


Report to be read in conjunction with the Decision Notice.

Signed:	Officer:	LW	Date:	07/05/26	Manager:	LH	Date:	12/5/26
----------------	-----------------	----	--------------	----------	-----------------	----	--------------	---------

Application Ref:	3/2026/0216			 Ribble Valley Borough Council www.ribblevalley.gov.uk			
Date Inspected:	N/A	Site Notice:	N/A				
Officer:	LW						
DELEGATED ITEM FILE REPORT:				Decision	REFUSAL		

Development Description:	Prior notification for proposed agricultural storage building 30.2m long, 13m wide, 6.45m high to ridge and 5.3m high to eaves under Part 6 Class A of the GPDO.
Site Address/Location:	Carr Hall, Whalley Road, Wilpshire, BB1 9LJ.

CONSULTATIONS:	Parish/Town Council
N/A	

CONSULTATIONS:	Highways/Water Authority/Other Bodies
N/A	

CONSULTATIONS:	Additional Representations.
N/A	

RELEVANT POLICIES AND SITE PLANNING HISTORY:
Schedule 2, Part 6, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 and (Amendment) Order 2018
Relevant Planning History:
3/2024/0124: Prior notification for proposed agricultural storage building 30.2m long, 13m wide, 6.45m high to ridge and 5.3m high to eaves (Permission Required).
3/2009/0503: Implement and hay store 27.5m x 12.5m (Permission Required).
3/2009/0210: Erection of agricultural cattle shed (Refused).
3/2008/0043: The erection of a steel portal framed building to house livestock (Withdrawn).

ASSESSMENT OF PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT:
Site Description and Surrounding Area:
The application site is located to the south-east of Whalley Road at Carr Hall, between the defined settlements of Langho and Wilpshire and on land which is designated as Green Belt. To the south of the proposal site is Carr Hall Woodlands which is protected under a Tree Preservation Order.

Proposed Development for which consent is sought:

The application seeks a determination as to whether the Council's prior approval is required for the construction of a proposed agricultural storage building.

The proposed building would measure 30.2m by 13m with an eaves and ridge height of 5.3m and 6.45m respectively. The building would be constructed from block work to the lower elevations and dark green profile sheeting to the upper elevations and roof. To the front elevation, two timber sliding doors would be featured.

A new area of hardstanding would also be created as part of the development.

The application is a re-submission of prior approval application 3/2024/0124 which was refused for the following reason:

Insufficient evidence has been provided to demonstrate that the proposed development would be reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture, and the submitted information fails to show that the proposed development is needed to support the agricultural activity currently in operation on the agricultural holding.

Prior approval is also required and refused in regard to siting and design/appearance in accordance with condition A2 (2) (i) of Schedule 2, Part 6, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015.

Whether or not permitted development

The scheme must satisfy a number of criteria as set out under Class A of Part 6 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended 2018).

The first of those requirements is that the development must be 'carried out on an agricultural unit of 5 hectares or more' and be 'reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture within that unit'. To qualify as an 'agricultural unit' the land must be used in agriculture for the purposes of a trade or business.

Prior approval application 3/2024/0124 was refused on the grounds that the 'reasonably necessary' test had not been met. In an attempt to address this, an updated Agricultural Justification statement has been submitted in support of this current application.

The submitted Agricultural Justification document states that the Applicant operates a long-standing agricultural business from Cunliffe House Farm and for the past six years have farmed agricultural land at Carr Hall under a Farm Business Tenancy. Following a period where the land was split between two tenants, the Applicant has held the tenancy for the entirety of the land (36.8 hectares) for the last two years and now seeks to consolidate and formalise their operations on the site.

The information goes on to state the holding is used for grazing and intensive forage production (mowing for hay and silage). The current stocking density on the land consists of 80 cattle and 200 sheep annually, which, in winter, are fed on a provin mix and silage, distributed via a feed mixer machine.

It is stated that the holding produces high volumes of winter fodder, with the proposed building sized specially to house up to 260 big bales of hay and silage in addition to bulk provin mix, with indoor storage vital to maintain the nutritional value of the feed and prevent spoilage from the elements. The statement goes on to note that in order to manage a holding of this size, a significant fleet of machinery is required on site. Currently, these items are said to be stored outside and exposed to the weather or transported back and forth from the main farm to the proposed site, with the proposed building thus also serving as

secure, weather-protected storage for tractors, trailers, mower, tedder, baler, feed mixer trailer, telehandler and various other implements, subsequently reducing the transportation of heavy machinery and winter feed.

In seeking to further justify the proposed development, the Agent has stated that there is no direct access between the parcel of land in question and Cunliffe House Farm, with the land at Carr Hall forming a separate parcel with no existing agricultural building. Cunliffe House Farm has extensive buildings accessed from a driveway off an adopted road, The Rydings, which leads onto the Langho Centre, south from Longsight Road. The buildings at Cunliffe House Farm include four dwellings, a small garden centre and numerous agricultural buildings. It is understood that this is currently the only site from which the farm business operates and to date all the hay and silage made at Carr Hall has been transported back to Cunliffe House Farm only to be transported back again to Carr Hall when livestock have needed feeding, resulting in additional time, fuel and traffic disturbance along the A59.

Despite this, it is necessary to consider what is reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture on the whole of the unit, not merely on the Carr Hall land. Cunliffe House Farm is located an approximately 1.5 miles from proposal site by road and no further details have been received regarding the main base at Cunliffe House Farm to sufficiently evidence that any other existing buildings within the agricultural holding cannot provide the storage space for the intended purposes. Even if it was accepted that a separate building was reasonably necessary on this piece of land, it is considered unlikely that significant pieces of machinery would be stored here due to a lack of surveillance, and the building is considered excessive in scale for crop storage which is the need emphasised in the agent's latest email of the 13th April. It is not disputed that the building would be ideally located to serve the land at Carr Hall; however, this does not mean that the proposal is reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture within this unit which is the relevant test in this case. Based on this, it cannot be concluded with certainty that the proposed development is reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture.

Additionally, there are concerns that two plans have been provided identifying the agricultural land holding. One, a site location plan submitted with the application, includes Carr Hall within the identified red edge, which is a commercial enterprise not an agricultural enterprise. The second, a plan provided by the agent on 13th April excludes Carr Hall but includes all the land at Cunliffe House Farm, again some of which is a commercial enterprise not an agricultural enterprise.

Furthermore, there are concerns that limited evidence on this being for an agricultural trade or business purpose has been provided. Whilst planning applications at Cunliffe House Farm suggest this site should reasonably be considered to be an agricultural enterprise, no evidence that the agricultural land at Carr Hall is also used in connection with that enterprise has been provided.

As such the proposal is not considered to be permitted development under Class A Part 6 and it is not necessary to go onto consider the rest of the criteria. However, in the interests of completeness and transparency the LPA's assessment on this is set out below.

Having regard to criteria a) – k), 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 development would be carried out on a parcel of land which is greater 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;

No development on the site has been carried out under Class Q or S of Part 3 of this Schedule within the last 10 years.

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

The development does not include any works in relation to a dwelling.

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

The proposal comprises an agricultural storage building and associated hardstanding.

(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 would exceed 1000 square metres; or

(ii) any building erected or extended or altered by virtue of Class A, would exceed 1500 square metres, calculated as described in paragraph D.1(2)(a) of this Part;

The ground area to be covered by the proposed building would measure approximately 392 square metres.

(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 proposed building is not within 3km 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;

The maximum height of the proposed building would measure 6.45 metres.

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

The proposed development would not be within 25 metres of a metalled part of a trunk road or classified road.

(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 proposal would not be used for the accommodation of livestock or for the storage of slurry or sewage sludge.

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

The proposal would not involve excavations or engineering operations on or over article 2(4) land which are connected with fish farming.

(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 proposed building would not be used for storing fuel for or waste from a biomass boiler or an anaerobic digestion system.

Whilst the proposal satisfies criteria a) – k), as stated above the proposed development would not constitute permitted development under the GPDO.

Whether or not prior approval is needed

Notwithstanding the above and in the interest of transparency, the Local Authority has still gone on to assess whether prior approval is required as to the siting, design and external appearance of the proposal, in accordance with condition A2 (2) (i).

Siting

The proposed building would not take a visually prominent position within the surrounding landscape, being set back from the main highway of Whalley Road and screened from view by the existing structures associated with Carr Hall. In this context, the proposed development would not appear an isolated addition to the application site or surrounding landscape.

The siting of the building has been amended slightly since the refusal of 3/2024/0124 in order to increase the distance from the periphery trees of the Carr Hall Woodland, situated to the south of the proposal which are protected under a Tree Preservation Order. However, no Arboricultural Impact Assessment, or information detailing any trees protection measures, were submitted with the application. As such, prior approval was deemed to be required in terms of siting, given it was unknown whether the proposal would affect the Woodland.

Following this, an Arboricultural Impact Assessment has been submitted in support of the proposal. The Assessment states that the site contains a limited arboricultural resource comprising two individual oak trees and one woodland group, all classified as Category B (moderate quality). Collectively, these features provide moderate value, contributing to local landscape character, boundary screening and ecological function. A drainage ditch/ watercourse is present along the woodland boundary and has been treated as a relevant physical and hydrological constraint. The Assessment goes on to note that the proposed development has been designed to avoid direct conflict with retained trees. No removals are required, and all trees can be retained without adverse impact, subject to appropriate protection. The proposed building and associated hardstanding are shown outside the plotted Root Protection Areas on the Tree Impacts and Protection Plan, drawings TIP-001 Rev A and standard arboricultural protection measures are proposed during construction works to ensure the long-term retention of the trees. With this in mind, the siting of the development is considered acceptable.

As such prior approval is required and approved in terms of siting.

Design / appearance

The proposed building would comprise a relatively large footprint; however, when read in context with the existing nearby built form, it is not considered that the proposal would read as an incongruous or over dominant addition. The building would be constructed from block work and dark green profiled sheeting to both the external elevations and roof, both of which are typical of agricultural buildings. The roller shutter doors proposed under application 3/2024/0124 have also been replaced with timber sliding doors which would appear more agricultural in nature.

As such prior approval is not required in terms of design and appearance.

Observations/Consideration of Matters Raised/Conclusion:

The applicant has failed to provide robust evidence to demonstrate that the proposed development is reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture within the unit. The proposed development would therefore not constitute permitted development under the GPDO.

RECOMMENDATION:

That Prior Approval be refused.