

DELEGATED DECISION REPORT

DET/2026/0017
Valid 11/06/2026

LAND WEST OF PORTERS
LANE
BRADNOP

APPLICATION TO DETERMINE
IF PRIOR APPROVAL IS
REQUIRED FOR A PROPOSED
AGRICULTURAL BUILDING

(AGRICULTURAL/FORESTRY
DETERMINATION)

MAIN ISSUES

Whether or not the proposal can be determined under a Part 6 Class A - Agricultural Development on Units of 5 Hectares or more Prior Notification application

Whether the LPA wishes to approve details of siting design and external appearance.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The site is a parcel of grassland on the western side of Porter's Lane and to the north of the A523 Ashbourne Road. There is an existing vehicular access off Porter's Lane with fields gates and some hardstanding at the access mouth. Trees / hedgerows mark many of the field boundaries. To the north of the proposed access track there is a detached stone barn which sits at the field boundary. Public Right of Way Bradnop and Cawdry (26) runs to the side of the stone barn in the direction of the A523. The application site sits within the open countryside to the south-east of Bradnop, it is not within the Green Belt.

PROPOSAL

This is a resubmission for an agricultural building under a prior approval.

The original application ref DET/2025/0046 was refused on lack of agricultural justification and siting. The applicant proposed an agricultural building that sat 220m from the existing access gate connected by a formal track.

Under this application, the agricultural building will have a width of 12.3m, length of 30m, eaves height of 4.8 and a dual-pitch ridge of 6m. The building would sit 110m from the existing vehicular access gate and sited next to established trees that defines the parcel of grassland north of the site. It will be constructed of concrete side panels and dark green profiled sheeting for the walls, and dark green profiled metal sheeting for the roof. The building would be used for the storage of hay, haylage and machinery. The application form confirms that the building would not be used for housing livestock.

RELEVANT LOCAL AND NATIONAL PLANNING POLICIES

Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan
SS10 Other Rural Areas Area Strategy
DC1 Design Considerations

DC3 Landscape and Settlement Setting
T1 Development and Sustainable Transport

Supplementary Planning Guidance
Design Principles for Development
Staffordshire Moorlands Design Guide

National Planning Policy Framework
2. Achieving sustainable development
12. Achieving well-designed places

SITE HISTORY / RELEVANT PREVIOUS APPLICATIONS

88/00874/OLD Change of use of barn to dwelling. Refused.
86/00041/OLDDC Overhead lines supported on wooden poles. Approved
84/13460/OLDDC Conversion of barn on land. Refused
DET/2025/0046 Application to determine if prior approval is required for a proposed new agricultural building. Refused

CONSULTATIONS

There are no provisions within Part 6 of Schedule 2 of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) for public consultation, other than by display of a site notice in the event the local planning authority deems that Prior Approval is required. In this instance Bradnop Parish Council have been notified.

Bradnop Parish Council
No representations received.

OFFICER COMMENTS

In order for a building to benefit from agricultural Prior Approval, there are several criteria that must be met.

Part 6 Class A is made up of two parts. The first part is to consider whether the proposal is considered permitted development and the second part is the subsequent conditions, that determines against siting, design and external appearance of the building. The report is divided under Part A and Part B.

Part A

In this case, as the site is greater than 5 hectares in size, these criteria are set out in

Part 6 Class A (a).

These are:-

- 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 proposal is for the erection of an agricultural building.

In the original application, the applicant failed to demonstrate what the application site formed part of, or be connected to, any established farmstead or agricultural unit; therefore, the case officer was unable to establish the necessity for an agricultural building within the application site.

Under this submission, the planning statement claims '*the applicant actively manages and utilises these areas as part of a single farming enterprise, with livestock grazing, fodder production and ongoing land management taking place across the wider land resource. The use of multiple parcels across the locality necessitates the storage and movement of machinery, equipment and fodder between sites. Therefore, the provision of a centrally located agricultural building on land within the applicant's control is therefore essential to support the efficient operation of the holding as a whole.*'

The agent has provided receipts, bank statements and invoices in respect of agricultural activity taking place, namely the service of hay/ hayage, evidence of equipment and machinery and, feed supply invoices directly to Apesford Farm House, Bradnop; this farm holding address is relatively close from the site at 1.3km south of the application site (approx. 5m drive away). Aerial view shows the farm holding to be well-established with a number of agricultural buildings on site. It is considered that while the evidence details the yield and necessary means to operate a large enterprise, it does not demonstrate the reasonably necessary need for a building within this specific site. The proposed building is isolated from the established farmstead at Apesford and as such, there is no obvious reason why this arrangement cannot continue. Furthermore, it would appear impractical to store machinery and farming equipment that has little surveillance and means to protect from theft given how disconnected the land is to the farmholding.

The application submission state that the existing stone barn is used for some storage but the planning statement confirms that the building is undersized for the accommodation of any farming equipment or hay / haylage bales. The case officer recognises the barn does not meet the standards to the modern farming equipment, nevertheless, the proposed building would sit in a relatively isolated part of the open countryside dissociated with the farm holding.

The application fails on the inability to demonstrate reasonable necessity, it is relevant to consider the application against the Part 6, Class A criteria.

Development is not permitted by Class A if—

a) the development would be carried out on a separate parcel of land forming part of the unit which is less than 1 hectare in area;

The building sits within a parcel of land that is more than 1 hectare in area.

b) it would consist of the erection or extension of any agricultural building on an established agricultural unit (as defined in paragraph X of Part 3 of this Schedule) where development under Class Q or S of Part 3 (changes of use) of this Schedule has been carried out within a period of 10 years ending with the date on which development under Class A(a) begins;

The land has not been subject to a Class Q development.

c) it would consist of, or include, the erection, extension or alteration of a dwelling;

The proposal does not include the erection, extension or alteration of a dwelling.

d) it would involve the provision of a building, structure or works not designed for agricultural purposes;

It does not involve the provision of a building, structure or works not designed for agricultural purposes. The design and access statement states that it

would be used for the management of livestock and the storage of fodder and equipment essential to the operation of the farm. When not used for hay/haylage the building will be used for the storage of agricultural machinery and equipment. As per the proposed plan, the design of the building does not raise concerns as it is a typical steel agricultural building.

e) the ground area which would be covered by—

(i) any works or structure (other than a fence) for accommodating livestock or any plant or machinery arising from engineering operations; or

(ii) any building erected or extended or altered by virtue of Class A, would exceed 1000 square metres, calculated as described in paragraph D.1(2)(a) of this Part;

The ground area to be covered does not exceed 1000m². The footprint is 375m².

f) the height of any part of any building, structure or works within 3 kilometres of the perimeter of an aerodrome would exceed 3 metres;

The building is not to be located within 3 kilometres of the perimeter of an aerodrome.

g) the height of any part of any building, structure or works not within 3 kilometres of the perimeter of an aerodrome would exceed 12 metres;

No part of the building would exceed 12 metres in height (the highest point is 6 metres).

h) any part of the development would be within 25 metres of a metalled part of a trunk road or classified road;

It is not to be sited within 25 metres of a metalled part of a trunk road or classified road. The nearest main road (Porters Lane) is at least 100m east of the site.

i) it would consist of, or include, the erection or construction of, or the carrying out of any works to, a building, structure or an excavation used or to be used for the accommodation of livestock or for the storage of slurry or sewage sludge where the building, structure or excavation is, or would be, within 400 metres of the curtilage of a protected building;

The building will not be used for the accommodation of livestock.

j) it would involve excavations or engineering operations on or over article 2(4) land which are connected with fish farming; or

Not applicable

k) any building for storing fuel for or waste from a biomass boiler or an anaerobic digestion system—

(i) would be used for storing waste not produced by that boiler or system or for storing fuel not produced on land within the unit; or

(ii) is or would be within 400 metres of the curtilage of a protected building.

The building will not be used for storing fuel for or waste from a biomass boiler or an anaerobic digestion system

Siting, design and External Appearance: Part B

The application meets all the required criteria under Part 6 Class A. Therefore, the second main issues is the effect of the proposal on the appearance of the surrounding area, having regard to its siting, design and external appearance set out under Class A2.

Full details of siting, design and external appearance have already been provided with the application. The agent has also submitted the applicant's plan along with invoices, receipts and bank statements relating to the purchase of livestock, agricultural supplies, machinery use and means for the holding.

The building will be made of concrete side panels and dark green profiled sheeting for the walls, and dark green profiled metal sheeting for the roof. A roller shutter door and personnel door for access will be on the west elevation. It is a conventional modern agricultural building to which I have no doubt that the design and appearance would serve the purpose for agriculture as described.

In terms of scale and siting, the building is proposed to have a footprint of 375m and would be sited 110m west of the existing vehicular access farm gate, linking to porters Lane. No formal track has been proposed given the close distance to the vehicular access. The application will have a ridge height of 6m, width of 12.3m, length of 30m and eaves height of 4.8.

The planning statement states the proposed building will be positioned at the mid-distance to the left-hand side of the image-below, a notably dense and protruding tree can be seen extending beyond the established tree line.



The building would benefit from the natural screening albeit visible from the access from Porters Lane. Nevertheless, the building is large. Whilst it may be smaller in size than what can be supported in principle within the Part 6 criteria, it is nonetheless a large structure which would have visual impact upon this part of the countryside. Furthermore, it does not account for the seasonal change especially during the winter months when foliage is less dense. The views of the building during this period would be noticeable and considered to undermine the wider rural hinterland.

PROW Bradnop and Crawdry (26) would have clear views of the building as it runs at the other end of Porters Lane adjacent to the stone barn. The agent states that *whilst the proposed building may be visible from sections of the route, this is a typical agricultural development within a working farmland and the proposal will be viewed in the context of an actively managed rural landscape*. Nevertheless, the case officer

would argue the proposal would introduce a large built structure that is poorly related to the existing development.

The agent refers to a recent allowed appeal decision: Holly Farm, Bradnop, Staffordshire Moorlands (ref 6001570). The agent claimed the agricultural buildings are frequently located away from existing built form due to operational requirements and access considerations. The inspector confirmed that visibility alone does not equate to harm, particularly where development is seen in the context of a working rural landscape and is not unduly prominent or intrusive. In this case, the reduced scale, removal of extensive engineering works, and siting against an established tree line ensure the proposal integrates appropriately within its surroundings.

Having read this appeal, it is worth noting that the proposed building was located close to existing structure and the access track- as shown below (X is where the building lies).

The case officer recognises that agricultural buildings are often sited away from other buildings. However, in this case the land does not appear to be connected to or form part of a farmstead for an agricultural buildings of this size to appear visually appropriate. Ultimately, however, each case must be judged on its own merits and it is considered that the characteristics of the Holly Farm appeal site are materially different to this site.



Other matters

The planning statement noted that the applicant has a large mobile home on the land and is being pursued by Planning Enforcement. This would be removed following permission of the new agricultural building. The mobile home is not considered relevant to this prior approval as this is not comparable to an agricultural building either in terms of its use or its degree of permanence.

CONCLUSION / PLANNING BALANCE

For the reasons outlined within the report, it is found that the application has not satisfactorily demonstrated the proposal is reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture within the unit. It is also found that due to the size and location, the development would be harmful in terms of siting and scale.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION : Prior approval required and refused

Case Officer: Lisa O'Brien

Recommendation Date: 8th July 2026

X *B.J. Haywood*

Signed by: Ben Haywood

On behalf of Staffordshire Moorlands District Council