



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 February 2026

by **D R Kay BA Dip.Arch RIBA**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 27 March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/N0410/W/25/3375616

Fulmer Wood Farm, Fulmer Common Road, Fulmer, Buckinghamshire SL3 6AA

- 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 UCC UK against the decision of Buckinghamshire Council.
 - The application Ref is PL/25/2120/AGN.
 - The development proposed is the notification of agricultural or forestry development under Schedule 2, Part 6 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 for: chicken coop and sheep barn.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and prior approval is granted under the provisions of Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 6, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended) for the notification of agricultural or forestry development under Schedule 2, Part 6 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 for: chicken coop and sheep barn at Fulmer Wood Farm, Fulmer Common Road, Fulmer, Buckinghamshire SL3 6AA in accordance with the application PL/25/2120/AGN and the details submitted with it.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application form describes the area of the agricultural unit as 6 hectares. However, the design and access statement which accompanied the application denotes the area of the agricultural unit as approximately 7.5 hectares, as defined by the submitted land use plan, and which corresponds with the County Parish Holding (CPH) number 03/194/0185. As both figures are above the minimum 5-hectare threshold required by the GPDO, I have not sought further clarification from the parties, as it would not be determinative.

Background and Main Issues

3. Schedule 2, Part 6, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England), Order 2015 (as amended) (GPDO) sets out that agricultural development, which is reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture, on units of 5 hectares or more is permitted development, subject to certain restrictions, limitations and conditions.
4. This includes a requirement that, under Paragraph A.2 (2) of Class A, the developer applies to the local planning authority for a determination as to whether the prior approval of the authority will be required as to the siting, design and external appearance of the building, amongst other matters.

5. There is no dispute that the site is an agricultural unit which meets the size threshold. However, the main parties are in dispute with regards to whether the proposed buildings are reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture, and in relation to the siting of the proposed buildings.
6. Accordingly, the main issues are:
 - Whether, or not, the proposed buildings are reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture within the unit; and if so,
 - Whether, or not, prior approval should be granted having regard to the matter of the siting, design and external appearance of the proposed buildings.

Reasons

7. The appeal site is part of Fulmer Wood Farm, an estate which runs to around 80 hectares (197 acres) in area. A significant proportion of the overall estate is woodland, principally to its northern and western areas, together with a large body of water known as Upton Lake. The open agricultural land is situated to its eastern and southern areas, adjoining Black Park Road and Rowley Lane. The estate previously housed a large residential farmhouse and its agricultural outbuildings, several of which had been granted prior notification under Class Q of Part 3, Schedule 2 of the GPDO, for change of use to several dwellings.
8. Following sale of the property, the farmhouse and its outbuildings were the subject of a planning application¹ for the demolition of the farmhouse and all its associated outbuildings, and their replacement with a large single residence. At my visit, it was apparent that development relating to this approval was in the latter stages of completion.

Whether or not reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture

9. Owing to its long history as part of Fulmer Wood Farm and its valid CPH number (03/194/0185), the agricultural use of the appeal site is acknowledged by the Council. It is further acknowledged by the Council that the proposal would comply with criteria (a) to (l) of A.1 of Class A, Part 6, Schedule 2 of the GPDO, and with Conditions (a) to (c) outlined in A.2 of Class A, Part 6, Schedule 2 of the GPDO. Having examined the evidence, I have no reason to find otherwise.
10. At my visit, the agricultural unit encompassed a small number of open, relatively flat fields suited to grazing pasture and to the production of hay. I observed no existing buildings on the site, and at the time, there were no animals currently grazing within the fields.
11. The proposals would provide a chicken coop with roost, run and food store areas, all located within a secure compound, and proposed to accommodate a flock of around 49 chickens. They would also provide a separate small building within its own secure compound, incorporating a sheep barn, to provide shelter for sheep, especially during lambing, together with an area for the storage of feed and equipment associated with the care and management of a flock of around 25 sheep. There would also be a small wash bay building adjacent, to ensure hygiene security for the care of the livestock.

¹ PL/22/1176/FA

12. The design and size of the proposed buildings appear commensurate with the agricultural purposes to which they are proposed to be put, and which would accord with the size of the agricultural unit for which they are proposed to serve.
13. Given this information and the evidence presented in the application, including the letter from Acorus, I conclude that I am satisfied that the proposed buildings would be reasonably necessary for the purposes of agriculture within the agricultural unit, in accordance with paragraph A of Schedule 2, Part 6, Class A of the GPDO.

Siting, design and external appearance

14. Paragraph A2(2)(i) of the GPDO requires determination as to whether prior approval is required as to the siting, design and external appearance of the proposed buildings.
15. The Council state that the buildings, would be sited in the open, undeveloped Green Belt and would be at considerable distance from the nearest vehicular access point. However, considerations relating to Green Belt fall outside of the scope of applications under Part 6 of the GPDO, and in any case, would benefit from the exception to inappropriate development in the Green Belt, contained in paragraph 154(a) of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
16. With regards to the relationship of the proposed buildings to the nearest vehicular access, at my visit, I observed an existing, approximately 4-metre-wide, tarmac surfaced road, which appeared to be of some age. This ran from its junction with the main driveway to and from the main dwelling to Black Park Road, in an s-shaped curve, through the wooded area, to the north of the field within which the buildings are proposed to be sited. Whilst this access road enters the field towards its north-east corner, vehicles which would normally be used for agricultural purposes, do not always require hard surfaced tracks to carry out agricultural work. I therefore find that the proposal would be provided with adequate vehicular access to the field within which they are proposed to be located.
17. The chicken coop, sheep barn and associated wash area buildings are proposed to be located within the north-west corner of the main field, at a position which would be the closest to the main dwelling, whilst remaining within the defined area of the agricultural unit. This field shares its eastern boundary with Black Park Road. Whilst there is a 2.4 metre high, black steel mesh security fence, erected following a recent planning approval² to the boundary with the road, this does allow views through into the agricultural unit from the public realm, though such views are restricted in areas where trees and hedges are present along the boundary. The proposed buildings would be around 100 metres from the closest vantage point from the road.
18. To the north and west of the location of the proposed buildings are dense mature woodlands of mixed evergreen and deciduous trees. The proposed buildings would be modest in size, being well under the maximum floor area allowed by the GPDO. Their scale, being a maximum of just under 4.5m to the ridge of the pitched-roof sheep barn, as the largest building, would also be modest. The chicken coop and wash bay buildings would be much smaller, mono-pitch roofed buildings. Their design, and modest scale, would be consistent with agricultural buildings normally

² PL/23/2915/FA

found within such an agricultural setting, such as field shelters for livestock or horses.

19. The materials proposed for their construction, being timber to their walls and metal sheeting to their roofs would also be consistent with that normally expected for such livestock shelters. Whilst the chicken coop and sheep barn would both be enclosed within fenced paddock areas, these would be normal for protection of chickens from predators, and to create a secure pen area for sheep and their lambs at lambing time.
20. Consequently, due to their positioning at some distance away from the highway and adjacent to significant areas of woodland, their modest scale and design, and their materials, the proposed buildings would be unlikely to draw any significant attention. They would not appear as either overly dominant or incongruous additions in the landscape. As a result, I find the proposal would accord with the Framework by ensuring that development is sympathetic to local character.
21. For the above reasons, I conclude that the siting, design and external appearance of the proposed buildings would be acceptable. Prior approval should therefore be granted.

Conditions

22. Development under Schedule 2, Part 6, Class A is permitted subject to standard conditions set out at Paragraph A.2 under Class A. These include that the development must be completed within a period of five years, starting with the prior approval date. The GPDO does not provide any specific authority, for this type of development, to impose additional conditions beyond those listed above.

Conclusion

23. For the reasons given above, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed, and prior approval should be granted.

D R Kay

INSPECTOR