



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 18 June 2026

by **C Billings BA (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 15 July 2026

Appeal Ref: 6007833

Oakfield Farm, Watling Street, Craven Arms SY7 8DX

- 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 Mr Colin Bowen against the decision of Shropshire Council.
 - The application Ref is 26/00791/AG1.
 - The development proposed is a covered muck store.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this appeal is whether the proposed development would be granted planning permission by Article 3, Schedule 2, Part 6, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order (as amended) (GPDO) with regard to paragraph A.1(i), in particular whether the proposal would be for the storage of slurry or sewage sludge.

Reasons

3. The proposed development would be for the storage and handling of solid farmyard manure arising from the livestock enterprise. The manure would be solid, straw-based, stackable and non-pumpable. It is set out that it would not include slurry, liquid waste handling, tanks, lagoons or pumping infrastructure.
4. The wording at A.1(i) of Article 3, Schedule 2, Part 6, Class A, refers specifically to slurry or sewage sludge, which could imply water-based as opposed to solid animal manure. However, D.1 (1) of Part 6 provides interpretation for classes A to C, including that the definition of “slurry” means animal faeces and urine (whether or not water has been added for handling).
5. Even if there are other distinctions between what is slurry and solid manure, including those adopted by DEFRA and the Environment Agency and no evidence of any appeal decisions of legislative basis for treating a covered muck store for solid farmyard manure as slurry storage. For the purposes of interpreting “slurry” in relation to development permitted under Article 3, Schedule 2, Part 6, Class A.1(i) of the GPDO, slurry includes non-water based animal faeces. Consequently, the proposed storage of livestock manure would fall within the definition of slurry for the purposes of Part 6, Class A.1 of the GPDO in this instance. This is the case even though the manure would be solid and non-pumpable.

6. Accordingly, while the proposed development would be within the applicable dimensional thresholds, located on an agricultural unit exceeding 5 hectares and, be reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture, the proposed covered muck store would include the storage of 'slurry'¹. In view of this, and that the structure would be within 400 metres of the curtilage of a protected building; as undisputed by the main parties, means that the proposal would not be permitted development under Article 3, Schedule 2, Part 6, Class A(1)(i) of the GPDO.

Conclusion

7. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

C Billings

INSPECTOR

¹ As defined under D.1 (1) of Article 3, Schedule 2, Part 6 of the GPDO