

APPLICATION FOR PRIOR NOTIFICATION – PART 3 CLASS Q CASE OFFICER REPORT

APPLICATION REFERENCE:	PL/2025/09092
APPLICATION TYPE:	Prior approval Part 3 Class Q: Agricultural buildings to dwellinghouses
SITE ADDRESS:	BARN ADJACENT TO MAYS FARM, 25 THE STREET, HULLAVINGTON, CHIPPENHAM, SN14 6DP
DEVELOPMENT DESCRIPTION:	Change of Use of Agricultural Building to a Dwellinghouse (Class C3) and Associated Works including a Single Storey Rear Extension.
RECOMMENDATION:	That Prior Approval is REQUIRED and GRANTED

SITE DESCRIPTION & PROPOSAL

The application is for the change of use of an agricultural building to a dwellinghouse, and associated works including a single storey rear extension at Barn Adjacent to Mays Farm, 25 The Street, Hullavington.

The application site is situated on the southern edge of Hullavington. Hullavington is designated as a Large Village within the WCS, and the application site sits outside of the defined settlement boundary.

Mays Farmhouse, and the barns and cowsheds to the north east of Mays Farmhouse are Grade II listed. These buildings are no longer in agricultural use and have been converted. Hullavington Airbase Conservation Area is situated approximately 130m to the south-east. There is a Right of Way approximately 110m to the south-east ref: HULL9.

RELEVANT LEGISLATION, POLICY AND GUIDANCE

This application is assessed under Article 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), which grants planning permission for certain types of development described in Schedule 2 of the Order. The grant of permission is subject to the limitations, conditions, and provisions set out within the relevant Classes of permitted development.

Under Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), certain changes of use and associated operations may be permitted subject to prior approval from the Local Planning Authority.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

Proposal / Summary
None for the application building, significant history elsewhere on land at Mays Farm.

CONSULTATIONS

Wiltshire Council Highways Officer: “The site is located outside of the settlement policy boundary, raising concerns with regards to the sustainability of the site for residential development due to the likely reliance upon the private car for any occupants and their visitors/lack of pedestrian facilities/safe cycling provision The proposal is therefore, contrary to Core Policies 60 and 61 of the Wiltshire Core Strategy and Section 9, of the National Planning Policy Framework 2024, which aim to reduce the need to travel particularly by private car and encourage the use of sustainable transport alternative in order to promote a sustainable pattern of development. However, I shall be guided by you on this sustainability issue and wish to advise with regard to highways in the instance that you would be minded to permit dwellings in this location.

The site is located with existing access onto The Street, a C classified section of public highway subject to a speed limit of 30mph. There are no proposals to alter the public highway through the proposed development.

The proposals are for a single 2-bed dwelling. It would appear from the plans submitted that vehicle parking is proposed close to the dwellings in the order of 2 spaces per dwelling, which accords with minimum parking requirements. The proposals also include space for cycle parking in the order of 2 spaces and an EV charging point, both of which are in accordance with required standards.

The proposals would not be deemed an intensification of the access over the existing use. Therefore, other than the sustainability issue highlighted above, it is considered that no objection be raised with regard to highways”

Wiltshire Council Public Protection Officer: “We have reviewed historic maps and found no flags for contamination.

Due to the proximity of residential dwellings, we propose the following condition:

- No construction or demolition work shall take place on Sundays or Public Holidays or outside the hours of 0800 to 18:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays.

Reason: Core policy 57, Ensuring high design and place shaping such that appropriate levels of amenity are achievable.”

Wiltshire Council Ecology Officer: “The ecology team do not comment on permitted development applications. However you can add the following informative onto any given permission.

There is a low risk that bats may occur at the development site. Many species of bat depend on buildings for roosting, with each having its own preferred type of roost. Most species roost in crevices such as under ridge tiles, behind roofing felt or in cavity walls and are therefore not often seen in the roof space. Bat roosts are protected all times by the Conservation of Habitats and Species 2017 (as amended) even when bats are temporarily absent because, being creatures of

habit, they usually return to the same roost site every year. Planning permission for development does not provide a defence against prosecution under this legislation or substitute for the need to obtain a bat licence if an offence is likely. If bats or evidence of bats is found during the works, the applicant is advised to stop work and follow advice from an independent ecologist or the applicant is advised to follow the advice of a professional ecologist or to contact Natural England's Batline through the internet."

ASSESSMENT

This application seeks prior approval under Class Q, which sets out the provisions, limitations and conditions for the permitted development right to change the use of "buildings on agricultural units and former agricultural buildings to dwellinghouses" as follows:

Q. 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 sub-paragraph (a) together with building operations reasonably necessary to convert the building referred to in sub-paragraph (a) to a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses) of that Schedule or to extend that building.

For the purposes of the PD right, the building's curtilage is defined by para. Q.3 as being:

(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,

whichever is the lesser;

Does the Proposal Qualify as Permitted Development?

Development under Class Q is subject to a number of conditions and limitations. Development is not permitted by this class if any of the specified restrictions apply. These are set out at Appendix

1. Subject to compliance with these criteria and any limitations or conditions specified within the Order, the proposed development may be considered permitted development.

Having completed the detailed checklist at Appendix 1, it is concluded that the proposed development qualifies as permitted development under Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), and the assessment may now proceed to consider whether prior approval is required by the LPA.

In addition to the limitations set out in Paragraph Q.1 of the GPDO, case law has established that certain proposals may exceed the scope of a “change of use” and instead constitute the construction of a new dwelling. In such instances, the development would fall outside the permitted development rights granted under Class Q. Therefore, it is necessary to assess whether the proposed works amount to a genuine “conversion” of the existing agricultural building, or whether they effectively result in a “replacement building.” The Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) provides helpful clarification on this point, emphasising that the structural integrity and extent of building operations must be considered when determining whether a proposal qualifies as a conversion under Class Q. More specifically the PPG¹ provides the following guidance in this regard:

“The right allows either the change of use (a), or the change of use together with reasonably necessary building operations (b). Building works are allowed under the right permitting agricultural buildings to change to residential use...

However, 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...

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 application is accompanied by a structural appraisal which states that the barn is in good condition and suitable for conversion. Minor repointing work is recommended, and stone at the top

¹ Planning Practice Guidance - Paragraph: 105 Reference ID: 13-105-20180615 (revision date 15/06/2018).

of the wall is recommended to be re-bedded. The roof structure comprising timber purlins, ridge beam, king post frames and A-frames are satisfactory. A new insulating slab is proposed to be added to the floor. The proposed corrugated roof sheets are proposed for replacement.

The proposed works are considered to fall within the scope of those permitted under Class Q of the GPDO. The development comprises alterations that are consistent with the conversion of the existing agricultural building to residential use, including the installation of new windows and doors, replacement roof covering, and internal works such as flooring. These works are to be carried out around the existing structural frame, which is to be retained.

The existing metal sheet roof covering is proposed to be replaced with standing seam sheeting. During the application process, a section drawing was requested to provide certainty on the extent of the roof alterations. The submitted section confirms that the existing roof structure will be retained, with only the covering being replaced. Given that the structural elements are safeguarded, the proposal is considered to fall within the scope of the approved works.

No structural alterations are proposed or appear necessary to facilitate the conversion, and the works are therefore regarded acceptable, not requiring separate planning permission. Therefore, the proposal does not exceed the limitations set out in paragraph Q.1 and is considered to constitute permitted development.

Is Prior Approval Required?

Where a proposal complies with all the provisions limitations set out under Class Q of Schedule 2, Part 3 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended), the developer must apply to the Local Planning Authority (LPA) for a determination as to whether prior approval is required for the specified impacts and, if so, whether it should be granted.

In respect of this proposal, the following considerations must be assessed as part of the prior approval process as set out by Q.2.

Where the development proposed is development under Class Q(a) together with development under Class Q(c), development is permitted subject to the condition that before beginning the development, the developer must apply to the local planning authority for a determination as to whether the prior approval of the authority 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 Schedule 1 to the Use Classes Order,*
- (f) the design or external appearance of the building, and*
- (g) the provision of adequate natural light in all habitable rooms of the dwellinghouses,*

and the provisions of paragraph W (prior approval) of this Part apply in relation to that application.

Where the development proposed includes development under Class Q(b), the developer must also apply, as part of the application under sub-paragraph (1) or (2) (as the case may be), for a determination as to whether the prior approval of the authority will be required as to the impact of the proposed extension on the amenity of any adjoining premises.

Paragraph W sets out a number of requirements for both the developer (in terms of the application submission) and the LPA (relating to consultations and advertisement of the application). Paragraph W(10) states that:

The local planning authority must, when determining an application—

(a) take into account any representations made to them as a result of any consultation under sub-paragraphs (5) or (6) and any notice given under sub-paragraph (8);

(b) have regard to the National Planning Policy Framework issued by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government in February 2019 July 2021, so far as relevant to the subject matter of the prior approval, as if the application were a planning application; and

(c) in relation to the contamination risks on the site—

- (i) determine whether, as a result of the proposed change of use, taking into account any proposed mitigation, the site will be contaminated land as described in Part 2A of the Environmental Protection Act 1990, and in doing so have regard to the Contaminated Land Statutory Guidance issued by the Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs in April 2012, and*
- (ii) if they determine that the site will be contaminated land, refuse to give prior approval*

Para. W(13) allows LPAs to grant prior approval unconditionally or subject to conditions reasonably related to the subject matter of the prior approval.

Transport and highways impacts of the development

Policy Context

Paragraph 115 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) emphasises the importance of promoting sustainable transport modes, ensuring safe and suitable access for all users, and designing development in accordance with national guidance. It also requires that any significant impacts on the transport network—whether in terms of capacity, congestion, or highway safety—can be mitigated in a cost-effective manner.

Paragraph 116 of the NPPF further clarifies that development should only be refused on highways grounds where there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or where the residual cumulative impacts on the road network, following mitigation, would be severe.

In terms of locational sustainability, the Local Planning Authority (LPA) is not able to assess whether the site's location in open countryside is sustainable in relation to access to services, employment, or facilities. This is not a consideration under the relevant prior approval provisions. Accordingly, the key matter for assessment is the impact of the proposal on highway safety, particularly in relation to the site access and the surrounding local highway network.

Assessment

The site benefits from an existing access onto The Street. There is sufficient parking at the application site including parking for vehicles, cycle parking and an EV charging point. The proposals are not considered to adversely intensify the existing access and the Council's Highway Engineer has no objection to the proposals (other than from a sustainability concern which is not applicable to this type of application).

Conclusion

Prior approval in relation to traffic matters is required, but the assessment made based on the detail provided indicates that this should be granted.

Noise impacts

Policy Context

Paragraph 187(e) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires that planning decisions contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by ensuring that new and existing development does not contribute to, or is not exposed to, unacceptable levels of noise pollution. This includes preventing development from being put at risk or adversely affected by such impacts.

Further to this, Paragraph 198(a) advises that new development should be appropriate for its location, taking into account the likely effects, including cumulative impacts, of pollution on health, living conditions, and the natural environment. It emphasises the need to mitigate potential adverse impacts arising from noise and to avoid noise that could result in significant harm to health or quality of life.

In the context of this proposal, the key consideration is whether the development would result in, or be exposed to, unacceptable levels of noise, and whether any such impacts can be appropriately mitigated to ensure a suitable living environment.

Assessment

There are no neighbouring uses likely to generate adverse noise impacts. Mays Farm has ceased operations and some of the other former agricultural buildings have been converted into residential dwellings. The application site is located close to other residential properties, and the Council's Public Protection Team has recommended a construction hours condition to safeguard residential amenity during the construction period. In order to minimise disturbance during the construction period, it is considered this condition is reasonable and necessary to apply.

Conclusion

It is not considered the proposal would cause, contribute or be exposed to unacceptable levels of noise pollution. Prior approval in relation to noise matters is therefore required and approved. In

the interests of neighbour amenity during the construction period, an hours of construction condition is considered appropriate.

Contamination risks

Policy Context

Paragraph 196 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out the expectations for planning decisions in relation to land quality and safety. It states that:

- a) Sites must be suitable for their proposed use, taking into account ground conditions and any risks arising from land instability or contamination. This includes risks from natural hazards or former activities such as mining, and any proposed mitigation measures, including land remediation and its potential environmental impacts.
- b) Following any necessary remediation, land should not be capable of being determined as contaminated under Part IIA of the Environmental Protection Act 1990.
- c) Adequate site investigation information, prepared by a competent person, must be available to inform the assessment of these risks.

In the context of this proposal, the Local Planning Authority must be satisfied that the site is not subject to contamination or instability that would render it unsuitable for the proposed use, and that any necessary investigations or mitigation measures have been appropriately considered.

Assessment

No contamination risks have been identified by the Public Protection Officer.

Conclusion

There are no contamination issues at the application site. Prior approval in relation to contamination is required and approved.

Flooding risks

Policy Context

The NPPF makes clear that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by steering development towards areas with the lowest risk, whether that risk is current or future. Where development is necessary in areas at risk, it must be demonstrated that the development can be made safe for its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere.

Assessment

The application site lies within Flood Zone 1, and the proposed conversion and small extension are not considered to raise any flood risk concerns.

Conclusion

Prior approval in relation to flood risk matters is required and approved, given that there are no flood risk concerns.

Location (impractical or undesirable)

Policy Context

The PPG advises that LPAs should apply a reasonable approach to the assessment of the location being “impractical or undesirable”². It goes on to advise that:

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.

Applications should only be refused if there may be circumstances where adverse impacts cannot be mitigated. Examples given by the PPG, when looking at location, include an agricultural building on the top of a hill with no road access, power source or other services being impractical and the location of a 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.

Assessment

The application site is located close to existing residential properties and adjoins the settlement boundary for Hullavington, which is classified as a Large Village in the WCS. There are no identified factors that would render the location impractical or undesirable for the proposed development.

Conclusion

The location is not considered to be impractical or undesirable. Prior approval in relation to location matters is required and approved.

Design or external appearance of the building

Policy Context

Paragraph 131 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) highlights that good design is a fundamental aspect of sustainable development, helping to create better places in which people live and work, and making development more acceptable to communities.

Relevant to this application type, Paragraph 135 sets out key principles to ensure that new development:

- a) Functions well and contributes positively to the overall quality of the area, not just in the short term but over the lifetime of the development;
- b) Is visually attractive through high-quality architecture, thoughtful layout, and effective landscaping;

² Planning Practice Guidance - Paragraph: 109 Reference ID: 13-109-20150305, Revision date: 05/03/2015.

- c) Is sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding built environment and landscape setting;
- d) Creates places that are safe, inclusive, and accessible, promoting health and well-being and providing a high standard of amenity for both existing and future users.

The NPPF also encourages Local Planning Authorities to make appropriate use of design tools and processes to assess and improve the quality of development proposals. This includes reference to national guidance such as the National Design Guide and assessment frameworks like Building for a Healthy Life, which support the delivery of well-designed, contextually appropriate development.

Assessment

The proposed conversion of the building retains the structure, while introducing a limited number of new openings to ensure adequate natural light. During the application process, the number of openings was reduced as the number of openings was initially considered excessive.

The existing metal sheeting on the roof would be replaced with standing seam sheeting. A modest rear extension is proposed that would be finished in vertical cedar boarding and set beneath the matching standing seam roof sheeting.

Overall, the scheme preserves much of the building's character, and it is considered to be a sensitive conversion appropriate in this context. It is considered to be acceptable in design terms.

Conclusion

Prior approval in relation to design matters is required and approved.

Provision of Natural Light

Policy Context

The prior approval matter to be assessed under para. Q.2(1)(g) relates to the provision of natural light into habitable rooms of the proposed dwelling.

For the purposes of the Part 3 (change of use) PD rights, para. X of the GPDO defines "habitable rooms" as:

...any rooms used or intended to be used for sleeping or living which are not solely used for cooking purposes, but does not include bath or toilet facilities, service rooms, corridors, laundry rooms, hallways or utility rooms.

Assessment

There is sufficient natural light provided to all rooms.

Conclusion

The proposed plans demonstrate adequate natural light. Prior approval in relation to natural light matters is required and approved.

Impact on amenity of adjoining premises

Policy Context

Condition Q.2. (3) requires that, where an extension is proposed under Class Q(b), prior approval must be sought to determine whether the extension would have an adverse impact on the amenity of any adjoining premises.

Assessment

The closest neighbouring properties are located to the to the west and south west. The rear extension is positioned on the south-west side of the existing building, and it is situated a considerable distance from neighbouring properties. Given its single storey form and separation to neighbouring properties, the extension is not considered to result in any loss of light, overbearing impact or harm to the amenity of any adjoining premises.

Conclusion

The proposed extension is appropriately located and a sufficient distance from neighbouring properties and would not cause harm to the amenity of any adjoining premises. Prior approval is therefore required and granted in this instance.

Other matters

The Council's Ecologist has recommended an informative is added onto any permission in relation to in the event bats were found at the site (although this is deemed to be low risk).

CONCLUSION

Prior Approval is Required and Approved

The proposed development has been assessed against the provisions, limitations, and conditions set out in Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended). Based on the submitted plans, supporting information, and the findings of this report, it is concluded that the proposal complies with the criteria for permitted development, and therefore falls within the scope of Class Q.

As such, the local planning authority has considered whether prior approval is required in relation to the relevant matters. In this case, it is concluded that prior approval is required; however sufficient information has been submitted and the application to allow the LPA to make an informed decision, taking into account representations received.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Prior Approval is required in relation to transport and highways impacts, noise impacts, contamination risks, flood risks, location and siting matters, design and external appearance matters, natural light matters and amenity of adjoining premises; and is approved with conditions:

1. The development shall be carried out in accordance with the following plans received by the Local Planning Authority:

Plans received 24/11/25:
Location Plan 001
Existing Site Plan 100
Existing Floor Plans + Elevations 105
Proposed Site Plan 120
Plan received 15/01/26:
Proposed Floor Plans + Elevations 125 C

REASON: For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning

2. No construction work shall take place on Sundays or Public Holidays or outside the hours of 0800 to 18:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00 to 13:00 on Saturdays.

Reason: Ensuring that appropriate levels of amenity are achievable during the construction process

Informatives to applicant:

1. There is a low risk that bats may occur at the development site. Many species of bat depend on buildings for roosting, with each having its own preferred type of roost. Most species roost in crevices such as under ridge tiles, behind roofing felt or in cavity walls and are therefore not often seen in the roof space. Bat roosts are protected all times by the Conservation of Habitats and Species 2017 (as amended) even when bats are temporarily absent because, being creatures of habit, they usually return to the same roost site every year. Planning permission for development does not provide a defence against prosecution under this legislation or substitute for the need to obtain a bat licence if an offence is likely. If bats or evidence of bats is found during the works, the applicant is advised to stop work and follow advice from an independent ecologist or the applicant is advised to follow the advice of a professional ecologist or to contact Natural England's Batline through the internet.
2. Any alterations to the approved plans, brought about by compliance with Building Regulations or any other reason must first be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority before commencement of work
3. The applicant should note that the grant of prior approval does not include any separate permission which may be needed to erect a structure in the vicinity of a public sewer. Such permission should be sought direct from Thames Water Utilities Ltd / Wessex Water Services Ltd. Buildings are not normally allowed within 3.0 metres of a Public Sewer although this may vary depending on the size, depth, strategic importance, available access and the ground conditions appertaining to the sewer in question
4. The applicant is requested to note that this prior approval does not affect any private property rights and therefore does not authorise the carrying out of any work on land outside their control. If such works are required it will be necessary for the applicant to obtain the landowners consent before such works commence.

If you intend carrying out works in the vicinity of the site boundary, you are also advised that it may be expedient to seek your own advice with regard to the requirements of the Party Wall Act 1996

APPENDIX 1 – PERMITTED DEVELOPMENT CHECKLIST CLASS Q

Class Q – agricultural buildings to dwellinghouses

		Yes / No
Q.	Permitted Development Note: <i>If the answer is "Yes" to any, proceed to assessment under Q.1. If the answer is "No" to all, the proposal does not qualify as permitted development under this class.</i>	
(a)	Does the development consist of change of use of: (i) a building and any land within its curtilage from use as an agricultural building, 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)?	Yes
(b)	Does it include development referred to in sub-paragraph (a) together with the extension of the building referred to in sub-paragraph (a), or	Yes
(c)	Does it include development referred to in sub-paragraph (a) together with building operations reasonably necessary to convert the building referred to in sub-paragraph (a) to a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses) of that Schedule or to extend that building?	Yes
Q.1	Development is not permitted by Class Q if - Note: <i>If the answer to any of the questions below is "Yes", the proposed development would not constitute permitted development under this class</i>	
(a)	Was the site 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?	No
(b)	Is the site no longer part of an established agricultural unit and either: (i) Was not part of one on 24 July 2023, (ii) Has not been part of one for at least 10 years before development begins, or (iii) Has been used for any non-agricultural purpose since leaving the unit?	No
(c)	Does any proposed dwelling exceed 150 square metres in floor space?	No

(d)(i)	Would the total number of dwellings on the agricultural unit (including previous Class Q developments) exceed 10?	No
(d)(ii)	Would the total cumulative floor space of all dwellings on the unit exceed 1,000 square metres?	No
(e)	Is the site occupied under an agricultural tenancy without written consent from both landlord and tenant?	No
(f)	Was an agricultural tenancy terminated less than 1 year before development begins for the purpose of Class Q development, without written agreement that the site is no longer needed for agriculture?	No
(g)	Has development under Class A(a) or B(a) of Part 6 (agricultural buildings/operations) occurred on the unit within the last 10 years?	No
(h)	Would the development extend the building beyond its existing external dimensions, except for: (i) Extensions allowed under Q.1(i), or (ii) Protrusions up to 0.2m allowed under Q.1(j)(i)?	No
(i)	Would the proposed extension: (i) Have more than one storey? (ii) Be sited anywhere other than the rear? (iii) Extend more than 4m beyond the rear wall? (iv) Have eaves higher than the existing building? (v) Be taller than the highest part of the roof or 4m above ground? (vi) Extend beyond a side or principal elevation? (vii) Be sited on land not covered by a hard surface installed before 24 July 2023 or not in place for at least 10 years?	No
(j)	Would the building operations include anything other than: (i) Installation/replacement of windows, doors, roofs, exterior walls, or services, or (ii) Partial demolition reasonably necessary for those operations?	No
(k)	Is the site located on article 2(3) land (e.g., National Parks, AONBs, conservation areas)?	No
(l)	Is the site or any part of it: (i) A Site of Special Scientific Interest? (ii) A safety hazard area? (iii) A military explosives storage area?	No
(m)	Is the site or any part of it a scheduled monument?	No
(n)	Is the building a listed building?	No

(o)	Would the converted building (excluding extensions) fail to meet the nationally described space standard?	No
(p)	Does the building lack suitable existing access to a public highway?	No