



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 27 August 2025

by H Senior BA (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 October 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/W4705/W/25/3363156

Land at Scartop, Oldfield BD22 0JR

- 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. Garry Hodgkinson against the decision of City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/03919/FUL.
 - The development proposed is cabin for agricultural storage and welfare.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The cabin was in situ at the time of my site visit and therefore I have dealt with the appeal on the basis that permission is being sought retrospectively for its siting or erection.

Background and Main Issues

3. Paragraph 154 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) indicates that development in the Green Belt is inappropriate subject to a number of exceptions. Under paragraph 154 (a) of the Framework, these exceptions include buildings for agriculture and forestry.
4. The Council indicates that it cannot be certain that the building would be utilised for agricultural purposes. However, the appellant explains that the building is needed as a “stop gap” pending the construction of an agricultural barn under an extant permission. The cabin is clearly not designed as an agricultural building, but there would be nothing to prevent its use for agricultural storage and welfare. I have dealt with the appeal on this basis and accordingly the cabin does not constitute inappropriate development in the Green Belt.
5. Therefore, the main issues are:
 - the effect of the development on the character and appearance of the area; and
 - whether, in the event of harm being identified in respect of the first main issue, there are material considerations to indicate that a decision should be made otherwise than in accordance with the development plan.

Reasons

Character and appearance

6. The appeal site is a steeply sloping field which lies close to a public footpath. It is accessed via a track which appears substantially similar to the track permitted under planning application Ref 18/03594/FUL for a larger agricultural barn approved elsewhere on the site. The approved building would be of a different design and materials, and it would be screened by existing development and substantial landscaping.
7. The appeal building, by contrast, has the appearance of a static caravan and there is no screening or landscaping proposed. Due to the location higher than the road and the pale colour of the building, it is highly prominent and visually intrusive in the open countryside location. The building stands out as an alien feature in an otherwise predominantly rural location.
8. I therefore conclude that the development harms the character and appearance of the area. It conflicts with Policies EN4 and DS2 of the Local Plan for Bradford District Core Strategy 2017 which together and amongst other matters seek to ensure that development integrates into the wider landscape and makes a positive contribution towards the conservation, management and enhancement of landscapes within the District.

Other considerations

9. The building has been used to store materials related to drainage works and boundary rebuilding which would allow the land to be used for grazing sheep. It would not be required once the approved agricultural barn has been constructed, however this will be dependent on funding. The appellant's case fails to demonstrate that the temporary agricultural storage requirements could not be met in a less harmful manner. Given this, and the uncertainties on timescales for constructing the barn, the appellant's suggestion of a temporary 3-year planning permission would not be appropriate. Any benefits to the appellant would not justify the landscape and visual harm, even in the short term.

Conclusion

10. The appeal scheme conflicts with the development plan and the material considerations do not indicate that the appeal should be decided other than in accordance with it. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

H Senior

INSPECTOR