



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 12 November 2025

by Andreea Spataru BA (Hons) MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 8th December 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/R0660/W/25/3373360

Agricultural field to the rear of Stocks Lane, Easting: 378730 Northing: 374109

- 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 R Clarkson against the decision of Cheshire East Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/2452/PRIOR-6.
 - The development proposed is an agricultural shed.
-

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 shed at agricultural field to the rear of Stocks Lane, Easting:378730 Northing:374109 in accordance with the terms of the application ref 25/2452/PRIOR-6 and the details and plans submitted with it.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr R Clarkson against Cheshire East Council. This application is subject of a separate decision.

Preliminary Matter

3. 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 GPDO), 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 Council refused the application for prior approval solely on the basis of the siting of the building.

Main issue

4. The main issue is whether prior approval should be granted having particular regard to the siting of the building.

Reasons

5. The appeal site is part of an agricultural field located to the north-east of Stocks Lane. The site comprises undulating land, with no significant changes in the land levels within the site, but at higher level than the dwellings that front Stocks Lane.

There are several trees scattered across the field and a group of mature trees towards the north-eastern corner of the site. There is also a line of trees that bounds the north of the site and several other trees scattered across the eastern and western boundaries of the site.

6. The surrounding area is predominantly rural in nature, with large fields of agricultural land and scattered trees belts. Built form is concentrated along Stocks Lane, with clusters of residential properties and several services and facilities. The nearest group of buildings to the appeal site consists of the dwellings fronting Stocks Lane. A public footpath runs just beyond the northern boundary of the site, providing public views into the field.
7. The proposed building would be located towards the north of the site, next to the group of mature trees, at a considerable distance from Stocks Lane. Its siting within the natural contour of the land, and in relation to the neighbouring buildings and the existing trees, is such that the proposal would be partly screened in many views.
8. While the proposed building would be visible from the public footpath, that does not necessarily mean it results in harm. Its overall height, combined with the topography and the existing tree cover, would prevent it from appearing unduly prominent or incongruous. Even at the proposed scale, the mature trees would soften and partially screen the building throughout the year, albeit to varying degrees depending on seasonal foliage. Additional landscaping, as indicated on the submitted plans, would further enhance this screening, particularly along the northern edge of the site, and ensure that the building integrates well into the rural setting.
9. The Council found the design and external appearance of the proposal acceptable. The submitted details reflect the functional and utilitarian design typical of agricultural buildings. While the proposed building would stand alone within the field, and would be away from the existing informal track, it would be linked to an agricultural use, and its overall design would reflect its intended purpose. Such a building is not unusual within a rural landscape and cannot reasonably be considered out of place, particularly in the specific context of the appeal site as outlined above. Accordingly, its siting away from other built forms and its visibility from the public footpath do not, in themselves, render the building inappropriate in this context. Overall, I find the siting, design and external appearance of the building acceptable.
10. In conclusion, the proposal would not appear visually intrusive or excessively conspicuous. It would be in keeping with the prevailing rural character and appearance of the area and would not unduly detract from its otherwise open and undeveloped nature. The siting, design and external appearance of the building would therefore be acceptable.

Conditions

11. The Council has suggested conditions relating to the implementation of the submitted details, landscaping, and materials. However, unlike other Parts of the GPDO, Class A, Part 6 does not provide any specific authority for imposing additional conditions beyond the deemed conditions in Paragraphs A.2(2)(v) and (vi). 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. There is no need to restate them in my decision.

12. In relation to landscaping and materials, as the development must be carried out in accordance with the details approved, I am satisfied that there is no need for further conditions. In any event, it is not clearly shown that such further conditions would not fall outside the scope of the GPDO.

Conclusion

13. I conclude that the appeal is allowed, and prior approval is granted.

Andreea Spataru

INSPECTOR