains, a scheduled monument; or	The site is not a scheduled monument.
m) the building is a listed building	The building is not listed.

In respect of criterion i), considered briefly above, the Planning Practice Guidance highlights the following:

> *The right assumes that the agricultural building is capable of functioning as a dwelling. The right permits building operations which are reasonably necessary to convert the building, which may include those which would affect the external appearance of the building and would otherwise require planning permission. This includes the installation or replacement of windows, doors, roofs, exterior walls, water, drainage, electricity, gas or other services to the extent reasonably necessary for the building to function as a dwelling house; and partial demolition to the extent reasonably necessary to carry out these building operations. It is not the intention of the permitted development right to allow rebuilding work which would go beyond what is reasonably necessary for the conversion of the building to residential use. Therefore, it is only where the existing building is already suitable for conversion to residential use that the building would be considered to have the permitted development right.*
>
> *For a discussion of the difference between conversions and rebuilding, see for instance the case of Hibbitt and another v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (1) and Rushcliffe Borough Council (2) [2016] EWHC 2853 (Admin).*
>
> *Internal works are not generally development. For the building to function as a dwelling it may be appropriate to undertake internal structural works, including to allow for a floor, the insertion of a mezzanine or upper floors within the overall residential floor space permitted, or internal walls, which are not prohibited by Class Q.'*

The previous prior notification (referred to in the planning history section above) was refused against this test. The decision notice highlights that the *'likely works required to convert the building will go beyond that deemed reasonably necessary by Class Q. For example, the introduction of new structural elements, such as a whole new first floor and staircase'*.

However, since this refusal, the Planning Practice Guidance has been updated and it is now clear that the addition of a floor is not prohibited. The proposal is also accompanied by a Structural Report which is considered further above but concludes that the building is structurally sound and capable of conversion. The proposed works do not extend beyond those that are reasonably necessary for the building for the conversion of the building to residential use, and only include the addition of minimal doors and windows, with the main light being achieved where there is already and existing opening.

In respect of this issue, reference is made to the appeal at Ash Tree Farm, Lambert Bank, Gedney Hill, Lincolnshire (APP/A2525/W/17/3167955) which also falls within South Holland District. This is for a similar building and for a similar proposal to that now proposed, although greater interventions to enable to change of use were proposed. The appeal decision is enclosed but the Inspector highlights the following:

> *6. With regard to the appeal building, taking into account its relative age, method of construction and condition as I observed it, it is structurally sound. There would likely be areas of the wall cladding that would require opening up to provide for windows and doors but this is explicitly mentioned as being an acceptable type of work by Class Q. Other works proposed could be described as substantial, but I cannot see any part which could be legitimately argued as being a new structural element. Further, the works would most likely be within the existing structure and attached to or incorporating the existing roof and wall coverings. The stanchions, the roof supports, the floor and the cladding would all form integral elements of what would eventually become the dwelling.*
>
> *7. Class Q does not place a ceiling on the amount of building works that it allows and on the basis of the evidence before me and my findings, and whilst there may be a lot of it required, insulation works would be necessary to make a thin metal profile sheet wall able to function as a wall that would be acceptable around a dwelling....*
>
> *9.....Taking into account all of the above, I am satisfied that it has been adequately demonstrated in this particular case that the the proposed development would not consist of building operations more extensive than those specified, importantly, to the extent reasonably necessary for the building to function as a dwellinghouse.*

In line with the above, the works as proposed as part of this proposal are acceptable and fall within the provisions allowed.

Paragraph Q.2

Paragraph Q.2 places conditions upon such permitted development namely that before development commences, the developer shall apply to the LPA for determination as to whether the prior approval of the LPA will be required as to:

a) transport and highways impacts of the development;
b) noise impacts of the development;
c) contamination risks on the site;
d) flooding risks on the site;
e) whether the location or siting of the building makes it otherwise impractical or undesirable for the building to change from agricultural use to a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses) of the Schedule to the Use Classes Order; and
f) the design or external appearance of the building.

These are assessed in turn below.

Transport and Highways Impacts of the Development

The existing access to the site via Eaugate Road can be utilised without any changes to serve the dwelling. Appropriate parking provision for a single dwelling can be achieved on site.

The change of use from agricultural to residential will not result in any material highways or transportation issues, given the existing use on site and the traffic generation associated with an agricultural building. The change of use will not require any alteration to the local highway network and any traffic generation will not compromise highway safety.

Noise Impacts of the Development

The building does not lie within close proximity to any significant noise generating sources. There are number of residential properties, in proximity to the site, scattered along Eaugate Road. Therefore, the conversion of the building for residential use is more compatible with this, as opposed to continued agricultural use.

Contamination on the Site

The building has been in agricultural use, it has not been used for the storage of fuel, or any hazardous substances or materials and it has not been occupied by any hazardous processes. Accordingly, there is nothing reasonably to suggest that the site has a risk of contamination. It is noted that the Structural Survey highlights the possibility asbestos based materials given the age of the barn; however, this has not been confirmed. Whilst it is not considered that any contamination issues arise in this instance, a suitably worded condition would offer sufficient safeguard in relation to this consideration. This has been confirmed by many appeal Inspectors.

Flooding Risks on the Site

The site is located within Flood Zone 1, as ascertained by the Environment Agency's *Flood Map for Planning* Service, which is an area of lowest flooding risk. Therefore, it cannot be reasonably considered that the proposed site is at risk of flooding.

Whether the Location or Siting of the Building is Impractical or Undesirable

In respect of whether a location is suitable, the Planning Practice Guidance provides some useful guidance. It states:

> *The Permitted Development Right does not apply a test in relation to sustainability of location. This is deliberate as the right recognises that many agricultural buildings will not be in village settlements and may not be able to rely on public transport for their daily needs. Instead, the local planning authority can consider whether the location and siting of the building would make it unpractical or undesirable to change use to a house.*
> *(ref ID. 13-108-20150305)*
>
> *What is meant by impractical or undesirable for the change to residential use?*
> *Impractical or undesirable are not defined in the regulations, and the local planning authority should apply a reasonable ordinary dictionary meaning in making any judgment. Impractical reflects that the location and siting would "not be sensible or realistic", and undesirable reflects that it would be "harmful or objectionable".*
>
> *When considering whether it is appropriate for the change of use to take place in a particular location, a local planning authority should start from the premise that the permitted development rights grants planning permission, subject to the prior approval requirements. Than an agricultural building is in a*

location where the local planning authority would now usually grant planning permission for a new dwelling is not a sufficient reason for refusing prior approval.

There may, however, be circumstances where the impact cannot be mitigated. Therefore, when looking at location, local planning authorities may, for example, consider that because an agricultural building on the top of a hill with no road access, power source or other services its conversion is impractical. Additionally, the location of the building whose use would change may be undesirable if it is adjacent to other uses such as intensive poultry farming buildings, silage storage or buildings with dangerous machines or chemicals.'
(ref ID. 13-109-20150305)

In this context, the site is in a suitable location for the proposed change of use and there is no evidence that a residential (C3) use would be impractical or undesirable at the intended location. The site is adjacent to the existing residential properties on Eaugate Road and therefore the use of the site for residential is compatible with this. There is an existing access which connects the building to the public highway.

Design and External Appearance of the Building

As demonstrated above, and through the plans produced by Remway Design Ltd, the external appearance of the building will remain unaltered, other than the inclusion of doors and windows to create a habitable dwelling. The proposal will therefore retain its rural character.

In light of the above, there are no grounds to refuse the proposed change of use against the matters outlined in Class Q.2.

Other Considerations

Curtilage

Paragraph W highlights that for the purposes of Class Q, 'curtilage' means:

a) the piece of land, whether enclosed or unenclosed, immediately beside or around the agricultural building, closely associated with and serving the purposes of the agricultural building, or
b) an area of land immediately beside or around the agricultural building no larger than the land area occupied by the agricultural building,

The proposed curtilage is 207m2, as demonstrated on the plans that accompany this application. This is less than the footprint of the agricultural building to be converted (208m²) and therefore this criterion is met.

Summary

Overall, the proposed conversion falls within the scope of Class Q and is thus permitted development. This application provides the necessary information to justify that the proposal meets the tests of Class Q.1 of Part 3, Schedule 2 of the General Permitted Development Order and the Planning Practice Guidance. It has also been demonstrated that the proposal meets the requirements of Class Q2 and there are no grounds to refuse approval against those matters.

I trust the enclosed information is adequate for prompt registration of this application. However, please do not hesitate to contact me if you require any further information.

Yours faithfully,

[redacted]

Jenny Henderson MRTPI
For Ridge and Partners LLP

Enc:
Decision Notice H13-0446-15
Appeal Decision APP/A2525/W/17/3167955)

FILE COPY

Matrix Planning Ltd
36 Stamford Road
Market Deeping
Peterborough
Cambridgeshire
PE6 8AB

SOUTH HOLLAND DISTRICT COUNCIL

Council Offices
Priory Road
Spalding
Lincolnshire
PE11 2XE

Admin 01775 764723
DC Officers 01775 764703
facsimile 01775 762937

planningadvice@sholland.gov.uk
www.sholland.gov.uk

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990
PRIOR NOTIFICATION

Reference: H13-0446-15 **Received:** 15th May 2015

Applicant: Mr W and Mrs A Ravell
Woodgate Farms Ltd
Snake Hall
190 Eaugate Road
Moulton Chapel
Spalding
PE12 0XJ

Location: Agricultural Barn At Eaugate Road Moulton Eaugate Spalding

Description: Change of use of agricultural building into dwelling.

South Holland District Council hereby give notice that this application has been REFUSED for the above proposal for the following reason(s):

1 Change of use of a building and any land within its curtilage to a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouse) is only permitted development under Class Q(a) of Part 3 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 if the proposal complies with specific criteria. These include the curtilage being a piece of land, whether enclosed or unenclosed, immediately beside or around the agricultural building, closely associated with and serving the purposes of the agricultural building, or an area of land immediately beside or around the agricultural building no larger than the land area occupied by the agricultural building, whichever is the lesser. The curtilage shown on Drawing Number 2485-007 is significantly larger than is allowed under the provisions of Class Q(a) and, as such, the proposal cannot be considered permitted development.

2 Building operations reasonably necessary to convert the building to a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouse) are only permitted development under Class Q(b) of Part 3 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 if the proposal complies with specific criteria. In this instance it is considered that the likely works required to convert the building into a liveable dwelling will go beyond that deemed reasonably neccessary by Class Q. For example, the introduction of new structural elements, such as a whole new first floor and stair case. There is also considerable doubt as to whether the existing building is structurally sound to enable it to be converted without substantial alteration tantamount to forming a second structure within the building to make it liveable and to provide structural support, including for the new upper floor, and for insulation. As such, the proposal is

considered to be contrary to the provisions of Class Q(b) and, as such, cannot be considered permitted development.

Notes:

The determined plans are:
Dwg. nos. 2485-001, 2485-002, 2485-004, 2485-005, 2485-006, 2485-007 and 2485-008.

Paul Jackson
Planning Manager
South Holland District Council

19th June 2015

BUILDING REGULATIONS:
This decision refers only to planning permission as granted under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The works that you are proposing may also require Building Regulations and this planning permission does not give authority under Building Regulations to commence work. Please contact the Building Control section for further information on 01775 764557 or bcadmin@sholland.gov.uk

RIGHTS OF APPEAL

Appeals to the Secretary of State

If you are aggrieved by the decision of your Local Planning Authority to refuse permission for the proposed development or grant consent subject to conditions, then you can appeal to the Secretary of State under Section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 or Section 20 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Timescales for appealing

The deadlines for appeals are calculated from the **date of decision** and are as follows for the types of applications below:

12 Weeks	6 Months	8 Weeks
Householder Applications	Planning Permission	Consent to Display Adverts
Minor Commercial Development	Listed Building Consent	
Agricultural Determinations	Other Prior Approval Applications	
Householder Prior Approval Applications		

Enforcement Notices

If an enforcement notice was served prior to the planning application being determined then the deadline for appealing is 28 days from the date of the **planning refusal**

If an enforcement notice is served after the planning application is determined then the deadline for appealing is 28 days from the date of the **enforcement notice** OR **the timescales stated above for each application type** from the date of the planning refusal - whichever is sooner.

All appeals must be made using an Appeal Form which you can get from The Planning Inspectorate at Temple Quay House, 2 The Square, Bristol, BS1 6PN (tel: 0303 444 5000) or you can submit your appeal online at:

http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/planning/appeals/online/makeanappeal

The Secretary of State can allow a longer period for giving notice of an appeal but he will not normally be prepared to use this power unless there are special circumstances which excuse the delay in giving notice of appeal.

The Secretary of State need not consider an appeal if it seems to him that the Local Planning Authority could not have granted planning permission for the proposed development or could not have granted it without the conditions it imposed, having regard to the statutory requirements, to the provisions of the development order and to any directions given under the order. In practice

the Secretary of State does not refuse to consider appeals solely because the Local Planning Authroity based its decision on a direction given by him.

For detailed information on appeals, appeal types and guidance on the appeals process please visit:

http://www.planningportal.gov.uk/planning/appeals/planningappeals

Purchase Notices

If either the Local Planning Authority or the Secretary of State refuses permission to develop land or grant it subject to conditions the owner may claim that he can neither put the land to a reasonably beneficial use in its existing state nor can he render the land capable of a reasonably beneficial use by the carrying out of any development which has been or would be permitted.

In these circumstances the owner may serve a purchase notice on the Council in whose area the land is situated. This notice will require the Council to purchase his interest in the land in accordance with the provisions of the Part VI of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 or Section 32 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

Compensation

In certain circumstances compensation may be claimed from the Local Planning Authority if permission is refused or granted subject to conditions by the Secretary of State on appeal or on reference of the application to him.

These circumstances are set out in Section 114 and related provisions of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 and Section 27 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.

The Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 July 2017

by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 8 August 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/A2525/W/17/3167955
Ash Tree Farm, Lambert Bank, Gedney Hill, Lincolnshire PE12 0PR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant prior approval required under 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 and Mrs J Ling against the decision of South Holland District Council.
- The application Ref H05-0754-16, dated 26 July 2016, was refused by notice dated 26 September 2016.
- The development proposed is the change of use of agricultural building to a dwelling.

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and approval is granted under the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) for the change of use of agricultural building to a dwelling at Ash Tree Farm, Lambert Bank, Gedney Hill, Lincolnshire PE12 0PR in accordance with the terms of the application Ref H05-0754-16, dated 26 July 2016, subject to the following conditions:

    1) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with approved plan reference APP/LP01.

    2) Notwithstanding the approved plan, no development shall commence until details/samples of the design, finish and materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. Development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details/samples.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is whether the proposed development would consist of building operations other than the installation of windows, doors, roofs or exterior walls or water, drainage, electricity, gas or other services, to the extent reasonably necessary for the building to function as a dwellinghouse.

Reasons

3. The appeal building is a detached modern single storey agricultural storage building. It has a concrete pad which makes up the floor. Four pairs of upright steel stanchions and the same number of diagonal steels form the building's frame, supporting the walls and roof respectively. The walls are clad in thin

metal profile sheet which is bolted to the frame and the roof is fibre cement sheet. The roof is further supported by five full length additional steels, two either side and one at the apex. These are also attached to the remainder of the building's frame.

4. Paragraph 105 of Planning Practice Guidance refers to the assumption of Class Q that the agricultural building is capable of functioning as a dwelling. Recognising however that for this to be possible some building operations which would affect its external appearance, which would otherwise require planning permission, should be permitted. This may allow such things as replacement windows and doors, roofs, exterior walls and connection of utilities. Making it clear that such is to an extent reasonably necessary for the building to function as a dwelling house.

5. As well as this reasonably necessary to function test, it has been established that it is not the intention of Class Q to include the construction of new structural elements which is where the proverbial line in the sand appears to be drawn. Therefore it is only where the existing building is structurally strong enough to take the loading which comes with the external works to provide for residential use that the building would be considered to have the permitted development right.

6. With regard to the appeal building, taking into account its relative age, method of construction and condition as I observed it, it is structurally sound. There would likely be areas of the wall cladding that would require opening up to provide for windows and doors but this is explicitly mentioned as being an acceptable type of work by Class Q. Other works proposed could be described as substantial, but I cannot see any part which could be legitimately argued as being a new structural element. Further, the works would most likely be within the existing structure and attached to or incorporating the existing roof and wall coverings. The stanchions, the roof supports, the floor and the cladding would all form integral elements of what would eventually become the dwelling.

7. Class Q does not place a ceiling on the amount of building works that it allows and on the basis of the evidence before me and my findings, and whilst there may be a lot of it required, insulation works would be necessary to make a thin metal profile sheet wall able to function as a wall that would be acceptable around a dwelling.

Conditions

8. For certainty, I have set out the approved plans as there are two which are part of the appeal documentation. Both show the building and curtilage in the same place but the plan I have referred to above is a clearer version. It would not be appropriate to require that development is commenced within a specified period given the provisions of Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q, paragraph Q.2 (3) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). As it is not precise in the details that have been submitted, and to ensure an appropriate external appearance to the proposed development, I have set out that the design, finish and materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development should be agreed. Given the nature of this requirement, it would be necessary to be agreed prior to the commencement of development.

Conclusion

9. It is a matter of works that are undertaken to facilitate a function change that infers how far they are permitted to go under the auspices of Class Q and this will vary in each case. Further, Class Q does not rule out the change of use of non-traditional agricultural buildings. Taking into account all of the above, I am satisfied that it has been adequately demonstrated in this particular case that the the proposed development would not consist of building operations more extensive than those specified, importantly, to the extent reasonably necessary for the building to function as a dwellinghouse.

10. As such, and subject to the conditions set out above, the appeal is allowed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR