



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 August 2025

by H Whitfield BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 21 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/V1505/W/25/3367319

Stoneyhills, Land at Ramsden View Road, Ramsden View Road, Wickford SS12 0LE

- 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 6, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr D Keeling against the decision of Basildon Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01418/AGBAS.
 - The development proposed is two number identical buildings for hay and machinery storage.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and prior approval is granted under the provisions of Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 6, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) for the erection of two agricultural buildings at Stoneyhills, Land at Ramsden View Road, Ramsden View Road, Wickford SS12 0LE in accordance with the application 24/01418/AGBAS and the details submitted with it including plan nos BP01, SP01, BARN/01, BARN/02, BARN/03, BARN/04 and BARN/05.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr D Keeling against Basildon Borough Council. This is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. For clarity, I have taken the description from the application form in the banner heading above. However, I have used the description from the decision notice and appeal form in my formal decision, removing words that do not relate to an act of development, as this more accurately describes the proposal.
4. Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 6, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (GPDO) set out that on agricultural land comprised in an agricultural unit of 5 hectares or more, the erection of a building reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture within that unit is permitted development, subject to limitations and conditions. Paragraph A.1 sets out a list of criteria by which development is not permitted by Class A. There is no dispute between the parties that the appeal proposal adheres to these criteria. I see no reason to come to a different conclusion and have determined the appeal on this basis.
5. Paragraph A.2 requires, amongst other things, that where the erection of a building is proposed, 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 prior approval of the authority will be required in relation to

the siting, design and external appearance of the building. In this case, the Council raises no objection to the design and external appearance of the buildings.

Main Issue

6. The main issue is the effect of the siting of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

7. The appeal site comprises part of an agricultural field to the south of London Road that has an undulating topography and is predominately enclosed by established hedgerows and trees. The site has an agricultural character and rural appearance with many nearby open fields in the vicinity. To the east are residential properties on Ramsden View Road.
8. The appeal scheme proposes two large agricultural buildings. Whilst they would be sited away from other buildings, they would be located adjacent to the eastern boundary of the site, relatively close to a cluster of existing residential development. The buildings would also be partially screened by established vegetation to the north and east, with the trees to the north likely to provide effective screening from London Road due to the changes in topography. Together, this would help visually contain the buildings, reduce their visible bulk, minimise their prominence and enable them to assimilate into the landscape. Whilst the buildings would be visible from certain vantage points in the surrounding landscape, they would be read as agricultural buildings within a wider agricultural setting, commensurate with their use and the surrounding context. Accordingly, they would not be unduly prominent or incongruous.
9. The Council's preference is for the buildings to be located closer to the properties on Ramsden View Road to lessen their visual impact, particularly due to the site's location within the Green Belt. However, the appellant explains that the location has been chosen to ensure the living conditions of nearby properties are preserved. Nevertheless, the location of the appeal site within the Green Belt is not a matter for consideration under Schedule 2, Part 6, Class A of the GPDO and I have found the proposed siting to be appropriate.
10. For the above reasons, I therefore conclude that the siting of the proposed development would not result in harm to the character and appearance of the area.

Other Matters

11. The Council has ticked that protected species are likely to be affected by the proposals on the appeal questionnaire. However, it has not provided any explanation as to why it considers this to be the case. As such, there is no substantive evidence before to demonstrate that the proposal would have an adverse effect on protected species.

Conditions

12. The GPDO does not provide any specific authority for imposing additional conditions beyond the deemed conditions for agricultural development on units of 5 hectares or more at paragraph A.2(2). These specify that the development must be carried out in accordance with the approved details submitted with the application and within 5 years of the date of this approval. As such, there is no reason for me to impose any additional conditions.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude the appeal should be allowed and prior approval should be granted.

H Whitfield

INSPECTOR