

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 17 September 2025

by **Andreea Spataru BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 October 2025

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/W/25/3366274**

**Land west of Alstonefield Road, Hulme End SK17 0EY**

- 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 Barlow against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
  - The application Ref is NP/GDO/1124/1175.
  - The development proposed is described as ‘agricultural building for the storage of fodder and implements.’
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Preliminary Matters

2. 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 Order), planning permission is granted for the erection, extension or alteration of a building which is reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture subject to limitations and conditions. Paragraph A.2.(2)(i) to Part 6 requires the developer to apply to the local planning authority for a determination as to whether prior approval would be required as to various matters, including the siting, design and external appearance of the building. The Authority refused the application for prior approval solely on the basis of the proposed development’s siting and scale.
3. The provisions of Class A do not require regard to be had to the development plan. I have had regard to the policies of the development plan only insofar as they are a material consideration relevant to the matter of the proposed development’s siting, design and external appearance.

### Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether prior approval should be granted having regard to the proposed development’s siting, design and external appearance.

### Reasons

5. The appeal site relates to an agricultural field located within the Peak District National Park, to the west of Alstonefield Road. The site comprises undulating farmland, with variations in terms of land levels. Post and wire fencing along with dispersed trees and other vegetation constitute most of the appeal site’s boundary treatment. Apart from the cluster of trees located next to the north-western corner of the appeal site, which provides limited screening for part of the site, the area is generally open to views from within the surrounding area.

6. The surrounding area is rural in nature, characterised by open land interspersed with sporadic agricultural buildings. Within the immediate setting of the appeal site there are agricultural buildings opposite, to the north of the appeal site, across the access track. There is also a group of buildings associated with Paddock House Farm to the west of the site, behind the cluster of trees.
7. The appeal building would be sited close to the field's northern boundary where the access track is, and next to the western side. Apart from the screening provided by the group of trees from the west, and the additional hedgerow proposed also to the west, the proposed building would not benefit from much natural screening. The application form indicates that the dimensions of the proposed building would be 18.29 metres in length, 9.14 metres in breadth, and 4.89 metres in height to the ridge of the roof. As such, the building would form a substantial structure with a significant presence.
8. Due to its overall scale, including its height, the proposed building would be visually prominent within the surrounding area, including from public viewpoints from the nearby footpaths, and out of keeping with the low-lying, open qualities of the fields, particularly in the context of the nearest buildings, opposite the access track, which appear to be sited at a lower level than the proposal.
9. The land levels also appear to be lower immediately to the west of the site, where the cluster of farm buildings are. Given the topography of the area, the siting of the proposed building in relation to the nearby buildings, and the cluster of trees which separates Paddock House Farm from the proposed building, I find that the proposal would not relate to this group of buildings and would dominate the immediate landscape and erode the sense of openness that characterises the site.
10. The appellant asserts that the appeal site is the lowest area of the holding. The site is not at the top of a hill, and there are variations in the land levels beyond the appeal site, which I observed during my site visit. Nevertheless, this does not justify the presence of the proposed building in this location, nor does it make it less prominent within the surrounding area.
11. I acknowledge the appellant's need for a storage building, and I understand that an alternative would be the storage of fodder in plastic wraps. However, the scope of the determination of this proposal in the context of the prior approval application is limited to the matter of siting, design, and external appearance of the proposed building, which I found unacceptable.
12. In conclusion the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area. Consequently, prior approval regarding the proposed development's siting, design and external appearance should not be granted.

### **Other Matters**

13. The appellant has drawn my attention to a different scheme approved in proximity to the appeal site. However, I have not been provided with full details of that case, and it has not been demonstrated that the proposal before me is directly comparable with that development. In any event, I have considered the proposal based on its own merits and site-specific circumstances.
14. I have taken into account the benefits of the proposal, which include management of agricultural land, as well as community and economic benefits. I have also had

regard to the letters of support from third parties, which also highlight some of the benefits of the development. However, given the scale of the proposal these benefits are limited, and in any event, they do not outweigh the harm identified above.

### **Conclusion**

15. For the reasons set out above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Andreea Spataru*

INSPECTOR