



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 May 2026

by R Bartlett PGDip URP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 May 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/T2350/C/25/3363899

Land lying to the North of Preston Road, Ribchester, Preston, PR3 3XL

- The appeal is made under section 174 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr Terrence Ball of Caltz Investments Ltd against an enforcement notice issued by Ribble Valley Borough Council.
 - The notice was issued on 17 March 2025.
 - The breach of planning control as alleged in the notice is without planning permission, the construction of concrete hardstanding's and siting of two modular structures on said hardstanding's, and the siting of a black metal and glass office style structure.
 - The requirements of the notice are to: Remove the modular buildings and hardstanding's upon which they stand and remove the black metal and glass office style structure from the land.
 - The period for compliance with the requirements is: 12 weeks from the date the notice takes effect.
 - The appeal is proceeding on the grounds set out in section 174(2) (f) and (g) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
-

Summary Decision: The appeal is dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld.

Procedural Matters

1. There is a typographical error in the notice, specifically the incorrect use of an apostrophe in the word hardstanding's. However, as this does not alter the interpretation or meaning of the text, it is not necessary for me to formally correct the notice.
2. I acknowledge that representations have been made by third parties, but as no appeal has been made under ground (a), that planning permission ought to be granted, I am unable to consider the planning merits.
3. The appeal was made on grounds (f) and (g), and although in their evidence the appellants mention that the siting of the office style structure is ancillary to the use of the site, this argument has not been sufficiently developed to enable me to consider it as a hidden appeal on ground (b) that the matters stated in the notice have not occurred or a hidden appeal on ground (c) that those matters (if they occurred) do not constitute a breach of planning control. The allegation relates only to operational development, not a material change of use, and in the absence of any evidence to the contrary I have determined the appeal on this basis.
4. At the time of my visit the two modular structures referred to in paragraph 3 of the notice, which I understand from the information before me were intended to be used as holiday accommodation, had already been removed from the land. The concrete hardstanding upon which these structures had been sited was still present, as was the small office structure.

The appeal on ground (f)

5. The appeal on ground (f) is made on the basis that the requirements of the notice exceed what is necessary to either (a) remedy the breach of planning control or (b) remedy any injury to amenity which has been caused by the breach.
6. In this case, as the enforcement notice requires the removal of all buildings, structures and hardstanding from the land, I consider the purpose of the notice is to remedy the breach of planning control.
7. The appellant states that the area of concrete hardstanding and the office structure are small ancillary elements and their removal exceeds what is necessary to remedy the suggested harm caused by the breach. However, as the purpose of the notice is to remedy the breach of planning control, no lesser steps other than those set out in the notice would achieve that purpose.
8. Furthermore, as there is no appeal on ground (a), I am unable to consider the planning merits or to grant planning permission, conditional or otherwise, for all or part of the matters referred to in the notice. I also note that retrospective planning permission has already been refused and dismissed at appeal.
9. The appeal on ground (f) therefore fails.

The appeal on ground (g)

10. The appeal on ground (g) is made on the basis that the period for compliance specified in the notice falls short of what should reasonably be allowed. The period specified in the notice is 12 weeks. A period of 12-18 months has been requested to enable a pending planning application to be determined and an appeal against that decision lodged and determined if necessary. I am aware that all of these things have now occurred and no additional reasons for extending the period for compliance have been put forward.
11. The time for compliance relates to the time taken to meet the requirements of the notice. The two modular structures have already been removed, and there is no evidence before me to suggest that removing the remaining small office structure and area of hardstanding would not be straightforward. As such 12 weeks would be a sufficient and proportionate period of time.
12. The appeal on ground (g) therefore fails.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should not succeed. I shall uphold the enforcement notice.

Formal Decision

14. The appeal is dismissed and the enforcement notice is upheld.

R Bartlett

INSPECTOR