



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 July 2025

by **K L Robbie BA (Hons) DipTP MTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 July 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/W/25/3366736

Hollins Bank Lane, Steeton

Easting (x): 403990 Northing (y): 443212

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Mr Marcus Preston against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
- The application reference is 25/00190/FUL.
- The development proposed is described as “Full retrospective planning for retention of agricultural building”.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. In the absence of a postcode, I have included the easting and northings provided on the application form in the banner above in the interests of clarity.
3. At the time of my site visit the agricultural building had already been constructed. However, ‘retention’ as referred to in the application form and decision notice does not constitute an act of development. I have therefore dealt with the appeal on the basis that planning permission is sought for an agricultural building.

Background and Main Issue

4. The appeal site is located within the Green Belt. In accordance with paragraph 154 of the National Planning Policy Framework, buildings for agriculture are not inappropriate development in the Green Belt. This matter is not in dispute. Therefore, the main issue is:
 - The effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal building is located within an agricultural field bounded by drystone walls in an area of open countryside. It is accessed via a steeply inclined track off Hollins Bank Lane and sits close to the top of a ridgeline which runs approximately parallel with Hollins Bank Lane before it levels off towards Redcar Lane. The building is constructed from metal sheeting and cement fibre boarding with timber Yorkshire boarding in the gables. At the time of my site visit it was in use for the storage of farm machinery.
6. According to the Council’s Landscape Character Supplementary Planning Document the appeal site is located in a landscape character area described as ‘*Pennine Upland*’ noted for its sparsely inhabited landscape and cultural literary

associations with the Bronte sisters. More specifically it is situated within in a sub-area defined as '*Upland Pasture*' where there are scattered farmsteads on the actively farmed lower slopes. The landscape, nonetheless, has a sense of openness and isolation. The appeal building, set within a mosaic of relatively small agricultural enclosures, is physically disconnected from any of the existing farmsteads in the area.

7. Whilst the topography and intervening woodland means that the building is not readily visible from Hollins Bank Lane, it is clearly visible for some distance when travelling along Redcar Lane. Its isolated location on the ridge of the escarpment means that, although the building is constructed of materials typical of agricultural buildings it appears out of character with the wider landscape where similar farm buildings tend to be clustered and more closely associated with farmsteads.
8. Consequently, the proposal harms the character and appearance of the area contrary to Policies EN4 and DS2 of the Bradford Core Strategy (2017) which amongst other things, seek to ensure that development is integrated into the wider landscape and makes a positive contribution toward their conservation and enhancement.

Other Matters

9. In coming to my conclusion, I have taken the desire of the appellant to support his agricultural business, with the intention of enabling it to be passed on to future generations of his family into consideration. However, this does not overcome the harm that I found on the main issue, and I am not persuaded that the appeal proposal would be the only means by which this aim could be achieved.
10. It is not disputed that that the appellant farms land within the area, however it has not been adequately demonstrated that that an agricultural building in this precise location is necessary or that other locations which would be less harmful have not been fully explored.
11. The building may be much smaller than permitted development rights allow under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (GDPO). However, I have little evidence to support a claim that a larger building would represent a realistic fallback position as it which would require an application under the prior approval process, which it has not been demonstrated would be forthcoming.
12. The appellant also states that he was unaware of the prior approval process. This is not a matter I can take into account in the determination of the appeal, which I have considered on the basis of what is proposed and its consequent effects.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out and having had regard to the development plan as a whole and all other material considerations raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

K L Robbie

INSPECTOR