

### 3 RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

3.1. The following planning history is considered relevant to the current proposal:

**Application: 97/00049/AGN**      Prior approval not required      28 February 1997

Agricultural machinery store

**Application: 15/01578/Q56**      Undetermined

Prior approval for the conversion of barn to dwellinghouse under Schedule 2, Part 3, Class Q(a) of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).

**Application: 15/01780/CLUP**      Application Permitted      19 January 2015

Certificate of Lawfulness of Proposed Use for the conversion of agricultural barn to dwelling

**Application: 16/01587/F**      Application Permitted      21 November 2016

Conversion of agricultural building to dwelling following Certificate of Lawful Development 15/01780/CLUP

**Application: 17/00177/DISC**      Application Permitted      9 June 2017

Discharge of condition 4 (cladding) of 16/01587/F

**Application: 18/00121/F**      Application Permitted      13 March 2018

Minor material amendment to 16/01587/F - to increase structural steel columns in section, alterations to the window fenestration and increase in ridge height of 450mm and eaves height of 450mm

**Application: 18/00114/NMA**      Application Permitted      5 October 2018

Alterations to approved windows and openings (proposed as non-material amendments to 18/00121/F)

**Application: 19/00139/DISC**      Application Permitted      12 June 2019

Discharge of Condition 3 (drainage) of 18/00121/F

**Application: 19/01056/F**

Application  
Refused

4 October 2019

Erection of garage adjacent to approved dwelling and change of use of land to residential

Refused on the following grounds:

By virtue of its siting, scale and design the proposed substantial garage building and associated hardstanding, and by virtue of its extent and location the proposed change of use, are not considered sympathetic to the rural context of the site and are considered an inappropriate form of development, that would cause undue and unjustified visual intrusion into the valued rural landscape and open countryside. Further that it has not been demonstrated the proposals would provide a net gain in biodiversity opportunities at the site.