

Meadow Farm Nursery, Woodgaston Lane, Hayling Island

Class Q(a)(ii) Application for Prior Approval
– Change of Use of Former Agricultural
Building to 2no Dwellings (C3 Use Class)



Planning Statement

JULY 2024

APPLICANTS: MEADOW FARM NURSERY

PREPARED BY: STEPHEN JUPP MRTPI, PO BOX 839, CHICHESTER ROAD, PO19 8XQ

Contents

1	INTRODUCTION	1
2	SITE CONTEXT	2
3	IS THE BUILDING CAPABLE OF BEING CONVERTED?	3
4	CLASS Q - ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT	5
	A. CLASS Q.1 REQUIREMENTS	5
	B. CLASS Q.2 CONDITIONS	10
	C. CLASS Q.3 INTERPRETATION	14
	D. PARAGRAPH W	14
5	CONCLUSIONS	15

Appendices

- 1 Letter dated 17th February 2023 from owners of Meadow Farm Nursery confirming no use of building on 20th March 2013 but that last use was agricultural

Schedule of Drawings

Drawing 1A	Location plan
Drawing 2A	Block plan
Drawing 5A	Existing floor plan
Drawing 6A	Proposed floor plan

1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Please find enclosed on behalf of my client, Meadow Farm Nursery, an application for Prior Approval of Proposed Change of Use of a former agricultural building to 2no dwellinghouses (Use Class C3), and for associated operational development, under Part 3, Class Q(a)(ii) of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) which was amended by Statutory Instrument 2024 No. 579 which came into effect on 21st May 2024.
- 1.2 A previous application [APP/23/00324] was refused prior approval on 20th June 2023 on the basis that the change of use of the building to 1No dwellinghouse would not meet the requirements of Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q, paragraph Q.1 (a) (ii). This resubmitted application has been made on the basis of that provision has been substantially changed through the aforementioned SI.
- 1.3 In accordance with the Fee Regulations, the fee, due to development being involved, in the amount of £96.00, based upon 2 no dwellings being created, will be paid by phone.
- 1.4 Part 3 changes of use includes Class Q which is now titled 'Buildings on agricultural units and former agricultural buildings to dwellinghouses'.
- 1.5 The amended Class Q states:

Class Q - Permitted development - Development consisting of –

- (a) a change of use of –**
 - (i) a building that is part of an established agricultural unit and any land within that building's curtilage, or**
 - (ii) a former agricultural building that was (but is no longer) part of an established agricultural unit and any land within that building's curtilage,****to a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses) of Schedule 1 to the Use Classes Order,**
 - (b) development referred to in sub-paragraph (a) together with the extension of the building referred to in sub-paragraph (a), or**
 - (c) development referred to in paragraph (a) together with building operations reasonably necessary to convert the building referred to in paragraph (a) to a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses) of that Schedule.**
- 1.6 The subject building was a former agricultural building that was, but is no longer, part of an established agricultural unit. Its use as a tea room was in my professional judgement ancillary of the agricultural unit and if not was a breach which was not lawful and therefore one reverts back to the

last lawful use of the building, namely agricultural.

- 1.7 More importantly whilst the previous version of Class Q specifically referred to the word 'use' that is no longer included. The subject building was constructed as an agricultural building on a former agricultural unit.
- 1.8 The application is therefore submitted as being for: Development consisting of — a change of use of a former agricultural building that was (but is no longer) part of an established agricultural unit and any land within that building's curtilage
- 1.9 The application is submitted under Q(a)(ii), namely for the change of use on the basis that external changes are not required. Accordingly building operations are NOT a consideration. On this basis the LPA CANNOT look at Q.1(i) [building operations] and Q.2(1)(f) [external appearance].

2.0 SITE CONTEXT

- 2.1 Meadow Farm Nursery was a grower/retail horticultural business offering a wide range of plants for sale to the general public. The nursery occupies a 2.25 acre site in Woodgaston Lane and was staffed by eight people including the owner partners. Since around 2000 it was managed by Dan Myatt, son of Catherine and Mike who developed the business over a 13 year period, from 1987. All plants for sale were grown on site, production being a key activity.
- 2.2 The subject building was identified by me in an appeal statement in respect of 02/56431/002 as being: Blockwork range of buildings – 25 x 6.5m, containing staff room, germination room, covered sales (till), 2 offices, 2 toilets and store. It was original constructed and used as an agricultural building.
- 2.3 It is accepted that between June 2013 and March 2020 the building was in use as a tea room. Such a use was considered to an ancillary use to the primary use of the land for agricultural purposes.
- 2.4 The agricultural use of the site ceased in December 2020.
- 2.5 The building subject to this application comprises the subject building which is located to the east of the large greenhouse and its access is at the southern edge of the former car park.
- 2.6 There will be a parking area to the north side. Private amenity space will also be provided to the front, south and rear.
- 2.7 The remainder of the nursery will remain as it is – currently empty.

3 IS THE BUILDING CAPABLE OF BEING CONVERTED?

- 3.1 Paragraph 105 of the PPG provides guidance on building operations reasonably necessary in a Class Q conversion. This confirms that 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. Therefore, it is only where the existing building is already suitable for conversion to residential use that it would be considered to have the permitted development right.
- 3.2 PPG paragraph 105 goes on to say that internal works are not generally development and for the building to function as a dwelling it may be appropriate to undertake structural works, including to allow for an upper floor, which are not prohibited by Class Q.
- 3.3 Based on this advice in the PPG, the design approach has been to adopt a non-invasive approach to the conversion of the building to the extent that no external changes are required and the only internal alterations are the alteration of existing, and erection of new, internal wall divisions.
- 3.4 In addition, a structural report has been prepared for this proposed conversion scheme. This report is provided as a separate document accompanying this application.
- 3.5 The Structural Engineer, Elise O'Donovan, makes the following observations:

Existing Building

The single storey building is in three distinct sections. The northern section was constructed in the 1980s and was refurbished in the 2000s. This is understood to be of timber frame construction. Whilst much of the structure is concealed, timber roof ties are exposed and suggest that the roof has adequate resistance against spread. This correlates with the fact that the ridge line displays minimal evidence of sagging. The roof is of slate tiles. There is a line of internal timber columns which support the roof at the point at which it changes from pitched to flat.

The middle section is structurally different but of a similar age. This is formed with blockwork walls and roundwood timber roof beams supporting timber purlins supporting corrugated roof sheeting. The roundwood timber beams are supported directly onto the blockwork walls and appear to be functioning adequately. Sprayed insulation has been retrospectively added to the underside of the corrugated roof. There are many internal blockwork walls which, in conjunction with the perimeter walls, provide lateral stability to the building.

The southerly section is the newest, is of timber frame construction and appears to be well constructed.

The building is founded on a concrete slab/raft which has performed adequately. There are no apparent problems associated with ground movement. It is noted that there are no significant trees in close proximity to the building.

I am of the view that the condition of the existing building is such that it is capable of functioning as a dwelling without the need for any rebuilding works.

Proposed Conversion

Referring to your drawings, all main structural elements of the building are to be retained as part of the conversion process. The proposed alterations comprise modest changes to internal walls and openings.

The proposed floor plan indicates new internal timber stud walls to provide separation between the Master Bedroom and En-suites. The buttressing effect to the rear wall will be maintained as existing block walls will be kept, with openings formed to provide a route to Bedroom 3. All openings within perimeter walls are unchanged.

It is understood that subject to normal overhaul, the external timber wall cladding and the corrugated roof sheeting would be retained.

Observations and Advice

The building is to good line and level and the overall structural performance of the building is satisfactory. The proposed conversion retains the existing structural form, and the proposed alterations have been carefully considered to ensure that they do not compromise the structural integrity of the building.

3.6 As the engineer concludes:

In conclusion, the building is performing adequately in its current form and is capable of functioning as a dwelling without any requirement for remedial works or additional structural elements. The works required are the minimum that are reasonably necessary for the building to function as a dwelling and are minor in their extent.

3.7 It is therefore plain beyond peradventure, that the expert advice is that the building is wholly capable of being converted to a dwelling, along the lines proposed.

4 CLASS Q – ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

CLASS Q1 REQUIREMENTS:

- 4.1 Class Q1 sets out a number of scenarios and thresholds (a) – (p) whereby development is not permitted under this Part.
- 4.2 In order to assure the Council that the proposal is permitted development in this context, I have assessed the proposal against all of these criteria.
- 4.3 In considering these criteria, I have had due regard to the latest version of Planning Policy Guidance that has been issued.
- 4.4 I consider each of the relevant criteria in turn below.
- 4.5 In this regard the GPDO provisions make clear that Development is not permitted if:

(a) in the case of a site that is part of an established agricultural unit, the site was not part of the established agricultural unit—

(i) on 24th July 2023, or

(ii) where the site became part of the established agricultural unit after 24th July 2023, for a period of at least 10 years before the date development under Class Q begins,

(b) in the case of a site that was (but is no longer) part of an established agricultural unit—

(i) the site was part of an established agricultural unit on 24th July 2023,

(ii) where the site ceased to be part of an established agricultural unit after 24th July 2023, the site has not been part of the established agricultural unit for a period of at least 10 years before the date development under Class Q begins, or

(iii) where ceasing to be part of an established agricultural unit, the site has been used for any non-agricultural purpose,

- 4.6 On 24th July 2023 the **site** was not part of any established agricultural unit since it had ceased trading in December 2020. Accordingly, Q1(a) does not apply. Instead one needs to consider Q1(b).

- 4.7 The use of the overall site as a horticultural nursery ceased in December 2020 due to the impact of COVID19.
- 4.8 As set out at Appendix 1 is a letter from the applicants, confirming that the subject building was taken out of agricultural use in October / November 2012 for refurbishment.
- 4.9 It is accepted that the subject building was in use as a tea room as part of nursery from the beginning of June 2013 until March 2020. If not considered to be ancillary to an agricultural use then when its use ceased in March 2020 its use would have reverted back to its lawful – agricultural – use.
- 4.10 Accordingly, it is clear that the 'site' satisfies Q.1 (b) (iii) in that it was a building in use before 20th March 2013 but not in use on that date a site that was (but is no longer) part of an established agricultural unit and where ceasing to be part of an established agricultural unit, the site has been NOT been used for any non-agricultural purpose,

(c) the floor space of any dwellinghouse developed under Class Q having a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses) of Schedule 1 to the Use Classes Order exceeds 150 sq m;

- 4.11 Whilst the cumulative floorspace of the existing building is 182.2 sq m, it is proposed to create 2no dwellings with floorspaces of 46.8 and 134 sq m. therefore the follow space of any dwelling will not exceed 150 sq m.
- 4.12 Accordingly, it is clear that the existing building satisfies Q1 (c).

(d) the development under Class Q, together with any previous development under Class Q, within the original limits of an established agricultural unit (see paragraph Q.3(2) of this Part) would result in –

- (i) the cumulative number of separate dwellinghouses having a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses) of Schedule 1 to the Use Classes Order exceeding 10;***
(ii) the cumulative floor space of dwellinghouses having a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses) of Schedule 1 to the Use Classes Order exceeding 1,000 sq m;

- 4.13 The proposal seeks to adapt the existing floorspace [182.2 sq m] within the agricultural building to create two dwellings. No other dwellinghouses have been permitted on this farm holding so the threshold of 10 separate dwellinghouses and 1,000 sq m for cumulative dwellinghouses would not be exceeded.
- 4.14 Accordingly, it is clear that the proposal satisfies Q1 (d).

- (e) The site is occupied under an agricultural tenancy, unless the express consent of both the landlord and the tenant has been obtained;**

4.15 The land in question is not occupied under an 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;

4.16 This is not applicable for the reasons set out in 4.15 above.

- (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 during the period which is 10 years before the date development under Class Q begins,**

4.17 No development has taken place under Class A(a) or Class B(a) of Part 6 of this Schedule (agricultural buildings and operations) has been carried out in the previous 10 years.

4.18 Accordingly, the proposal satisfies Q1 (g).

- (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, other than –**
(i) extension of the building allowed by paragraph Q.1(i);
(ii) protrusions of up to 0.2 metres to accommodate building operations allowed by Q.1(j)(i),

4.19 The proposed development relates only to the change of use of the existing floorspace of the building. The proposal does not seek to increase the external dimensions of the existing building. Q1(h) does not apply.

- (i) the development under Class Q(b) would result in an extension that—**
(i) has more than one storey,
(ii) is sited anywhere other than to the rear of the existing building,

- (iii) extends beyond the rear wall of the existing building by more than 4 metres,*
- (iv) has eaves the height of which exceed the height of the eaves of the existing building,*
- (v) is higher than whichever is the lower of— (aa) the highest part of the roof of the existing building, or (bb) a height of 4 metres above the ground,*
- (vi) extends beyond a wall that forms a side or principal elevation of the existing building, or*
- (vii) would be sited on land that, before the development under Class Q(b), is not covered by a hard surface that was provided on the land by virtue of any development, and—*
 - (aa) the hard surface was not provided on the land on or before 24th July 2023, or*
 - (bb) where the hard surface was provided on the land after 24th July 2023, the hard surface has not been situated on the land for a period of at least 10 years before the date development under Class Q(b) begins,*
- (vii) would be sited on land that, before the development under Class Q(b), is not covered by a hard surface that was provided on the land by virtue of any development, and—*
 - (aa) the hard surface was not provided on the land on or before 24th July 2023, or*
 - (bb) where the hard surface was provided on the land after 24th July 2023, the hard surface has not been situated on the land for a period of at least 10 years before the date development under Class Q(b) begins,*

4.20 The application has been submitted under Class Q(a) so this section is not relevant.

- (j) 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*
 - (ii) partial demolition to the extent reasonably necessary to carry out building operations allowed by paragraph Q.1(j)(i);*

4.21 The application has been submitted under Class Q(a) so this section is not relevant.

- 4.22 In any event, the proposed development does not include any changes to the external fabric of the building.
- 4.23 All existing external glass will be retained and left unaltered.
- 4.24 No intervention is proposed to the building.
- 4.25 No rebuilding is required and the works can be undertaken within the fabric of the existing structure.
- 4.26 No new structural elements are required – as confirmed by the structural engineer.
- 4.27 Therefore, the extent of the proposed development would sit within the parameters as set out above, being those reasonably necessary for the building to function as a dwellinghouse.
- 4.28 In summary, no rebuilding is necessary; and, no new structural elements are required. This is confirmed by the structural engineer as set out in his detailed report and as summarised in section 3 of this statement.
- 4.29 That said, as made clear at 4.21 this application has been submitted under Class Q(a) so this criterion is not a relevant consideration.

(k) The site is on article 2(3) land;

- 4.30 The site is not located on Article 2(3) land. It is not situated within any Conservation Area nor is it within the Chichester Harbour Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

(l) 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;***

- 4.31 The site is not located in a SSSI, safety hazard area or military explosives storage area.

(m) The site is, or contains, a scheduled monument;

- 4.32 The site does not contain any scheduled monuments.

(n) The building is a listed building.

- 4.33 The building is not listed, nor within the curtilage of a listed building.

(o) the existing building, excluding any proposed extension under Class Q(b) but including any proposed building operations under Class Q(c), would not be capable of complying with the nationally described space standard issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government on 27th March 2015⁶⁴ as read with the notes dated 19th May 2016 which apply to it,

- 4.34 The floor area to be converted to create the 1p 1bed unit is 46.8 sq m which above the minimum floorspace of 39 sq m; and the 5p 3bed unit has a GIA of 134 sq m which exceeds the minimum standard of 86 sq m, so criteria (o) is complied with

(p) the building does not have suitable existing access to a public highway.

- 4.35 The site has a good existing access to the public highway as it is the access historically used by the nursery.

CLASS Q.2 - CONDITIONS

- 4.36 Class Q.2 sets out conditions in respect of the prior approval procedure. It makes clear that Class Q(a) together with development under Class Q(c), development is permitted subject to the condition that before beginning the development, the developer shall apply to the local planning authority for a determination as to whether the prior approval of the authority will be required as to conditions (a) to (g) and that the provisions of paragraph W apply. However Q2(2) qualifies that for development under Class Q(a) only then subparagraph (f) does not apply.

- 4.37 As with Class Q.1 I have set out below an assessment of the proposals against those specific conditions that are relevant to a Class Q(a) development.

(a) Transport and highways impacts of the development

- 4.38 The proposal is for 1no one bed and 1no three bed roomed dwellings which will give rise to minimal additional traffic movements on this private road.
- 4.39 The existing access will be utilised and parking will be provided for three cars – 1 for the 1bed unit and 2 for the 3bed unit and it is also intended to provide a secure store for 2no cycles for each dwelling.

- 4.40 On the issue of sustainability, Government advice on the portal at Reference ID: 13-108-20150305 is relevant. 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 impractical or undesirable to change use to a house."

- 4.41 On this basis the issue of whether the site is in a sustainable location is irrelevant.

(b) Noise impacts of the development

- 4.42 The site is not located near any significant noise generating uses and as such the proposals would not be impacted upon in this respect.
- 4.43 The proposed development is well separated from surrounding uses. In any event any noise impacts in relation to residential accommodation on the site would be less than the existing agricultural activity. No remediation measures are proposed or required.

(c) Contamination risks on the site

- 4.44 For a considerable period of time the land has been used for agricultural purposes. This building has been used for general storage but not for storing chemicals. As such there is no record of any activities which are likely to have generated contamination. No remediation measures proposed or required.

(d) Flooding risks on the site

- 4.45 The application site does not lie within Flood Zones 2/3.
- 4.46 For these reasons the scheme is acceptable on flood risk grounds.

(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

- 4.47 There are no practical issues of technical constraints which would prevent

the proposed change of use, and the development would not have any detrimental impact as evidenced above. Consequently, this is not considered to be an issue.

- 4.48 Government advice on the portal at Reference ID: 13-109-20150305 is also relevant to this issue.

- 4.49 It states: ***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 right grants planning permission, subject to the prior approval requirements. That an agricultural building is in a location where the local planning authority would not normally 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.

When a local authority considers location and siting it should not therefore be applying tests from the National Planning Policy Framework except to the extent these are relevant to the subject matter of the prior approval. So, for example, factors such as whether the property is for a rural worker, or whether the design is of exceptional quality or innovative, are unlikely to be relevant.

- 4.50 Two issues arise here. First, is the location sensible or realistic? Second, would the siting be harmful or objectionable?

- 4.51 Importantly, consideration of both questions MUST start from the premise that permitted development rights grant planning permission - therefore just because a building is not in a location where the council would normally grant permission is not a sufficient reason to refuse prior approval.

- 4.52 Consideration of these two issues relates to circumstances where the impact cannot be mitigated.

- 4.53 The examples given are very specific. For example, a building on a hilltop with no road or services, or, if the residential use would be adjacent to intensive poultry farming, silage storage or buildings with dangerous machines or chemicals.
- 4.54 In this regard it is clear that the siting **IS** sensible. There is a road access and services such as water and electric exist.
- 4.55 Secondly, there are no intensive agricultural practices being undertaken on the land – the former nursery has now closed and will not reopen.
- 4.56 Moreover, there is no silage nearby and no dangerous machines or chemicals.
- 4.57 It is therefore clear that the proposed residential use is neither impractical or undesirable.
- 4.58 The site does, however, lie within the catchment area of the Chichester and Langstone Harbour Special Protection Areas (SPAs) and as such the creation of one additional dwelling would be likely to have a cumulatively significant effect on that area of nature conservation.
- 4.59 In accordance with the requirements of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010; and the National Planning Policy Framework, provision should be made for the mitigation of these impacts.
- 4.60 Given the scale of the proposal it is established practice of the Council to accept a financial contribution towards putting in place a scheme of access management measures.
- 4.61 The applicant is agreeable to such payment and this will be done by way of a Unilateral Undertaking.

(f) The design or external appearance of the building

- 4.62 This is not relevant for a Class Q(a) development as made clear above.
- 4.63 In any event, for the record, the design and external appearance of the proposed building is sympathetic to its surroundings.

(g) the provision of adequate natural light in all habitable rooms of the dwellinghouses

- 4.64 The proposed accommodation is clearly set out on drawing 6A. All of the habitable rooms have a minimum of one window and the size of the windows, as set out on drawing 6A, are more than sufficient to ensure that all of the habitable rooms have sufficient natural light.

- 4.65 Finally, the national prescribed space standards at 10i requires a minimum floor to ceiling height of 2.3m for at least 75% of the Gross Internal Area. As indicated on Drawing 6 the proportion of GIA exceeding 2.3m in height will be 100% - far in excess of the 75% minimum requirement.

CLASS Q.3 - INTERPRETATION

- 4.66 Class Q.3 (1) defines 'curtilage' for the purposes of Class Q only as being:
- (a) the piece of land, whether enclosed or unenclosed, immediately beside on an established agricultural unit or former agricultural building (as the case may be), closely associated with and serving the purpose of that building, and
 - (b) an area of land immediately beside or around the building on an established agricultural unit or former agricultural building (as the case may be), no larger than the land area occupied by that building,
- 4.67 In this case the lesser area is the footprint of that part of the building to which the change of use applies has been measured. In this case for Unit 1 it is 52.2 sq m and for Unit 2 it is 145.3 sq m.
- 4.68 In this regard the red line indicates the application site and has to include land forming the access to and the parking area. The extent of the actual curtilage [garden] to the dwellings is indicated on Drawing 2A – Block Plan – by cross hatching and the text confirms that the curtilage of each dwelling does not exceed the footprint of the building.
- 4.69 Compliance with the definition of 'curtilage' in Paragraph X is therefore achieved.

PARAGRAPH W

- 4.70 Paragraph W(2)(a) requires the application to be submitted by a statement specifying the net increase in dwellinghouses proposed by the development.
- 4.71 In this case I can confirm that the net increase in dwellinghouses, as set out in W(2)(ba) is 2.
- 4.72 Paragraph W(2)(bb) requires the application to be submitted by a statement specifying the number of dwellinghouses proposed; the number of larger dwellinghouses proposed; and, whether previous development has taken place under Class Q within the established agricultural unit and, if so, the number of smaller and larger dwellinghouses developed under Class Q.
- 4.73 In this case I can confirm that the number of dwellinghouses proposed is 2; and that no previous development has taken place under Class Q.

- 4.74 Paragraph W(2)(bc) requires the application to be accompanied with a floor plan indicating the total floor space in square metres; the dimensions and proposed use of each room; and, showing the sizes of windows, doors and walls. Drawing 6 is drawn to scale and this drawing provides all of the required details.

5 CONCLUSIONS

- 5.1 The detailed assessment which I have undertaken above confirms that the proposed development under **Class Q(a)** complies with the criteria and conditions as set out in **Q.1 and Q.2** of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, as amended.
- 5.2 It is stated Government policy that LPAs should take a pro-active approach to such applications in order to foster economic growth and to meet the needs of an acute national housing shortage.
- 5.3 The structural engineer concludes her report by stating:
- Whilst involving improvement works the structural fabric of this building is in my opinion adequate without alteration and is wholly capable of functioning as a dwelling in the manner proposed. From a structural viewpoint the proposed conversion is entirely reasonable and feasible for this building given that other aspects of the Building Regulations can be satisfied without any need for a rebuild.*
- 5.4 On this basis it is clear that the existing structure and the proposed manner of its conversion, satisfy the requirements of Class Q(a).
- 5.5 I therefore trust that officers will adopt a pro-active approach to this notification which, I submit, is reasonable on all counts and for the detailed reasons set out above fully complies with the provisions of Class Q.

APPENDIX 1

EMAIL FROM
APPLICANTS
CONFIRMING HISTORIC
AND CURRENT USE FOR
AGRICULTURAL
PURPOSES

