



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 9 October 2025

by K Savage BA(Hons) MPlan MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 14 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/M9496/W/25/3370614

Shutts Farm, Shutts Lane, Bakewell DE45 1JA

- 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 GPDO)
- The appeal is made by Mr Jamie Corbridge against the decision of Peak District National Park Authority.
- The application reference is NP/GDO/0525/0488.
- The development proposed is a portal framed building for agricultural storage purposes.

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 a portal framed building for agricultural storage purposes at Shutts Farm, Shutts Lane, Bakewell DE45 1JA, in accordance with the application NP/GDO/0525/0488 and the details submitted with it, including drawing numbers S1103-001 Rev C (Location Plan); S1103-002 Rev C (Block Plan); S1103-003 Rev E (Elevations and Floor Plan); and subject to the following condition:
 - 1) The timber boarding to the elevations of the building, at the time of their first installation, shall either be left unpainted to weather naturally or coloured slate blue (BS 18B29) and thereafter maintained in the same state as initially installed. Otherwise, no timber boarding shall be installed until details of the proposed finish and colour of the boarding have first been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The timber boarding shall be installed in accordance with the approved details and retained as such thereafter.

Background and Main Issue

2. Schedule 2, Part 6, Class A of the GPDO permits the carrying out on agricultural land comprised in an agricultural unit of 5 hectares or more in area of (a) works for the erection, extension or alteration of a building; or (b) any excavation or engineering operations, which are reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture within that unit. The permitted development right is qualified by conditions and limitations set out at Paragraph A.1. The National Park Authority (NPA) is satisfied that the proposal accords with the requirements of Paragraph A.1. and constitutes development permitted under Part 6, Class A. I have no evidence to counter this finding.
3. The second aspect to address is Paragraph A.2(2)(i), which states that for development permitted by Class A the developer must, before beginning the

development, apply to the local planning authority for determination as to whether its prior approval will be required as to the siting, design and external appearance of the building.

4. The NPA refers to a number of its development plan policies in its reason for refusal. For the avoidance of doubt, whilst these policies may be relevant as material considerations that help to inform a planning judgement, prior approval appeals are not expressly determined against the development plan.
5. However, the National Planning Policy Framework states that great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in National Parks, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues. There is also a statutory duty to seek to further the purposes of the National Park to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage and to promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of national parks by the public.
6. Having regard to this context, the main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the landscape character of the surrounding area, having regard to its siting, design and external appearance.

Reasons

7. The proposed building would be located to the south-western corner of an agricultural field extending westwards from Shutts Lane. The appellant's dwelling and ancillary buildings stand to the south of the field, whilst the majority of the agricultural buildings forming part of the farm are located on the opposite side of Shutts Lane, to the north of which are the nearest neighbouring dwellings. The campus of Lady Manners' School is located to the north of the field in which the building is proposed.
8. The site lies within the Limestone Village Farmlands character area, described as gentle undulating plateaus of pastoral farmland enclosed by drystone walls, with repeating narrow strip fields and scattered boundary trees and tree groups around buildings. I saw the surroundings to exhibit these characteristics, particularly to the west of the site where the land falls and then rises up dramatically with stone-walled fields ascending the hillside, interspersed with copses of trees.
9. The proposed building would be of a typical, modern agricultural design, rectangular in shape with a shallow pitched roof. The side walls would be formed mainly of timber boarding above concrete panels. The western elevation and roof would be covered with metal cladding, whilst the eastern elevation, facing Shutts Lane, would be open. The plans indicate the building would be located on a sloping site and partially set into the ground on its northern side.
10. The building would be sited some 20m from the nearest building and to the other side of the boundary wall that contains the rest of the farmstead, but my observations were that it would be sufficiently close to be read as a constituent part of the farmstead, in a standard design typical of agricultural buildings. It would be located to the rear corner of the field where the land level is lowest and adjacent to the boundary walls. The proposal to cut into the sloping ground would also reduce the apparent height of the building and its prominence in views. These steps would accord with guidance in the NPA's Agricultural Development Supplementary Planning Guidance (July 2003) that large buildings are best sited

to the far side of the farmhouse and should take advantage of any natural slopes to reduce the apparent scale and visual harm.

11. At over 30m long, 18m wide, 4.5m to the eaves and 7m to the ridge, the proposal would still introduce a substantial agricultural building into the landscape. It would be visible from several vantage points, including Shutts Lane to the east, a public footpath a short distance to the west and from the grounds of Lady Manners' School to the north-east. However, agricultural buildings are part of the immediate character of the area. Various stone built outbuildings surround the existing farmhouse and the appellant's holding includes a significant farmyard to the opposite side of Shutts Lane with a mix of older, stone barns and large, modern steel portal buildings. Therefore, the site is not within expansive, unaltered countryside but in an area of transition between the built development of Bakewell and the open countryside where development is more fragmented and interspersed with agricultural land.
12. Thus, in each of the views described above, the building would be seen as proximate to existing development, and would not appear as an isolated structure. From Shutts Lane, it would appear as a low level structure close to other buildings and would not adversely affect the wider vista towards the taller, rolling hills beyond to the south-west, the openness of which would be substantively retained. This would also be the case in views from the school grounds. From the public footpath, views towards the site would take in the school buildings and other development beyond, in which context the building would integrate as a further agricultural feature common to this landscape in form and character.
13. Therefore, I conclude that the siting, design and external appearance of the proposal would preserve the landscape character of the surrounding area. In doing so, the proposal would also accord with the purpose of the National Park to conserve and enhance its natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage.
14. Though not determinative, there would be no conflict with Policies GSP1, GSP3, DS1 and L1 of the Peak District National Park Core Strategy (October 2011) or Policies DMC3 and DME1 of the Development Management Policies Part 2 of the Local Plan (May 2019), which together seek to ensure that development respects, conserves and enhances the valued characteristics of the site by ensuring it is appropriate in scale and design to the character and appearance of the National Park and wider landscape.

Other Matter

15. I have noted other points raised, including whether other parts of the appellant's holding are suitable locations in the alternative. Such considerations go beyond the scope of the prior approval assessment, which is limited to the siting, design, and external appearance of the proposed building itself. In any event, my findings above mean this is not a determinative matter.

Conditions

16. A new agricultural storage building granted under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 6, Class A is subject to the standardised conditions that are pursuant to the relevant parts of the GPDO which include, amongst others, the timescale for the development to be carried out and that it must be carried out in accordance with

the details approved, which include the submitted plans. Therefore, it is not necessary to set these conditions in the formal decision above.

17. The NPA has suggested additional conditions. Nos 1 and 2 replicate standard conditions for Class A development, and so are not necessary to repeat.
18. A condition to specify the colour of the treated Yorkshire boarding is not set out on the plans but is necessary to preserve the landscape character of the area. However, 'dark brown' as set out by the NPA in its suggested Condition No 3 is imprecise, and appears to contradict the slate blue specified on the application form. For clarity, but to allow flexibility if needed, I have reworded the condition to specify that the timber boarding may either be left uncoloured to weather naturally, coloured in the slate blue (BS 18B29) specified on the application form or, if necessary, another colour to be agreed in writing by the local planning authority.
19. Condition No 4 is not necessary as the plans already specify the colour of the roof sheeting and western elevation cladding.
20. A condition is suggested to restrict the use of the building for the purposes of agriculture only, in effect seeking to remove permitted development rights which may otherwise exist once the building is constructed. However, the GPDO sets limitations on when agricultural buildings permitted under Part 6, Class A can be converted under other provisions of the GPDO. I have no evidence to suggest that these limitations would not provide sufficient safeguarding against unanticipated use of the building for other purposes, and a condition is not necessary.
21. Finally, the suggested condition seeking removal of the building should it no longer be needed is also unnecessary as there is already provision for this in the GPDO, under Condition 5 of Paragraph A.2.

Conclusion

22. For the reasons set out, I conclude that the proposal would be acceptable with respect to its siting, design and external appearance, and prior approval should be granted. The appeal is therefore allowed.

K Savage

INSPECTOR