
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 3 February 2026 by E Street BSc (Hons) MSc

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 18 February 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/J0405/D/25/3376678

30 Oldhams Meadow, Bierton, Buckinghamshire HP20 2UT

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Amelia Hearn against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council - North Area (Aylesbury).
 - The application Ref is 25/01411/APP.
 - The development proposed is described as "Removal of current wooden picket fence that borders the side garden (to right, if facing house) This is rotting and leaning over. This would be replaced with an over 1.8m fence with trellis and access gates".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted for removal of current wooden picket fence that borders the side garden (to right, if facing house). This would be replaced with an over 1.8m fence with trellis and access gates at 30 Oldhams Meadow, Bierton, Buckinghamshire HP20 2UT in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 25/01411/APP, subject to the conditions below:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with drawing numbers: PP-13851511v3, Proposed new boundary fence (July 2025)

Appeal Procedure, Preliminary Matter & Main Issue

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal. The description on the application form differs to the decision notice. However, I am satisfied that the original description sufficiently describes the appeal development and is therefore reflected above, albeit with some superfluous explanatory details removed. The main issue in the appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons for the Recommendations

3. The appeal site is a residential area whereby the semi-detached building sits on a slight curve in the road. Dwellings vary in their siting and scale, with some having gardens backing onto the road causing instances of high sided close boarded fences and walling abutting the public realm, close to the back edge of the pavement. There are some lower picket fences, however these are generally sited forward of a front elevation of a building. These features in combination contribute to a varied and diverse street scene.

4. The appeal proposal would present a tall and solid fence to the street. The top section would be visually permeable. It is to be positioned to the side and rear elevation of the building. Whilst it would be obvious and prominent, its presence would not be unduly harmful given its positioning to the side and rear and part semi-permeable design. Since there are fences of a similar height and significant continuous length enclosing rear and side elevations elsewhere and very close by, the proposals would not overly stand out. The current side garden does not make a significant visual contribution to the openness of the street scene given the other open parcels of land accessed by the public and how these primarily serve the dwelling.
5. Overall, the features together would assimilate with the wider street scene and would not result in unacceptable harm. The scheme would thus comply with Policy BE2 of the Vale of Aylesbury Local Plan 2021 which together seek to ensure that development proposals are of a high-quality design and standard.

Other Matter

6. Highway safety concerns did not translate into a reason for refusal. There would be no change to the access leading into the appeal site's parking area, only the new fencing around their space. Resultantly, and due to the positioning of fencing in regard to parking spaces and low manoeuvring speeds, it would unlikely impinge on the visibility of drivers using the space nor on other users of the wider public highway with which the space would not connect.

Conditions

7. The standard time limit condition and reference to the approved plans is necessary for enforcement purposes. The plans also detail the proposed materials to be used. Since they are acceptable, I have not recommended a materials condition. The Council has not set out any other conditions, and I have not deemed any others necessary.

Conclusion and Recommendation

8. For the reasons given above, the scheme would comply with the development plan, I therefore recommend that the appeal should be allowed.

E Street

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

9. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is allowed, and planning permission is granted, subject to the conditions set out above.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR