



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 December 2025

by R Gravett BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 23 January 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/U2370/W/25/3373811

Estuary View Farm, Wardleys Lane, Hambleton, Lancashire FY6 9DX

- 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 Shore against the decision of Wyre Borough Council.
 - The application Reference is 25/00705/AGR.
 - The development proposed is agricultural building for the storage of hay.
-

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 agricultural building for the storage of hay at Estuary View Farm, Wardleys Lane, Hambleton, Lancashire FY6 9DX in accordance with the application 25/00705/AGR and the details submitted with it.

Preliminary Matters

2. Schedule 2, Part 6, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) (GPDO) permits works for the erection, extension or alteration of a building, which are reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture, on agricultural land comprised in an agricultural unit of 5 hectares or more in area.
3. To be permitted under Part 6, Class A of the GPDO, the development must also accord with further limitations and conditions. Paragraph A.1 sets out a list of criteria (a – l) by which development is not permitted by Class A. There is no dispute between the parties that the proposed building would meet the limitations and conditions and that it would be permitted development. I agree and have determined the appeal on that basis.
4. However, paragraph A.2(2)(i) 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. The Council determined that prior approval was required and refused it.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the siting, design and external appearance of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Reasons

6. The appeal site comprises part of an agricultural field which slopes down towards the River Wyre and lies to the west of Wardleys Lane, a narrow rural lane. There is a predominantly loose and sporadic pattern of existing development in the surrounding area, but it is nevertheless open and rural in its character with long, largely unobstructed and panoramic views towards the river estuary.
7. The proposed agricultural building would be used to store hay. It would be sited broadly centrally within the landholding of about 5.7Ha between the two grazing fields. Whilst being a distance from the main agricultural building, known as 'Estuary View Farm,' which is located to the south off Wardleys Lane, this would ensure that hay can easily be accessed and distributed to livestock (sheep), particularly during the wetter, winter months
8. While the proposal would introduce built form into an area of the field where there is currently none, the building would be relatively close to an existing 'pod' said to be used for storage for two detached holiday chalets located off Wardleys Lane to the north. Consequently, it would not be a standalone building or appear particularly isolated in its siting, and it would continue the relatively loose pattern of development which is characteristic of this side of Wardleys Lane.
9. The evidence before me is that the dimensions of the proposed building have been based on the expected quantity of hay (bales per acre) which would be stored. I have no reason to dispute this. The eaves height of around 3.3m would also allow farm machinery to access the building to move the hay, as well as other stored feed and consumables. It would therefore be of a scale and design appropriate for its intended agricultural use.
10. From the driveway of the holiday chalets, the proposed building would be viewed in the context of the large, gable end of the existing agricultural building behind and it would have a similar, simple form typically agrarian in its appearance, finished with green sheet cladding. It would not therefore appear unduly prominent or incongruous in its siting or appearance and the trees which have been planted to the south of the chalets would in time provide some screening of the gable of the building.
11. While there is a mature hedgerow along large sections of the road, much of the proposed building would be visible in gaps in the hedgerow, particularly when travelling from the south along Wardleys Lane. However, the building would be modest in overall height and would be offset a reasonable distance from the lane, at a lower ground level. Consequently, it would appear low within its setting, and it would not noticeably interrupt or obstruct the long estuary views or substantively erode the open character of the appeal site.
12. Therefore, I conclude that the siting, design and external appearance of the proposed development would not unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the surrounding area.

Other Matters

13. While I note the Council has suggested the proposed building could be sited closer to Estuary View Farm or that a bay could be added to the existing agricultural building, I have considered the proposal that is before me. In doing so, I have no

substantive evidence before me that there isn't a genuine intention to use the building for the storage of hay, despite its proximity to the holiday chalets.

Conditions

14. For the avoidance of doubt, any approval granted for the development under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 6, Class A of the GPDO is subject to the conditions set out in paragraph A.2 including the time limits for when development must be carried out as set out at A.2(2)(vi).

Conclusion

15. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, and prior approval should be granted.

R Gravett

INSPECTOR