



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 September 2025

by **C McDonagh BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 06 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/B3438/W/25/3363739

Land Adjacent to Heatherview, Moorside, Werrington ST9 0LY

- 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 Mrs Woodall against the decision of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council.
- The application Ref is DET/2024/0057.
- The development proposed is an agricultural building.

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 an agricultural building at Land Adjacent to Heatherview, Moorside, Werrington ST9 0LY in accordance with the application Ref DET/2024/0057 and the details submitted with it.

Applications for costs

2. An application for costs has been submitted by Mrs Woodall against Staffordshire Moorlands District Council. This is the subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matters

3. Section A.2(2)(d)(i) of schedule 2, part 6, class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (the GPDO) states that the developer must, before beginning the development, apply to the local planning authority for a determination as to whether the prior approval of the authority will be required as to the siting, design and external appearance of the building. The decision notice states that the Council refused prior approval, although the reason given relates to whether the building is reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture and the Council has not expressed concern regarding those prior approval matters given above. I have proceeded on the basis that these matters are not in dispute.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether the proposal would be development permitted under Schedule 2, Part 6 Class A of the GPDO.

Reasons

5. The appeal site comprises a rectangular field adjacent Heatherview. The proposal seeks to erect a building formed of concrete blocks and steel sheet clad walls and a further covering of steel sheeting for the pitched roof. The structure would be

24.4 metres (m) in length by 12.2m width, with a total height of 5.3m. The floor area of the building would be around 297 square metres.

6. Schedule 2, Part 6, Class A of the GPDO, permits works for the erection, extension or alteration of a building, or any excavation or engineering operations reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture within that unit, on agricultural land in an agricultural unit of 5 hectares (ha) or more in area. This is subject to certain criteria and circumstances listed under section A.1. Based on all that I have seen and read, I see no reason to disagree. While there was confusion as to the total area of the unit, there is no dispute that it exceeds 5ha.
7. Section D.1 of Part 6, Class A offers interpretations of Classes A to C. Agricultural land is defined as land which, before development permitted by this Part is carried out, is land in use for agriculture and which is so used for the purposes of a trade or business and excludes any dwellinghouse or garden. A straightforward reading of this interpretation would mean that whether it is currently used for agriculture is not the test; rather, it must be in agricultural use and used for the purposes of a trade or business prior to the development permitted is carried out. Were this not to be the case prior to the erection of the building, the proposal would not be permitted development and subject to enforcement action.
8. There was some confusion with regards to land ownership in the application. While 11 parcels of land were listed in the planning statement, I understand that 3 of these were deleted from the list. There is no requirement for the occupier of the agricultural land to actually own said land. Moreover, the appellant has provided a letter confirming the land is being rented to them for a period until 31 October 2034, while there is no requirement for the occupier to be a 'farmer' as such; only that the land is used for agriculture.
9. I understand that the building would be used to store machinery and equipment, haylage and silage, bedding, and feed. I observed on my site visit that some of this was stored in the field itself, and I see no reason to doubt that a building to keep these items would be reasonably necessary for the proposed use of the land and indeed would aid in the development of the use. There was further confusion with regards to whether the appellant owned cattle, which was asserted to be the case in the application for prior approval but corrected later that they intend to purchase the livestock later. Photography provided from 2010 and 2014 shows the land has been used to grow grass for silage as well as a satellite image of bails being stored in the field from 2022.
10. The wording of Schedule 2, Part 6, Class A of the GPDO permits work which is reasonably necessary rather than required for the purposes of agriculture. Drawing these factors together, I conclude that the building is reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture. Consequently, it would satisfy the necessary criteria set out in Part 6, Class A of the GPDO.

Conditions

11. The conditions and limitations set out in paragraphs A.1 and A.2 of Schedule 2, Part 6, Class A of the GDPO include the requirement that the development must be carried out in accordance with the details approved and the development must be carried out within a period of 5 years from the date on which approval was given. The developer must also notify the local planning authority in writing within 7 days of the date on which the development is substantially completed.

Conclusion

12. For the reasons given above, I conclude that prior approval is granted, and the appeal is therefore allowed.

C McDonagh

INSPECTOR