



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 21 January 2026

by R Major BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 3 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/U2370/W/25/3368379

Land adjacent to Woodcar, Grange Road, Hambleton, Lancashire FY6 9DB

- 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 Executors of Stanley Fenton (Deceased) against the decision of Wyre Borough Council.
- The application Ref is 25/00308/AGR.
- The development proposed is agricultural building for the storage of machinery and tractors.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Background and Main Issue

2. Schedule 2, Part 6, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (the Order) allows for the erection of a building, which is reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture, on agricultural land comprised in an agricultural unit of 5 hectares or more. Additionally, to be permitted under Part 6, Class A of the Order, the development must also accord with further limitations and conditions.
3. The Council considers that the development does not fall within Part 6, Class A because in its view insufficient information has been submitted that adequately demonstrates that the site forms part of an agricultural unit as defined in paragraph D.1(1) of Part 6 of the Order.
4. In view of the above, the main issues are
 - whether it has been demonstrated that the proposal would be permitted development under Part 6, Class A of the Order; and
 - if so, the effect of the proposal in terms of its siting, design and external appearance.

Reasons

Whether permitted development

5. The appeal seeks prior approval for an agricultural storage building to be situated on land adjacent to the residential dwelling known as Woodcar, and opposite the dwelling identified as Fashoda on the submitted location plan. The supporting agricultural planning statement details that the proposed building would be used to house agricultural machinery and hay/straw.

6. As set out above, the permitted development right conveyed by the Order is conditional, under paragraph A of Class A, on the proposed building being reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture and erected on agricultural land comprised in an agricultural unit of 5 hectares or more. Paragraph A.1. (a) also states that the development is not permitted if it would be carried out on a separate parcel of land forming part of the unit which is less than 1 hectare in area.
7. Clarification of the interpretation of Class A is provided at paragraph D.1.(1) to Part 6 where it states that “agricultural land” means land which, before development permitted by this Part is carried out, is land in use for agriculture and which is so used for the purposes of a trade or business. It defines an “agricultural unit” as agricultural land which is occupied as a unit for the purposes of agriculture.
8. The submitted planning application form states that the total area of the entire agricultural unit is 121 hectares (approx. 300 acres) and the parcel of land where the development is to be located is 1 or more hectare. The appellant’s submitted agricultural planning statement also states that they do not have a proper modern agricultural shed in this part of the land holding. The appellant’s planning statement does not however define what “...*this part of the land holding*” specifically refers to in this regard.
9. The appellant’s appeal statement further comments that the appeal site forms part of a wider holding comprising approx. 200 acres of agricultural land used for mixed farming, including storage of machinery and crop production. Two letters of support provided with the planning application also refer to the appellant owning, occupying and farming land in the surrounding area, for a lengthy period of time.
10. The submission also includes copies of three Rural Land Register (RLR) Maps showing parcels of land associated with SBI number 108016029. However, these RLR Maps are lacking in specific detail and supporting information to demonstrate how they relate to the appeal site. The location of the appeal site is not annotated within any of the highlighted parcels on this map and the detailing on the maps is insufficient for me to locate the appeal site myself within any highlighted parcel.
11. In addition, the Council’s submission details that when refusing a previous planning application¹ for agricultural workers accommodation at this site, a land agent established that the appellant’s “...*land ownership extended to 240 acres of grassland which is rented out to two neighbouring farmers who take up to four silage crops from the land over the summer and winter store sheep on the land*”.
12. The Council go on to state that “*The report confirms that all of the labour for harvesting grass and primary care for the wintered livestock is provided by the two licences who live on their own holdings and this has been the case for the last 20 years. The report further outlines that maintenance of hedges, fences, gates etc is undertaken by contractors*”. These comments are supported by several interested parties who have also stated that the appellant’s land is rented to, and worked by, local farmers who have their own farms and buildings.
13. These comments from the Council, which are supported by representations from interested parties, have not been directly disputed by the appellant within their submission. Furthermore, I note these were specific concerns raised by a previous

¹ Council Ref: 24/00068/FUL

Inspector when dismissing a prior approval appeal² for the erection of an agricultural storage building at the appeal site. In that case the Inspector concluded that “...I am also unable to conclude whether the proposed building would in fact fall within an agricultural unit of five hectares or more”.

14. Consequently, from the information before me, it seems possible that there is more than one agricultural unit operating within the land owned by the appellant.
15. As such, whilst there appears to be no dispute that the appellant owns more than 200 acres of farmland that is in agricultural use, it is unclear how much, and which areas, are associated with the appellant's own farming activities and/or which are associated with any tenant farmers' businesses. Furthermore, there is limited substantive evidence before me in respect of what specific agricultural unit or business the appeal site forms part of.
16. In coming to this view, I am aware that the submission states that the proposed building would be for the appellant's own agricultural activities. However, whilst I have some information in respect of the land the appellant owns, as mentioned, I have limited information before me in respect of what land the appellant farms themselves, and importantly whether the extent of the agricultural unit associated with the appeal site is 5 hectares or more in size. This is unclear from the submitted maps.
17. I also note that some invoices, and a copy of a Sustainable Farming Incentive Agreement, have been provided with the submission. However, and again, I do not consider these submissions are specific in terms of the agricultural unit to which they relate, or their relationship with the appeal site specifically.
18. Furthermore, and with regard to the size of the parcel of land where the development is to be located, the submitted site edged red includes only the front part of an enclosed paddock adjacent to Grange Road. I have not been provided with the size of this area of land within which the proposed building would be located.
19. Additionally, and as detailed earlier, it is unclear how the appeal site relates to any of the parcels highlighted on the RLR Maps. I cannot therefore also be sure that the development would not be carried out on a separate parcel of land forming part of the unit which is less than 1 hectare in area.
20. In view of all the above, and based on the evidence before me, I am unable to conclude with any certainty that the proposed building would be reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture within an agricultural unit of 5 hectares or more, and that the development would not be carried out on a separate parcel of land forming part of the unit which is less than 1 hectare in area. The proposed development would therefore not be permitted under Part 6, Class A of the Order.
21. As the proposal would not be permitted development, it is not necessary for me to consider the prior approval application any further, including whether the proposal would be acceptable in respect of the limitations, exclusions, conditions and matters of prior approval in terms of its siting, design and external appearance.

² APP/U2370/W/24/3347664

Other Matters

22. My attention has been drawn to a dismissed appeal³ at Winacre Farm, Turkey Street. However, other than its reference to the appellant owning farmland in the area, including that appeal site, I find its relevance in respect of the appeal scheme before me to be limited.

Conclusion

23. I conclude that the proposed development would fall outside the scope of that permitted under Part 6, Class A of the Order and the appeal is therefore dismissed.

R Major

INSPECTOR

³ APP/U2370/X/24/3348092