Planning Inspectorate

Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 November 2024

by D Wilson BSc (Hons) MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13th June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/Z3825/W/24/3341965
Stumbleholme Farm, Rusper Road, Ifield, West Sussex RH11 0LQ

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
- The appeal is made by William Farmer against the decision of Horsham District Council.
- The application Ref is DC/24/0036.
- The development proposed is proposed change of use from an agricultural building to 5 dwellings (C3 Use class).

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs has been made by William Farmer against Horsham District Council. This application is the subject of a separate decision.

Main Issues

3. The main issue is whether the proposal would be permitted development under Article 3, Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the GPDO, with particular regard to:

   - whether the proposal would result in the external dimensions of the building extending beyond those of the existing building,

   - and, if these conditions are met, whether adequate living conditions would be provided for future occupiers.

Reasons

External dimensions

4. The Council consider that the proposed development would result in the external dimensions of the building extending beyond the external dimensions of the existing building at any given point.

5. Having regard to the plans submitted with the appeal, it is clear that the external dimensions of the building would extend beyond the external dimensions of the existing building. The appellant has provided a photograph of the barn proposed to be converted in an attempt to show that there is sufficient height to allow for the proposed accommodation. I also note the appellant's suggestion that the conversion would take place without extending beyond the external dimensions of the existing building.

6. However, the plans submitted with the appeal clearly show that the proposal would extend beyond the external dimensions of the existing building. I note the appellant suggests the plans are indicative, however, based on all of the submitted information, I cannot be certain that the development would result in the external dimensions of the building extending beyond the external dimensions of the existing building at any given point.

7. The extracts of the Council's guidance provided by the appellant only replicate the requirements of Class Q and while the appellant considers there is no limit to the extent of the internal works that may be carried out and that structural elements would be retained this is not relevant to part (h).

8. I therefore conclude that the proposed development would be contrary to the requirement of Q.1(h) of Part 3, Class Q of the GPDO. The proposal would therefore not be permitted development under Class Q in this respect.

Whether adequate living conditions would be provided

9. As I have concluded that the proposed development is not permitted under Class Q, I have no need to consider the further issues in terms of the criteria contained within Q.2(1) (e) of the GPDO.

Other Matters

10. I note that prior approvals are less prescriptive than planning applications, however, this does not negate the requirement to comply with the criteria set out within Article 3, Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q of the GPDO.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

D Wilson

INSPECTOR