



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 August 2022

by Hannah Ellison BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30 August 2022

Appeal Ref: APP/A2335/W/22/3294906

Yealand Farm (Hyning Barn), Borwick Lane, Warton, Lancashire

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr Matthew Allen against the decision of Lancaster City Council.
 - The application Ref 21/01215/FUL, dated 22 September 2021, was refused by notice dated 3 February 2022.
 - The development proposed is the erection of an agricultural building.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposal on a) the character and appearance of the area, including the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and b) flooding.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

3. The appeal site is located within a wider agricultural holding which is predominantly characterised by large grass fields. The surrounding locality is extremely open and rural in character and there are wide ranging views of this landscape from public vantage points. These qualities contribute positively to the AONB in which the site is also located. The AONB is primarily designated for the purposes of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the area.
4. The proposal seeks to provide an additional building for the appellants expanding herd of cows. Support is provided in principle for agricultural businesses at paragraph 84 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework), Policy DM47 of A Local Plan for Lancaster District 2011-2031, Part Two: Review of the Development Management DPD (July 2020) (the DMDPD) and the Arnsdale & Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, Development Plan Document (the AONB DPD). However, this support is predicated on the requirement for developments to be well-designed and respect the character of the countryside.
5. The proposed building would be significantly detached from the existing cluster of built form and hardstanding within this part of the agricultural holding. Its removed positioning and large scale would cause it to appear stark and visually prominent in this part of the undeveloped field. It would therefore result in additional fragmented built form, contrasting with the natural character of the

wider landscape. The proposed hedgerow around three sides of the proposal would fail to overcome these concerns.

6. I note the constraints posed by the pipeline and overhead cables however the evidence is not convincing as to whether or not there is a more suitable location within this large agricultural holding for the proposal.
7. This proposal is considered on its own merits and is read within its own context and the presence of other built form in the locality, such as the water pumping station and BT exchange, do not serve to justify uncharacteristic development.
8. Accordingly, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area and would fail to conserve or enhance the natural beauty of the AONB. It therefore conflicts with Policies EN2 and EN3 of A Local Plan for Lancaster District 2011-2031, Part One: Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD (July 2020) and Policies DM29 and DM46 of the DMDPD which collectively seek, amongst other things, to ensure that developments have regard to and contribute positively to local distinctiveness and conserve and enhance the landscape character and visual amenity of the open countryside and the AONB.
9. For the reasons I have identified, the proposal would also conflict with policies AS01, AS02 and AS08 of the AONB DPD and Sections 12 and 15 of the Framework.

Flooding

10. Very limited details have been provided with regards to the surface water drainage of the proposed development. It has not therefore been satisfactorily demonstrated that the existing ground conditions and/or capacity of existing infrastructure is suitable and could adequately drain the development so as it would not pose a flood risk both on and off the site.
11. In the absence of further information, I cannot reach a conclusion that the proposal would have an acceptable effect on drainage and thus would not increase the risk of flooding. It would therefore conflict with the aim of Policies DM29 and DM34 of the DMDPD to incorporate sustainable drainage systems within new development. In this regard, the proposal would also fail to accord with policy AS12 of the Arncliffe & Silverdale AONB DPD and paragraph 167 of the Framework.

Conclusion

12. The proposal conflicts with the development plan as a whole and there are no material considerations, including the Framework, which indicate a decision should be made other than in accordance with the development plan. Therefore, the appeal should be dismissed.

H Ellison
INSPECTOR