



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 February 2025

by **John D Allan BA(Hons) BTP MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 7th March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/N1730/D/25/3358650

6 Moore Road, Church Crookham, Fleet, Hampshire, GU52 6JB

- 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 Mr Jeremy Edwards against the decision of Hart District Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/01191/HOU.
 - The development proposed is the enclosure of existing shed.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the enclosure of existing shed at 6 Moore Road, Church Crookham, Fleet, Hampshire, GU52 6JB in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 24/01191/HOU, and the plans submitted with it.

Procedural Matters

2. The application was made retrospectively after the work had been completed.
3. The application form contained a lengthy description of the works, describing an existing shed in need of repair. The Council's decision notice described the works as '*enclosure of existing shed*'. This was repeated by the appellant on the appeal form. I have used these form of words, which reasonably describe the development that has been undertaken, in the banner heading above and in my formal decision.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is the effect of the development upon the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal property is a detached dwelling set back from its frontage onto Moore Road within a residential area. The property is enclosed along the back edge of the pavement by tall timber fence panels. The modified shed sits forward of the dwelling and in a corner of the dwelling's frontage, close to the road and shared side boundary with 4 Moore Road. The timber clad building has a shallow, mono-pitched roof with its side elevation facing the road.
6. The building reaches a maximum height of 2.23m and can be partially seen from Moore Road above the height of the existing boundary fence. However, I found it to be neither imposing nor incongruous in its setting. The frontage to the appeal

property is large with ample space to accommodate the shed, which is perceived as an obvious ancillary and modest sized outbuilding in both form and function.

7. Furthermore, the garden frontages to properties along Moore Road vary considerably, with many bound by tall enclosures to the front and sides. They do not contribute to any significant sense of openness within the street scene. As such, I do not consider the frontage to No 6 to be overly sensitive to the degree of change that has been made to the original shed; the former presence of which appears undisputed by the main parties.
8. Overall, I am unable to identify any harm to the character or appearance of the area as a result of the development. As such, there is no conflict with Policy NBE9 of the Hart Local Plan (Strategy and Sites) 2032, adopted 2020, or saved Policy GEN1 of the Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006 as far as they both support development that respects local character. For the same reason I am satisfied that there is no conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework's objectives for achieving well designed places.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given, the appeal is allowed. As the development has taken place, I have no reason to impose any conditions.

John D Allan

INSPECTOR