

Planning Statement

Prior Notification for the change of use of one agricultural building to create three dwellinghouses under Class Q of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended), at Frog Hall Farm, Crow Lane, Sheepy Magna

19th May 2025 – David Harris-Watkins PgD MRICS

Contents

1.0	Introduction	2
2.0	The Site and Surrounding Area	2
3.0	Relevant Planning History	2
4.0	The Reasons for Refusal of 24/01121/P3CQ.....	2
4.1	Reason for Refusal 1	3
4.1.1	Structural Capability of Conversion	3
4.1.2	Conversion vs Rebuild	3
4.1.3	Consistency in Decision Making	6
4.2	Reason for Refusal 2 – Demolition.....	9
5.0	Relevant Legislation and Planning Policy	9
5.1	Town and Country Planning Order (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended)	9
7.0	Conclusion	13
8.0	Reference List/Appendices	14
8.1	Relevant Case Law	14
8.2	Relevant Planning Decisions within Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council.....	14

PLANNING STATEMENT

1.0 Introduction

- This statement has been produced by Andrew Large Surveyors Ltd on behalf of the applicant with regards to the Prior Notification for the change of use of one agricultural building to create three dwellinghouses under Class Q of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended), at Frog Hall Farm, Crow Lane, Sheepy Magna.

This application is made under the transitional arrangement of Class Q with applications submitted prior to the end of 20th May 2025¹ being determined on the basis of legislation prior to the 30th April 2024 amendments.

- This application essentially constitutes a partial resubmission of **24/01121/P3CQ**, which was refused by the planning authority, however with amended plans, documents and additional information in order to address the reasons for refusal. Agricultural Building 02 is now removed from the application and the prior notification relates solely to Agricultural Building 01.

24/01121/P3CQ was a resubmission of the identical application **22/00137/P3CQ**, which was given prior approval by the LPA.

2.0 The Site and Surrounding Area

- The subject building comprises a steel portal framed agricultural building. Its walls comprise concrete blocks over clad with vertical timber boarding to three elevations, with the fourth elevation having high level doors. The roof is fibre cement corrugated sheeting. The building has in part a concrete floor.

Frog Hall Farm comprises of Frog Hall Farmhouse as well as a range of agricultural buildings of different styles. The building subject of this prior notification application is located on the north extremity of the cluster of buildings. Frog Hall is accessed from Crow Lane. Crow Lane is an adopted but unclassified road.

- The nearest settlements to Frog Hall Farm are the small hamlet of Pinwall to the south, however the larger conurbations of Sheepy Magna and Atherstone are located to the east and south respectively.

3.0 Relevant Planning History

- **24/01121/P3CQ** | Notification to determine if Prior Approval is required for the change of use of two agricultural buildings to create five smaller dwellinghouses - **Refused**
- **22/00137/P3CQ** | Change of use of two agricultural building to create five dwellinghouses along with proposed building operations – **Approved**

4.0 The Reasons for Refusal of 24/01121/P3CQ

The following reasons for refusal were given the decision 24/01121/P3CQ. Agricultural Building 02 is now omitted from the application. Amended plans, documents and additional information is

¹ The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development etc.) (England) (Amendment) Order 2024: Article 10: Transition Provision

submitted as part of this application and as such each point of refusal will be responded to in turn. The reasons for refusal are highlighted in blue italic text.

4.1 Reason for Refusal 1

1 - The Applicant has failed to demonstrate that the proposal benefits from permitted development rights and that the proposal represents a conversion of the two structures rather than a rebuild. Based on the submitted details, the Applicant has failed to demonstrate that the two structures can be appropriately converted into a residential use. Consequently, it is the opinion of the Local Planning Authority that the works required to alter the structures into residential uses would be of such magnitude that they would go a very long way beyond what might sensibly or reasonably be described as a conversion. Therefore, the proposal does not comply with the limitations of Class Q of Part 3 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (pre-21 May 2024).

Reason for refusal 1 constitutes two elements, one in relation to structural capability of the barns to be converted without structural works going beyond the allowance of the legislation, and a second element in relation to whether the works to convert the building would constitute a conversion or a rebuild.

4.1.1 Structural Capability of Conversion

The officers' report for 24/01121/P3CQ highlighted concerns with the submitted structural reports for that application:

Whilst it is acknowledged that prior approval has previously been granted for these proposed works via application 22/00137/P3CQ, it is not considered that this previous prior approval appropriately justifies the approval of this application in light of the issues that have been identified within the submission.

Further investigations have been made by BTA Structural Engineers in March 2025 following 24/01121/P3CQ, including a measured survey and structural analysis (calculations). Their reports have been submitted alongside this application. The report covers both buildings forming part of 24/01121/P3CQ, please not only 'Barn 1' in the report as is relevant to this application. 'Barn 1' is Agricultural Building 01 noted in the plans and subject of this report and application. The structural surveyors report concludes:

"These works to both barns can be done with the existing structural elements in place, and without significant reconstruction of these elements. We therefore conclude that the two barns are in good structural condition and capable of conversion."

"The calculations show that the structures can safely carry the additional loads referred to above, and that the frames are stable under wind loading"

The proposal therefore can now be assessed positively against the structural based criteria relevant to the GDPO.

4.1.2 Conversion vs Rebuild

Below is a summary of the existing materials and finishes compared with the proposed:

Agricultural Building 1 > Dwellings 01, 02 and 03

Structural Element	Existing	Proposed	Acceptability
Walls	Enclosed on 3 sides with concrete blocks with timber cladding above. Open elevation has high level doors.	All existing wall materials are retained. Open elevations are the locations of glazing sections.	Existing materials are retained – Constituting a conversion
Roof	Corrugated fiber cement sheeting	Retained, all works are internal of existing sheeting	Existing materials are retained – Constituting a conversion
Floor	Concrete slab with a section of compacted hardcore overlaid with gravel	Concrete slab retained. Graveled section to be laid with concrete slab however substrate is already in situ and will be retained	Existing materials are retained – Constituting a conversion
Windows and Doors	High level doors to main opening	The introduction of windows and doors in order for the building to operate as a dwelling. A reduced number of openings are provided in the north, east and south elevations from the previous application.	Minimal windows and doors proposed, with glazing sections located in place of open sections of original barn in order to retain its original agrarian character.
New elements:		First floor Internal Walls (non-load bearing)	Allowed as noted below:

Planning Practice Guidance states with regards to **What works are permitted under the Class Q permitted development right for change of use from an agricultural building to residential use?** (underlining emphasis added by the author)

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.

Paragraph: 105 Reference ID: 13-105-20180615

The same paragraph also references more generally what constitutes a conversion versus a rebuild:

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.

The proposed development does not include the removal of any of the existing materials, the building is also enclosed on three sides, with only one elevation that is open where glazing sections will help retain the original form of the building. As no materials will be removed and replaced, including foundations, floor slab, steel frame, existing wall and roof cladding, then the development cannot be considered 'rebuilding' as no element is being rebuilt. The proposed works therefore constitutes a conversion as the works are primarily to facilitate the building to operate as a dwelling.

In the previous application, the officers report as well as Planning Practice Guidance make reference to the **Hibbit Case**². In the Hibbit case the building subject of the litigation was open on 3 sides and comprised largely a skeletal frame, with the rebuilding of all 4 external walls being required to facilitate the development. This is not the case with the building subject of this application, where Agricultural Building 01 is enclosed on 3 sides with high level doors on the 'open' elevation, providing an existing sense of enclosure. Existing wall materials are also retained.

Within the planning officers report for 24/01121/P3CQ they state that the works to convert the building "go beyond that which is reasonable and necessary for the building to function as a dwellinghouse." and in reason for refusal 1 state *"it is the opinion of the Local Planning Authority that the works required to alter the structures into residential uses would be of such magnitude that they would go a very long way beyond what might sensibly or reasonably be described as a conversion"*. However, this is not provided with any objective analysis of the works required for the construction of the development, nor consideration of the principles within the Hibbit Case.

The Hibbit Case in reference to PPG wording *"reasonably necessary for the conversion of the building to residential use"*, states the following (underlining as per the judgement and not by the author):

"there are the words "capable of functioning as a dwelling" in paragraph 105 NPPG to consider. In paragraph [10] of the Inspectors decision she found as a fact that the building would not be capable of functioning as a dwelling without the proposed works and she then went on to assess the extent of those works before concluding that they "... went well beyond what could reasonably be described as conversion". The words in Paragraph [105] NPPG are not easy to construe. On one level any pre-existing structure is "capable" of functioning as a dwelling once the development works have been completed. In this sense capability is no more than another way of expressing potential and any building, howsoever skeletal, has that potential. But if one construes the concept differently as implying that the "agricultural building" must possess some inherent or pre-existing feature(s) which are redolent of a dwelling this might impose an unnaturally restrictive construction on the scope of the permitted development. A traditional wooden barn which is converted into a dwelling might, objectively, be not much more than four outer walls and a roof supported by wooden beams and it might in that state be a long way from being a dwelling. Is it nonetheless "capable" of functioning as a dwelling? And if so what is it about the structure that makes it so? If the answer to the question is no more than as a structure it is sufficiently strong to bear the load of the proposed development works then the barn in the present case met that requirement. The Inspector in her decision seemed to equate the concept of capability in Paragraph [105] with the difference between conversion and rebuild; but in my view that flows logically from the reference to "convert" in Q, and not from the NPPG. Ultimately I do not gain very much from these particular words in Paragraph [105]."

The works required to convert the building subject of this application are primarily for the installation of windows and doors, insulation, damp proofing and construction of timber stud walling, works that

² Hibbit & Another v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and Rushcliffe Borough Council [2016] EWHC 2852

would be paramount to nearly all conversions. It would not be unreasonable to say stereotypically a 'barn conversion' is thought of as a red brick building with a pitched tiled roof, however the **Town and Country Planning (GDPO) 2015 (as amended)** does not discriminate between modern and traditional barn conversions. As such prejudice against steel portal frame conversions should not be held by the deciding authority. The proposed works include the retention of all existing roof and wall materials, includes the addition of no structural strengthening works to the existing frame, and the works required are those required for nearly all conversions, as outlined above. As such in consideration of the relevant Town and Country Planning (GDPO) 2015 (as amended) and the Hibbit Case, the proposed development cannot be considered a rebuild and is a conversion.

4.1.3 Consistency in Decision Making

There is a requirement for consistency in the decision process, an element of this is that previous decisions are a material consideration. Notable cases emphasising this point include the following:

- **North Wiltshire District Council v Secretary of State for the Environment (1993) 65 P & CR 137:** *"One important reason why previous decisions are capable of being material is that like cases should be decided in a like manner so that there is consistency [...]. Consistency is self-evidently important to both developers and development control authorities. But it is also important for the purpose of securing public confidence in the operation of the development control system."*
- **R (Midcounties Co-Operative Limited) v Forest of Dean District Council [2017] EWHC 2050:** *"Although the authorities demonstrate that a local planning authority is not bound by its earlier decision, nevertheless it is required to have regard to the importance of consistency in decision-making."*

For an application for a prior notification made under the same legislation for the same proposal at the same site, it would not be unreasonable to expect a similar approach in terms of the assessment of the application. 22/00137/P3CQ was approved at the application site, then 24/01121/P3CQ was refused with the same plans submitted. This report and the amended plans now submitted address the concerns raised in the officer's report for 24/01121/P3CQ.

The LPA have also determined a range of applications also under The Town and Country Planning (GDPO) 2015 (as amended) that are of relevance to the current application, particularly in terms of construction and what constitutes a conversion v rebuild. A selection of these is below:

- **25/00198/P3CQ|Notification to determine if Prior Approval is required for the change of use of two agricultural buildings to three dwellinghouses (Class C3) 39 Main Road Ratcliffe Culey Atherstone Leicestershire CV9 3NY - Approved**
 - 'Building 3' in 25/00198/P3CQ was an agricultural building enclosed on three sides with one open elevation. The walls were constructed of concrete panel walls with spaced timber boarding, comparable to the building subject of this application and was approved by the LPA.
 - Works to Building 3 also included replacing the roof sheeting, which is not proposed in the current application. The application though supported by a Structural Survey does not include structural calculations. On this basis the current application assesses more positively in terms of structural capability and has a stronger argument the development comprises a conversion and not a rebuild.
 - The officers report for 25/00198/P3CQ states:

Building 3 is a steel portal frame, formed of 6 bays, one of which is proposed to be removed to improve the amenity impact on building 4. All walls are pre-

cast concrete panels, with timber cladding to eaves level. The southwest elevation is open. No structural elements are required for conversion; however, the roof is to be replaced with a similar lightweight sheeting. The walls would be clad with brick slips. Overall, it is considered that the building operations associated with the proposed conversion are reasonably necessary to convert the building to a dwelling.

- **24/01162/P3CQ|Notification to determine if Prior Approval is required for the change of use of an agricultural building to a dwellinghouse (Class C3) |Glebe Farm Barn Orton Lane Sheepy Magna Atherstone Leicestershire CV9 3NJ – Approved**
 - The existing structures subject of this approval were steel portal framed, with concrete blockwork to “mid-height”, with fibre cement corrugated sheets above. The roof was also fibre cement corrugated sheeting. The works necessary for the existing building to function as a dwelling also include demolition more than half of the existing building(s).
 - The application was supported by a structural survey but with no structural calculations.
 - The development is comparable in terms of the existing materials, and also the level of enclosure of the existing building. Of the two structure that made up the conversion, one was enclosed on three sides with one open elevation (southwest), whilst the other had 2 out of 3 bays open on its southeast elevation.
- **24/01016/P3CQ|Conversion of existing barn to 2 residential units|45 Bagworth Road Newbold Heath Newbold Verdon Leicester Leicestershire LE9 9NB – Approved**
 - Building enclosed on 3 sides with one side with double doors covering the whole span. The building also had a hardcore floor.
 - The building subject of this application has a concrete floor in part, with hardcore and gravel to the remaining, being superior to the approved 24/01016/P3CQ. Additional internal works in battening out the internal of the cladding and stud work would be required for the metal sheeting cladding rather than that required for the concrete block walls of the building subject of this application.
- **23/01180/P3CQ|Proposed conversion of barn to dwellinghouse (C3) | Little Mulberry Upton Lane Stoke Golding Nuneaton Leicestershire CV13 6EU – Approved**
 - Dutch barn with lean to clad in corrugated sheeting with one entirely open elevation, no existing doors. The floor had a concrete floor slab. Works included construction of internal walls which were load bearing for new first floor.



- **23/01207/P3CQ| Conversion of agricultural building to dwellinghouse | Ratcliffe House Farm
Ratcliffe House Lane Ratcliffe Culey Atherstone Leicestershire CV9 3LZ**
 - A steel portal frame building with concrete blocks walls overclad with Yorkshire boarding, and a fibre cement roof and a concrete floor. The building was enclosed on 3 sides with one open side, measuring 30.8m in length.
 - In reference to assessment of whether the works required were reasonably necessary to function as a dwellinghouse, the officers report stated only the following: *“The scheme only consists of the building operations identified within Q.1(i).”*



The works required to convert the building subject of this application, and all of the above are primarily for the installation of windows and doors, insulation, damp proofing and construction of timber stud walling. All of the above also have comparable level of enclosure or less than the building at Frog Hall Farm. Some do and some do not have an existing concrete floor, whilst the existing building subject of this application has a concrete floor in part. The majority of the above applications are not supported by structural calculations demonstrating their capability to be converted without significant structural additions.

The below is the building subject of the application in comparison to the above approved applications by the LPA.





On the basis of how the LPA have consistently determined applications for a number of years, and the requirement for consistency in the decision-making process in order to maintain public confidence in the planning system, the current application should be approved.

4.2 Reason for Refusal 2 – Demolition

2 - The scheme's partial demolition of the existing structure is not considered to be reasonably necessary to carry out building operations allowed by Paragraph Q.1(i)(i) to the extent reasonably necessary for the building to function as a dwellinghouse. Therefore, the proposal does not comply with the limitations of Class Q of Part 3 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (pre-21 May 2024)

No demolition is proposed as part of the current application. The demolition only related to Agricultural Building 02 from 24/01121/FUL which does not form part of this submission.

5.0 Relevant Legislation and Planning Policy

5.1 Town and Country Planning Order (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended)

Class Q – agricultural buildings to dwellinghouses

Permitted development

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 (dwellinghouses) of the Schedule to the Use Classes Order; or

(b) 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.

Development not permitted

Q.1 Development is not permitted by Class Q if—

(a) the site was not used solely for an agricultural use as part of an established agricultural unit—

(i) on 20th March 2013, or

(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;

The LPA confirmed the building is an agricultural building in 24/01121/P3CQ

(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

(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;

(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;

(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 development is for three dwellings.

- Dwelling 01: 425.9m² (larger dwellinghouse)
- Dwelling 02: 86.1m² (smaller dwellinghouse)
- Dwelling 03: 86.1m² (smaller dwellinghouse)

(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;

(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;

The building 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;

The building did not form part of an agricultural tenancy in the last year prior to submission.

(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;

The applicant has not enacted the erection of an agricultural building or carried out operations since 20th March 2013

(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 development does not include the expansion of the external dimensions.

(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

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

Please see section 4.1.2 Conversion vs Rebuild for assessment in relation to these criteria.

(j) the site is on article 2(3) land; - it is not

(k) the site is, or forms part of—

(i) a site of special scientific interest; - it does not

(ii) a safety hazard area; - it does not

(iii) a military explosives storage area; - it does not

(l) the site is, or contains, a scheduled monument; or - it is not

(m) the building is a listed building. - it is not

Conditions

Q.2—(1) Where the development proposed is development under Class Q(a) together with development under Class Q(b), 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, -

Within 24/011121/P3CQ the officers report states the following:

The development is identical to the previously submitted application 22/00137/P3CQ, which was granted prior approval following the Local Highway Authority (LHA) advised approval for in matters relating to the highway, subject to conditions. Given this is an identical application of a currently extant application to which the LHA advised approval for, the LHA would not seek to resist the current application in these site-specific circumstances. Therefore, the proposal's impact on transport and highways matters is acceptable.

(b)noise impacts of the development, -

The officers report for 24/011121/P3CQ states:

The agricultural use of the site has ceased, and the proposal is for three new residential dwellings. Therefore, it not considered that the noise impacts of the development have a significant adverse impact on neighbouring residential amenity.

(c)contamination risks on the site, -

The applicant would be happy to accept the conditions proposed as part of 24/011121/P3CQ, as considered acceptable in the officers report.

(d)flooding risks on the site,

The site is in Flood Zone 1 and is not considered at risk from flooding

(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, -

The officers report for 24/011121/P3CQ states:

Although the application site is outside of defined settlement boundaries, there is an existing dwelling within the site. Therefore, the application is not considered to be located in an impractical or undesirable location for the building to change from an agricultural use to a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses) of the Schedule to the Use Classes Order.

(f)the design or external appearance of the building, and –

The officers report for 24/011121/P3CQ states:

The design and external appearance of the building does not have a significant adverse impact on the character of the building or the surrounding area.

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

All habitable rooms have windows and access to natural light.

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

The application accords with the provisions of Paragraph W (prior approval) of this Part.

(2) Where the development proposed is development under Class Q(a) only, 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 the items referred to in sub-paragraphs (1)(a) to (e) and (g), and the provisions of paragraph W (prior approval) of this Part apply in relation to that application.

(3) Development under Class Q is permitted subject to the condition that development under Class Q(a), and under Class Q(b), if any, must be completed within a period of 3 years starting with the prior approval date.

Interpretation of Class Q

Q.3. For the purposes of Class Q—

“larger dwellinghouse” means a dwellinghouse developed under Class Q which has a floor space of more than 100 square metres and no more than 465 square metres having a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses) of the Schedule to the Use Classes Order;

“smaller dwellinghouse” means a dwellinghouse developed under Class Q which has a floor space of no more than 100 square metres having a use falling within Class C3 (dwellinghouses) of the Schedule to the Use Classes Order.

7.0 Conclusion

It is considered on the submission of the additional information and amended plans, as summarised within the contents of this report that the proposed development adheres to the necessary stipulations of Class Q of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015, that prior approval should be issued by the LPA forthwith, subject to the conditions outlined in this report.

Signed.....

David Harris-Watkins PgD MRICS

Dated.....

Undersigned.....

Andrew Large MRICS FAAV

8.0 Reference List/Appendices

8.1 Relevant Case Law

- North Wiltshire District Council v Secretary of State for the Environment (1993) 65 P & CR 137
- R (Midcounties Co-Operative Limited) v Forest of Dean District Council [2017] EWHC
- Hibbit & Another v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and Rushcliffe Borough Council [2016] EWHC 2852

8.2 Relevant Planning Decisions within Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council

- 25/00198/P3CQ| Notification to determine if Prior Approval is required for the change of use of two agricultural buildings to three dwellinghouses (Class C3) 39 Main Road Ratcliffe Culey Atherstone Leicestershire CV9 3NY
- 24/01162/P3CQ| Notification to determine if Prior Approval is required for the change of use of an agricultural building to a dwellinghouse (Class C3)| Glebe Farm Barn Orton Lane Sheepy Magna Atherstone Leicestershire CV9 3NJ
- 24/01016/P3CQ| Conversion of existing barn to 2 residential units| 45 Bagworth Road Newbold Heath Newbold Verdon Leicester Leicestershire LE9 9NB
- 23/01180/P3CQ| Proposed conversion of barn to dwellinghouse (C3)| Little Mulberry Upton Lane Stoke Golding Nuneaton Leicestershire CV13 6EU
- 23/01207/P3CQ| Conversion of agricultural building to dwellinghouse| Ratcliffe House Farm Ratcliffe House Lane Ratcliffe Culey Atherstone Leicestershire CV9 3LZ
- 24/01121/P3CQ| Notification to determine if Prior Approval is required for the change of use of two agricultural buildings to create five smaller dwellinghouses| Frog Hall Farm Crow Lane Sheepy Magna Atherstone Leicestershire CV9 3QX
- 22/00137/P3CQ| Change of use of two agricultural building to create five dwellinghouses along with proposed building operations| Frog Hall Farm Crow Lane Sheepy Magna Atherstone Leicestershire CV9 3QX