



RUSHMOOR BOROUGH COUNCIL

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

*at the Council Offices, Farnborough on
Wednesday, 25th June, 2025 at 7.00 pm*

To:

VOTING MEMBERS

Cllr Gaynor Austin (Chairman)
Cllr C.P. Grattan (Vice-Chairman)

Cllr Thomas Day
Cllr Peace Essien Igodifo
Cllr A.H. Gani

Cllr Lisa Greenway
Cllr S.J. Masterson
Cllr Dhan Sarki

Cllr Calum Stewart
Cllr Jacqui Vosper
Cllr Ivan Whitmee

NON-VOTING MEMBERS

Cllr Keith Dibble (ex-officio)

STANDING DEPUTIES

Cllr P.J. Cullum
Cllr Rhian Jones
Cllr G.B. Lyon
Cllr Nadia Martin

Enquiries regarding this agenda should be referred to Committee Administrator, Lucy Bingham,
Democratic Services, 01252 398128 lucy.bingham@rushmoor.gov.uk

A G E N D A

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST –

All Members who have or believe that they have any interest under the Rushmoor Borough Council Councillors' Code of Conduct, adopted in April 2021, in any matter to be considered at the meeting are required to disclose that interest at the start of the meeting (preferably) or as soon as possible thereafter and to take the necessary steps in light of their interest as to any participation in the agenda item.

2. MINUTES – (Pages 1 - 6)

To confirm the Minutes of the meeting held on 21st May, 2025 (copy attached).

3. PLANNING APPLICATIONS – (Pages 7 - 90)

To consider the Executive Head of Property and Growth's Report No. PG2520 on planning applications recently submitted to the Council (copy attached).

Sections A & B of the report set out the items to be considered at future meetings and petitions received:

Item	Reference Number	Address	Recommendation
i	21/00271/FULPP	Block 3 Queensmead, Farnborough	For information
ii	23/00713/FUL	Manor Park Cottage, St Georges Road East, Aldershot	For information
iii	23/00794/REVPP	Farnborough Airport	For information
iv	24/00237/FUL	Nos. 235-237 High Street, Aldershot	For information
v	25/00096/FULPP	Land at Nos. 38A-42 Southwood Road, Farnborough	For information
vi	25/00287/REMPP	Zone G Pennefathers, Aldershot Urban Extension, Alison's Road, Aldershot	For information
vii	24/00748/FUL & 24/00746/LBCPP	Land at Orchard Rise No.127 & La Fosse House No.129 Ship Lane & Farnborough Hill School, No. 312	For information

Farnborough Road,
Farnborough

Section C of the report sets out planning applications for determination at this meeting:

Item	Pages	Reference Number	Address	Recommendation
viii	15-67	24/00465/FULPP	Land at Former Lafarge Site, Hollybush Lane, Aldershot	Grant subject to a s106 agreement and conditions

Section D of the report sets out planning applications which have been determined under the Council's scheme of delegation for information.

MEETING REPRESENTATION

Members of the public may ask to speak at the meeting, on the planning applications that are on the agenda to be determined, by writing to the Committee Administrator at the Council Offices, Farnborough by 5.00 pm on the day prior to the meeting, in accordance with the Council's adopted procedure which can be found on the Council's website at

<http://www.rushmoor.gov.uk/speakingatdevelopmentmanagement>

This page is intentionally left blank

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Meeting held on Wednesday, 21st May, 2025 at the Concorde Room, Council Offices, Farnborough at 7.00 pm.

Voting Members

Cllr Gaynor Austin (Chairman)
Cllr C.P. Grattan (Vice-Chairman)

Cllr Thomas Day
Cllr Peace Essien Igodifo
Cllr A.H. Gani
Cllr S.J. Masterson
Cllr Dhan Sarki
Cllr Calum Stewart
Cllr Jacqui Vosper

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Cllr Lisa Greenway, Cllr Ivan Whitmee and Cllr Keith Dibble.

1. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Having regard to the Members' Code of Conduct, the following declarations of interest were made. All Members who had or believed that they had any interest under Rushmoor Borough Council's Councillor Code of Conduct, adopted in April 2021, in any matter to be considered at the meeting disclosed that interest at the start of the meeting or as soon as possible thereafter and took the necessary steps in light of their interest as to any participation in the agenda item:

Member	Application No. and Address	Interest	Action
Cllr Gaynor Austin	25/00117/REVPP – MacDonalds, No. 1 North Close, Aldershot	Personal	Cllr Austin did not take part in the meeting during the discussion and voting thereon
Cllr Calum Stewart	25/00117/REVPP – MacDonalds, No. 1 North Close, Aldershot	Personal	Cllr Stewart did not take part in the meeting during the discussion and voting thereon

2. MINUTES

The Minutes of the Meeting held on 9th April, 2025 were approved and signed as a correct record of proceedings.

3. REPRESENTATIONS OF THE PUBLIC

In accordance with the guidelines for public participation at meetings, the following representations were made to the Committee and were duly considered before a decision was reached:

Application No.	Address	Representation	In support of or against the application
25/00117/REVPP	No. 1 North Close, Aldershot	Sarah Walton (resident)	Against

4. PLANNING APPLICATIONS

RESOLVED: That

- (i) permission be given to the following application, as set out in Appendix “A” (as required), subject to the conditions, restrictions and prohibitions (if any) mentioned therein:

- * 25/00204/FUL Farnborough Market Site, Queensmead, Farnborough

- (ii) the following applications be determined by the Executive Head of Property and Growth, in consultation with the Chairman:

- * 25/00117/REVPP Macdonald’s, No. 1 North Close, Aldershot

- * 24/00634/FULPP Royal Pavilion, Wellesley Road, Aldershot

- (iii) the applications dealt with by the Executive Head of Property and Growth, where necessary in consultation with the Chairman, in accordance with the Council’s Scheme of Delegation, more particularly specified in Section “D” of the Executive Head of Property and Growth’s Report No. PG2516, be noted

- (iv) the current position with regard to the following applications be noted pending consideration at a future meeting:

21/00271/FULPP	Block 3 Queensmead, Farnborough
----------------	------------------------------------

23/00713/FUL	Manor Park Cottage, St Georges Road East, Aldershot
--------------	-----------------------------------------------------------

	23/00794/REVPP	Farnborough Airport
	24/00237/FUL	Nos. 235-237 High Street, Aldershot
**	24/00465/FULPP	Land at Former Lafarge Site, Hollybush Lane, Aldershot
	24/00748/FUL & 24/00746/LBCPP	Land at Orchard Rise No.127 & La Fosse House No.129 Ship Lane & Farnborough Hill School, No. 312 Farnborough Road, Farnborough
	25/00096/FULPP	Land at Nos. 38A-42 Southwood Road, Farnborough
*	The Executive Head of Property and Growth's Report No. PG2516 in respect of these applications was amended at the meeting.	
**	It was agreed that a site visit would be arranged to this site.	

5. **PLANNING APPLICATION NO. 25/00117/REVPP - MACDONALD'S, NO. 1 NORTH CLOSE, ALDERSHOT**

The Committee considered the Executive Head of Property and Growth's Report No. PG2516 (as amended at the meeting), regarding the variation of Condition 1 imposed on planning permission, to allow permitted hours of operation from 06:00 to 23:00, 7 days a week.

ACTION

What	By whom	When
To request Site Management Plan be amended to include a requirement that the lighting is switched off automatically.	Planning Department	As soon as possible
To check wording of SPEAK letter to ensure procedure is clear.	Planning Department	As soon as possible

6. **ENFORCEMENT AND POSSIBLE UNAUTHORISED DEVELOPMENT**

Enforcement Reference No.	Description of Breach
24/00115/OUTBDG	Outbuilding erected to the rear of No. 68 Rectory Road, Farnborough.

A complaint had been made that an outbuilding had been erected to the rear of No. 68 Rectory Road, which overhung the properties abutting the boundaries and was over 3 metres in height. Upon inspection, the outbuilding did not encroach onto neighbouring properties as it was located over a metre away from the boundaries. However, it was over 2.5 metres in height which was the permitted development allowance within 2 metres of a boundary and did require planning permission. The owner was told that planning permission was required but no application was forthcoming. Due to the position of the outbuilding and the distance from the boundaries, had an application been submitted, it would have been supported. It was not therefore necessary to take enforcement action.

RESOLVED: That the Executive Head of Property and Growth's Report No. PG2517 be noted.

7. **APPEALS PROGRESS REPORT**

The Committee received the Executive Head of Property and Growth's Report No. PG2518 concerning the following appeal decisions:

Application / Enforcement Case No.	Description	Decision
Unit 1 No. 106 Hawley Lane, Farnborough 25/0004/REFUSE	Appeal against refusal of planning permission to allow an increase in external building material storage heights to 5.5m.	New appeal
Car Park at Carmarthen Close, Farnborough	Appeal against the refusal of planning permission for the erection of a pair of semi-detached, two storey, 3-bed houses.	Dismissed
Units 1, 2 and 3, 14 Camp Road, Farnborough 25/00001/REFUSE and 25/00003/ENFA	Appeal against the refusal of planning permission for the regularised use of Units 1-3 and the forecourts as a vehicle service repair and MOT premises. The Inspector for the enforcement appeal had given the Council an opportunity to respond to the appellant's final comments, and third-party representations, by 21 May 2025.	Appeal ongoing

RESOLVED: That the Executive Head of Property and Growth's Report No. PG2518 be noted.

8. **PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT) SUMMARY REPORT FOR THE QUARTER 1ST JANUARY 2025 TO 31ST MARCH 2025**

The Committee received the Executive Head of Property and Growth's Report No. PG2519 which provided an update on the position with respect to achieving performance indicators for the Development Management Section of the Planning Service and the overall workload of the Section for the quarter from 1st January 2025 to 31st March 2025 and for the year 2024/25.

During discussion, the Committee noted that there were two minor errors in the Report, but these were not considered consequential. A query was raised as to whether Rushmoor could work with neighbouring authorities in future to align planning fees in time for Local Government Reorganisation (LGR). The Committee were advised that statutory planning fees were set nationally by the Government, although it could be subject to change in the future. It was noted that a quarterly Report would be produced in future detailing all Section 106 contributions, not just those relating to the Wellesley development.

RESOLVED: That the Executive Head of Property and Growth's Report No. PG2519 be noted.

ACTION

What

To produce a Report detailing all Section 106 contributions.

By whom

Planning Department

When

End of the first quarter

The meeting closed at 8.07 pm.

CLLR GAYNOR AUSTIN (CHAIRMAN)

This page is intentionally left blank

**Development Management
Committee 25th June 2025**

**Executive Head of Property
& Growth
Report No. PG2520**

Planning Applications

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This report considers recent planning applications submitted to the Council, as the Local Planning Authority, for determination.

2. Sections In The Report

- 2.1 The report is divided into a number of sections:

Section A – FUTURE Items for Committee

Applications that have either been submitted some time ago but are still not ready for consideration or are recently received applications that have been received too early to be considered by Committee. The background papers for all the applications are the application details contained in the Part 1 Planning Register.

Section B – For the NOTING of any Petitions

Section C – Items for DETERMINATION

These applications are on the Agenda for a decision to be made. Each item contains a full description of the proposed development, details of the consultations undertaken and a summary of the responses received, an assessment of the proposal against current policy, a commentary and concludes with a recommendation. A short presentation with slides will be made to Committee.

Section D – Applications ALREADY DETERMINED under the Council's adopted scheme of Delegation

This lists planning applications that have already been determined by the Head of Economy, Planning and Strategic Housing, and where necessary with the Chairman, under the Scheme of Delegation that was approved by the Development Management Committee on 17 November 2004. These applications are not for decision and are FOR INFORMATION only.

- 2.2 All information, advice and recommendations contained in this report are understood to be correct at the time of publication. Any change in circumstances will be verbally updated at the Committee meeting. Where a recommendation is either altered or substantially amended between preparing the report and the Committee meeting, a separate sheet will be circulated at

the meeting to assist Members in following the modifications proposed. This sheet will be available to members of the public.

3. Planning Policy

- 3.1 Section 38(6) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) requires regard to be had to the provisions of the development plan in the determination of planning applications. The development plan for Rushmoor comprises the Rushmoor Local Plan (February 2019), the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (October 2013) and saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan.
- 3.2 Although not necessarily specifically referred to in the Committee report, the relevant development plan will have been used as a background document and the relevant policies taken into account in the preparation of the report on each item. Where a development does not accord with the development plan and it is proposed to recommend that planning permission be granted, the application will be advertised as a departure and this will be highlighted in the Committee report.

4. Human Rights

- 4.1 The Human Rights Act 1998 (the Act) has incorporated part of the European Convention on Human Rights into English law. All planning applications are assessed to make sure that the subsequent determination of the development proposal is compatible with the Act. If there is a potential conflict, this will be highlighted in the report on the relevant item.

5. Public Speaking

- 5.1 The Committee has agreed a scheme for the public to speak on cases due to be determined at the meeting (Planning Services report PLN0327 refers). Members of the public wishing to speak must have contacted the Meeting Coordinator in Democratic Services by 5pm on the Tuesday immediately preceding the Committee meeting. It is **not** possible to arrange to speak to the Committee at the Committee meeting itself.

6. Late Representations

- 6.1 The Council has adopted the following procedures with respect to the receipt of late representations on planning applications (Planning report PLN 0113 refers):
 - a) All properly made representations received **before** the expiry of the final closing date for comment will be summarised in the Committee report. Where such representations are received after the agenda has been published, the receipt of such representations will be reported orally and the contents summarised on the amendment sheet that is circulated at the Committee meeting. Where the

final closing date for comment falls **after** the date of the Committee meeting, this will be highlighted in the report and the recommendation caveated accordingly.

- b) Representations from both applicants and others made **after** the expiry of the final closing date for comment and received **after** the report has been published will not be accepted unless they raise a new material consideration which has not been taken into account in the preparation of the report or draws attention to an error in the report.
- c) Representations that are sent to Members should not be accepted or allowed to influence Members in the determination of any planning application unless those representations have first been submitted to the Council in the proper manner (but see (b) above).
- d) Copies of individual representations will not be circulated to members but where the requisite number of copies are provided, copies of individual representation will be placed in Members' pigeonholes.
- e) All letters of representation will be made readily available in the Committee room an hour before the Committee meeting.

7. Financial Implications

- 7.1 There are no direct financial implications arising from this report. However, in the event of an appeal, further resources will be put towards defending the Council's decision. Rarely, and in certain circumstances, decisions on planning applications may result in the Council facing an application for costs arising from a planning appeal. Officers will aim to alert Members where this may be likely and provide appropriate advice in such circumstances.

Tim Mills
Executive Head of Property & Growth

Background Papers

- *The individual planning application file (reference no. quoted in each case) Rushmoor Local Plan (Adopted Feb 2019)*
- *Current government advice and guidance contained in circulars, ministerial statements and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG).*
- *Any other document specifically referred to in the report.*
- *Regional Spatial Strategy for the South East, policy NRM6: Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area.*
- *The National Planning Policy Framework.*
- *Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan (2013).*

This page is intentionally left blank

Section A

Future items for Committee

Section A items are for INFORMATION purposes only. It comprises applications that have either been submitted some time ago but are still not yet ready for consideration or are recently received applications that are not ready to be considered by the Committee. The background papers for all the applications are the application details contained in the Part 1 Planning Register.

Item	Reference	Description and address
i	21/00271/FULPP	<p>Erection of an extension to Kingsmead Shopping Centre; commercial, business and service uses on the ground floor (3,088sqm), 104 apartments over nine floors, private amenity space, 53 car parking spaces, up to 222 bicycle parking spaces, a bridge link and alterations to existing block 2 car park and the meads, a new entrance to The Meads Shopping Centre.</p> <p>Block 3 Queensmead Farnborough</p> <p>This application is subject to a request for an extension of time to consider further amendments.</p>
ii	23/00713/FUL	<p>Erection of four one-bedroom flats with parking.</p> <p>Manor Park Cottage, St Georges Road East</p> <p>Assessment of this application continues and has not yet reached the stage for Committee consideration.</p>
iii	23/00794/REVPP	<p>Variation of Condition 2 (aircraft movements) and 6 (aircraft weight), replacement of conditions 7 (1:10,000 risk contour) and 8 (1:100,00 risk contour), of planning permission 20/00871/REVPP determined on the 22/02/2022, in order to: a) to increase the maximum number of annual aircraft movements from 50,000 to 70,000 per annum, including an increase in non-weekday aircraft movements from 8,900 to 18,900 per annum, and b) to amend the aircraft weight</p>

		<p>category of 50,000 - 80,000 Kg, to 55,000 - 80,000 Kg, and an increase from 1,500 to 2,100 annual aircraft movements within this category, including an increase from 270 to 570 annual aircraft movements for non-weekdays, and to c) replace Conditions Nos. 7 (1:10,000 risk contour) and 8 (1:100,000 risk contour) with a new condition to produce Public Safety Zone maps in accordance with the Civil Aviation Authority/ Department for Transport Requirements.</p> <p>Farnborough Airport Farnborough Road Farnborough</p> <p>Assessment of this application continues and has not yet reached the stage for Committee consideration.</p>
iv	24/00237/FUL	<p>Demolition of existing buildings and construction of 8 new flats and maisonettes.</p> <p>235-237 High Street, Aldershot</p> <p>Assessment of this application continues and has not yet reached the stage for Committee consideration.</p>
v	25/00096/FULPP	<p>Construction of seven dwellings to the rear of Nos.38a-42 Southwood Road, along with the partial demolition of No.40 and construction of a single storey rear extension following the demolition of two garages and six sheds to facilitate construction of private access drive from Southwood Road to serve the proposed development.</p> <p>Land at 38A to 42 Southwood Road Farnborough</p> <p>This application was added to the list of Future Items at the last DM Committee meeting. Assessment of this application has not yet reached the stage for Committee consideration.</p>
vi	25/00287/REMPP	<p>APPROVAL OF RESERVED MATTERS for the construction of 90 residential dwellings (including the conversion of Bradgate House to provide 6 flats) together with associated landscape, access and parking in Development Zone G (Pennefathers) pursuant to Condition 4 (1 to 22), attached to Hybrid Outline Planning Permission 12/00958/OUT dated 10th March 2014.</p> <p>Zone G Pennyfathers, Aldershot Urban Extension, Alisons Road, Aldershot</p>

		Assessment of this application has not yet reached the stage for Committee consideration.
vii	24/00748/FUL & 24/00746/LBCPP	<p>Demolition of the existing care home and dwelling, repairs and works to the kitchen garden wall and the erection of 20 residential dwellings, associated access works, drainage works, tree works, car parking, hard & soft landscaping.</p> <p>Land at Orchard Rise 127 and La Fosse House 129 Ship Lane Farnborough</p> <p>Assessment of these applications has not yet reached the stage for Committee consideration.</p>

Section B

Petitions

Item	Reference	Description and address
		None

This page is intentionally left blank

The information, recommendations and advice contained in this report are correct as at the date of preparation, which is more than two weeks in advance of the Committee meeting. Because of these time constraints some reports may have been prepared in advance of the final date given for consultee responses or neighbour comment. Any changes or necessary updates to the report will be made orally at the Committee meeting.


Case Officer	David Stevens
Application No.	24/00465/FULPP
Date Valid	17th September 2024
Expiry date of consultations	9th October 2024
Proposal	Development of Hollybush Lakes site for mixed-use development comprising aquatic sports centre including erection of building providing aqua sports facilities, reception, restaurant, bar and 20-bay golf-driving range, with associated grass fairway, car parking, landscaping and bund [revised scheme to development approved with planning permission 20/00400/FULPP dated 24 March 2023 and incorporating a total of 21 floating holiday lodges the subject of planning application 24/00140/REVPP currently under consideration]
Address	Land at Former Lafarge Site Hollybush Lane Aldershot
Ward	St Mark's
Applicant	Drayparcs Developments Ltd
Agent	Baca Architects Ltd
Recommendation	Grant subject to s106 Agreement

Description & Relevant Planning History:

The application site has an irregular shape and is part of the wider land ownership by the current applicants of an area of land and former gravel-pit lakes on the margins of Rushmoor Borough to the east of Hollybush Lane, where it runs parallel and to the east of the A331 road (BVR) to the south of North Camp railway station. The A331 North Camp Interchange and the North Camp Station approach road adjoin the north end of the application site. The site is also located to the west of the Blackwater River, which adjoins the entire eastern side of the site. To the south the wider land ownership abuts a drainage channel; with the Hollybush Park local nature reserve beyond, which is land owned by Rushmoor Borough Council and managed by the Blackwater Valley Countryside Partnership.

The wider land ownership by the applicants (see Existing Site Plan on next page) contains three lakes that are re-modelled former gravel pits used for coarse fishing (Lake 1 to the north and Lakes 3 & 4 to the south). The central section of the site largely comprises vacant unused

land, partially hard-surfaced and largely enclosed with earth bunds, which is the site of the former Lafarge concrete



Existing Site Plan (Not to Scale)

batching plant. A rusty hopper tower structure near the entrance gate is the one remaining remnant of the abandoned concrete batching plant. The site also contains a gated car park for people using the fishing lakes, which is situated between the former Lafarge site and Lake 1,

with a signed gateway from Hollybush Lane. A track from the car park gate around the east margin of the former Lafarge site provides onward access to another two lakes in the Applicants' ownership that are located on the east side of the River within Guildford Borough Council's area (Lakes 2 & 5). A low-lying area between the former Lafarge site separated from the River by a thin strip of raised land contains a small pond (Lake 6) that receives drainage water from elsewhere within the site.

Vehicular access to the applicants' land and the current application site is possible from the north only, where Hollybush Lane, (at this end a private gated road), has a T-junction with the North Camp Station approach road (technically a remnant part of Lynchford Road) close to the eastern roundabout of the North Camp A331 road interchange. Hollybush Lane has a metalled surface to the south as far as the current entrance into the former Lafarge site. However, beyond this, the Lane is somewhat overgrown and the surface is rough and comprises loose mud, sand, gravel and building rubble; and contains some substantial potholes and puddles. From the former Lafarge site gates until level with the south side of Hollybush Park, travel along Hollybush Lane is restricted to being by foot or bicycle only with concrete blocks blocking vehicular access. Hollybush Lane runs southwards parallel with the A331 road for approximately 1 km before it becomes a metalled once again at the Hollybush Lane Industrial Estate close to the other end of the Lane; and where it joins Government Road and Lakeside Road (Ash Vale).


A closed and now overgrown section of the Blackwater Valley footpath runs along the western side of the River and is also mostly situated just within the east boundary of the current application site. This section of footpath was closed by the Applicants in June 2014, with a diversion route provided instead that runs alongside the drainage channel to the south of Lakes 3 & 4 to join Hollybush Lane west of the site. The Blackwater Valley footpath runs both north and south of the closed section and is interlinked with various footpaths and roads to provide public access from the adjoining urban areas on both sides of the County boundary. The vicinity of the application site is accessible from the Blackwater Valley footpath, or via a footbridge over the A331 from the Ramilles Park military housing estate into Hollybush Park.

Planning permission was granted for the Hollybush Lakes #1 Scheme on 24 March 2023 for *"Development of site to create a leisure facility comprising aquatic sports centre including restaurant, indoor childrens' play area, equestrian centre and associated stabling; **9 floating holiday lodges (comprising 7 X 3-bedroom and 2 X 4-bedroom units)** with associated car parking, landscaping and bund (revised proposals submitted 24 August 2022)", 20/00400/FULPP : 'Hollybush Lakes #1'. This permission was granted subject to conditions and is accompanied by a tripartite s106 Agreement between the Applicants, Rushmoor BC (RBC) and Hampshire County Council (HCC) to: (a) Not implement the development unless and until SPA mitigation and avoidance financial contributions to address the SPA impact of the proposed floating holiday lodges has been paid to Rushmoor BC; (b) Travel Plan implementation and monitoring including and payment of Travel Plan Approval and Monitoring Fees to HCC; and (c) secure the restoration of the original line of the Blackwater Valley Path along the eastern side of the application site prior to the implementation of the development, and subsequent retention at all times thereafter.*

The Hollybush Lakes #1 permission has not, to date, been implemented, but remains extant and implementable until 24 March 2026. The main elements of the already approved Hollybush Lakes #1 development scheme are described in more detail as follows:-

Aquatic Sports Centre: As already approved, this building would be situated adjacent to the south end of Lake 1, aligned and built into a new section of earth bund to complete the enclosure of the adjoining proposed Equestrian Centre to the south. This building is primarily

to provide changing rooms and storage for the proposed use of Lake 1 for watersport activities. The plans show the provision of a jetty projecting into the lake adjoining the building and the use of a nearby zone on the lake where a floating “Aqua Activity Zone” would be moored. The approved building is also shown to include a restaurant at first-floor incorporating three separate external seating/dining areas and/or viewing decks; and the provision of a Childrens’ Indoor Play Area occupying a two-storey space, incorporating a food servery and party room at ground-floor level; and a further two party rooms and a viewing gallery at first-floor level.



Already Approved Scheme 20/00400/FULPP : Hollybush Lakes #1 : Site Layout

The approved Aquatic Sports Centre building would provide 1389 sqm of internal floorspace, together with an additional 445 sqm of external space at first-floor level accessible via the restaurant to be used as seating/dining and/or viewing areas. The uses of the proposed building floorspace are split as follows:-

Use(s)	Ground-Floor (Sqm)	First-Floor (Sqm)	Totals (Sqm)
<u>Aquatic Sports Centre</u> : (a) Foyer and circulation spaces, stairways/lifts, storage space, changing rooms, toilets, office and multi-function classroom;	619	100	719
<u>Childrens' Indoor Play Area</u> : including 3 party rooms, food servery and viewing gallery	286	94	380
<u>Restaurant</u> : (a) 80-seat internal area with bar; (b) external seating/dining areas (x2)	118 (Kitchen)	172	290
	-	275	275
<u>External first-floor Lake viewing deck and/or further external seating area for Restaurant</u>	-	170	170
Totals : Internal Space	1023	366	1389
External Space	-	445	445

The already approved Aquatic Sports Centre building has a cruciform footprint and would be of part single- and part two-storey height, and of modern design with flat roofs to minimise building bulk and visibility. The height above ground level would taper from a minimum of 7.69 metres up to 9.52 metres; with the tallest portion of the building (containing a restaurant) cantilevered to partly overhang the building entrance. Externally, the approved elevations would be finished with a fibre cladding system punctuated by glazing and with mainly green roofs, although with some rooflights and solar panels.

Equestrian Centre with Stabling: This already approved was to be situated on the vacant former Lafarge site land that is, as existing, already partially enclosed with earth bunding in a central position within the application site. The enclosure of this area was completed on the north side by the re-modelling of the existing earth bunds and their extension to join the Aquatic Sports Centre building [see (a) above]. Within the bunded Equestrian Centre enclosure, an area measuring approximately 15,000 sqm, the Hollybush Lakes #1 scheme approved provision of a covered and partially enclosed sand school measuring 60 X 35 metres (2,100 sqm); and an attached stable block measuring 800 sqm. The vehicular access into the enclosure would serve a car park containing space for 10 cars and 8 horsebox spaces, in addition to the stable delivery area. The approved buildings would be timber-clad and to have a green roof punctuated by rooflights. Also approved in the Equestrian Centre area was an uncovered sand school enclosure measuring 60 X 35 metres, with the remainder of the bunded enclosure measuring approximately 9,350 sqm being secure open space to be used for equestrian purposes.

Floating Holiday Lodges: These are already approved to be moored adjacent to, and accessible on foot from walkways mounted to, the promontory of land partly dividing Lakes 3

& 4. The approved Lodges would all be 8.9 metres wide by 4.15 metres tall with flat green roofs; with the 3-bedroom lodges being 17 metres, and the 4-bedroom lodges 19.95 metres, long. Externally the Lodges would be finished with the same fibre sheet cladding system and composite timber/aluminium-framed glazing as the approved Aquatic Sports Centre. Vehicular access serving the holiday lodges would be provided to a 42-space car park from Hollybush Lane to the south of the proposed Equestrian Centre and north of Lake 3.

Car Parking: The other significant element of the already approved #1 Scheme in terms of land use and construction work is the provision of car parking and associated access roads. The main car park for the approved development, containing a total of 118 spaces and landscape planting, would occupy a triangular-shaped area of land measuring 150 by 75 metres to the north of the Aquatic Sports Centre and to the south-west side of Lake 1. The existing line of Hollybush Lane to the side of Lake 1 would be retained, but as one side of a one-way traffic flow split around the new car park area, with a new section of road returning traffic flow past the west side. A slipway into Lake 1 would be provided from the access road at the eastern corner of the proposed car park. A separate 42-space parking area would be provided for occupiers of the proposed holiday lodges; and a further 22-space car park provided on the small area of land between Lakes 4 and 6.

In December 2023 the Council approved a non-material amendment (23/00800/NMAPP) to re-configure the format of planning permission 20/00400/FULPP to remove the reference to the quantum of floating holiday lodges from the description of the development proposals (set out in **bold type** above) and its replacement, instead, with the imposition of a planning condition reading as follows:-

“The number of floating lodges shall not exceed 9 floating holiday lodges and the proposed mix must comprise 7 x 3-bedroom and 2 x 4-bedroom units.”

Additionally, Members will recall that, at the 12 February 2025 meeting, the Development Management Committee resolved to approve a minor material amendment application under s73 for the addition of a further 12 floating holiday lodges over and above the 9 approved with the original Hollybush Lakes #1 planning permission 20/00400/FULPP. This amendment has, at the time of writing this report, yet to be approved by the Council since this is subject to the prior completion of a s106 Legal Agreement and confirmation that the applicants have acquired the necessary SANGS mitigation capacity from Grainger Plc, the owners of the Blandford House SANGS scheme. Nevertheless, should the amendment be approved, the #1 Scheme would then be for 21 units, comprising 3 X 2-bedroom, 14 X 3-bedroom and 4 X 4-bedroom units. These would be situated around Lakes 3 & 4, but mainly in Lake 4, alongside the 9 units already approved as follows, see Plan overleaf:-

This proposed amendment has yet to be determined by the Council, since it requires the completion of a s106 Legal Agreement to replicate the requirements of the original s106 Agreement in respect of Hollybush Lakes #1 dated 24 March 2023 relating to secure (a) SPA mitigation and avoidance for the 9 floating holiday lodges originally approved; (b) the Travel Plan Implementation and Monitoring requirements of HCC; and the restoration and retention of the original line of the Blackwater Valley Path; PLUS also (d) the SAMMs element of the SPA financial contribution for the additional 12 floating holiday lodges the subject of the proposed amendment. In addition, the Committee resolution also requires confirmation that the Applicants have acquired the appropriate SANGS mitigation capacity element from Grainger Plc in respect of the Blandford Woods SANGS scheme in order to address the SPA impact of the proposed additional 12 floating holiday lodges.



S73 Minor Material Amendment Proposal approved by DM Committee on 12 February 2025

The Current Proposals : Hollybush Lakes #2 Scheme

The red-line of the current application site is a smaller area of land wholly situated within the application site red-line for the original #1 Scheme that excludes Lakes 3, 4 and 6 (this is shown with the Existing Site Plan on the second page of this Briefing Note), albeit this land is outlined in blue denoting that it is land that remains within the ownership and control of the applicants. As a result, because they would be unaffected by the proposals the subject of the current application, the current application site excludes entirely the lakes that would accommodate the floating holiday lodges and their associated parking areas.

The current application seeks full planning permission for some significant material amendments to the #1 Scheme principally involving the following:-

- (a) A re-design of the Aquatic Sports Centre building to revise and simplify its design, reduce its scale from a total of 1,834 to 1,650 sqm, and to accommodate a different mix of uses, most notably including the cubicles and platforms for a Golf-Driving Range as follows....

Use(s)	Ground-Floor (Sqm)	First-Floor (Sqm)	Totals (Sqm)
<u>Aquatic Sports Centre</u> : Foyer and circulation spaces, stairways/lifts, storage space, & wet changing rooms	496	-	496
<u>Golf Driving Range</u> comprising 20 Driving Bays and seating; and including 2 bar areas (one on each floor) Also a total of 144sqm of external Driving Bay platform safety areas projecting from the exterior of the building.	440	432	872
<u>Café</u> with 54 covers and small external balcony area to overlook Lake 1	-	150	150
<u>Ancillary Space</u> : Kitchen and wcs	-	132	132
Totals	936	714	1,650

The proposed building would have a revised footprint shape but be finished externally with the same materials as already approved with the #1 Scheme, including green roof with some solar panels;

- (b) The deletion of the entire approved Equestrian Centre use, buildings (comprising a total of 2,900 sqm of floorspace) and facilities of the #1 Scheme to be replaced with the golf-hole and targets area of the proposed Golf-Driving Range;
- (c) A consequential re-design of the main car park area to the north of the Aquatic Sports Centre to reflect the re-positioning of the Aquatic Sports Centre building, which would comprise a total of 148 car spaces and 54 cycle stands;
- (d) A re-design of the proposed slipway and jetty into Lake 1 adjacent to the Aquatic Sports Centre; and
- (e) As a result of an amended Site Layout Plan submitted in January 2025, the #2 Scheme deletes the provision of a bus lay-by space to the side of the Station Approach Road adjacent to the site vehicular entrance – with HCC has confirmed is not required.

The #2 application is accompanied by a Design & Access Statement, Planning Statement, Transport Assessment, Framework Travel Plan, Flood Risk & Drainage Assessment incorporating Flood Management Evacuation Plan, (Flood Risk) Sequential Test Update, Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment, Lighting Impact Assessment, Noise Impact Assessment, Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Business Needs Assessment, Ecological Appraisal, Ecology Survey Reports, BREEAM Pre-Assessment Report, Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment, BNG Metric, BNG Statement Form. As a result of some consultee comments further submissions were made in December 2024 comprising a Technical Note of responses to HCC Highways comments, a revised Framework Travel Plan, and a response to comments made by HCC as Lead Local Flood Authority.

Consultee Responses

Lead Local Flood Authorities	Response #1 (8 October 2024) : Objection : More information required. Response #2 (20 December 2024) following submission of further information : On balance, we have no objection.
Ash Parish Council	No comments received.
Hampshire Bat Group	No comments received.
Natural England	No objections.
Environment Agency	No comments received.
Surrey County Council	No objection subject to Rushmoor Borough Council being satisfied that the design of the proposed development gives sufficient consideration to and incorporates appropriate measures to ensure that it would not prejudice the operation or future development of the existing waste management facility at Ash Vale Waste Transfer Station in accordance with Policy 7 of the Surrey Waste Local Plan and Paragraph 193 of the National Planning Policy Framework 2023.
Scottish & Southern Energy	No comments received.
Southern Gas Network (Formerly TRANSCO)	No comments received.
Guildford Borough Council	No comments received.
South East Water	No comments received.
Thames Water	No comments received.
Hampshire County Council Planning	HCC Minerals & Waste : No objections.
HCC Highways Development Planning	No objections subject to s106 Agreement to secure Travel Plan implementation and monitoring : Following the requested revisions to the Framework Travel Plan, I can confirm that this can now be approved.

In relation to the layby, the Highway Authority are happy for the bus layby to be removed from the proposals. However, it is still requested that a plan is provided which shows that the other proposed works on the highway in order to demonstrate that they are achievable. This is in reference to the works on the highway outlined in paragraph 4.6 of the Transport Assessment including a 2m footway from Hollybush Lane onto Lynchford Road and a footway connection between the station car park and existing provision on Lynchford Road.

The Blackwater
Valley
Countryside
Partnership

No comments received.

Neighbourhood
Policing Team

No comments received.

Environmental
Health

No objections subject to conditions: 60EH Tannoys, 62EH Sound Insulation (Plant) & 26CN Construction hours
Lighting: The submitted Lighting Impact Assessment is considered acceptable. In accordance with the Institute of Lighting Professionals (ILP) Guidance on the Reduction of Obtrusive Light, the report has determined that the site falls within Environment Zone E2, which is a classed as a rural, low district brightness. Environmental Health agree with this classification. The ILP guidance provides maximum light level criteria to control obtrusive lighting for each Environmental Zone and the proposed lighting scheme has been assessed with these limits in mind. Provided the proposed scheme incorporates the mitigation measures specified in Section 6 of the report, then the relevant ILP guidance light level criteria will be achieved. Environmental Health are satisfied with this assessment.
Noise: The submitted Noise Impact Assessment has considered noise from the proposed golf driving range by referencing measurements undertaken at a much larger facility in operation in the USA. The main impact will obviously be music from the individual driving bays, but given the distance to the nearest residential premises, noise from this source is predicted to be significantly below existing ambient noise levels. As per application 20/00400/FULPP, Environmental Health consider that noise from the venue can be addressed by suitable conditions imposed under the Licensing regime. EH would recommend that a condition be attached to ensure external plant noise is controlled.

Aboriginal
Officer

No comments received.

Hampshire Fire &
Rescue Service

No comments received.

Ecology Team

No objections subject to conditions and s106 to secure BNG provisions.

Biodiversity Net Gain : The applicant has submitted the following relevant ecological documents;
'Biodiversity Net Gain Design Stage Assessment', dated January 2024,

author Waterman Infrastructure & Environment Ltd;
Statutory Biodiversity Metric, dated 11th September 2024, author Tonisha Lawrence, reviewer Simon Dowell.
'R005 Ecology Appraisal', author Aspect Ecology, dated July 2024.

Extant permission 20/00400/FULPP was supported by a suite of ecological focused documents that provided detail of the pre-development and post-development ecological value of the development site. While the application was made prior to the implementation of statutory Biodiversity Net Gain requirements, the applicant applied the principles of Biodiversity Net Gain to the application to demonstrate no net loss and seek a quantified net gain, in line with best practice at that time and with regard to the existing high ecological value of the development site. Permission 20/00400/FULPP (and subsequent amendments) have been able to demonstrate that the development will achieve an above 10% biodiversity net gain as a result of development across the full redline boundary.

Documentation submitted was therefore appropriate for determination of permission 20/00400/FULPP at time of evaluation.

Current permission 24/00465/FULPP is reviewed in the context guidance, tools and methodologies appropriate for the new statutory obligations of Biodiversity Net Gain. Documents submitted indicate that the current submission is able to achieve a biodiversity net gain of above 10% and therefore meet the statutory obligations. Gains are primarily achieved through the enhancement of condition of existing retained habitats (scrub and woodland).

However, there appears to be a conflict between the delivery proposals for biodiversity net gain between the extant permission 20/00400/FULPP and current application 24/00465/FULPP. Permission 20/00400/FULPP is significantly predicated on the restoration and creation of high distinctiveness reedbed in three locations, including the northern tip of the northern lake. The current application notes the presence of some existing reedbed within the 'baseline' tabs of the submitted statutory metric, but makes no reference to the reedbed within the habitat creation or enhancement tabs. Reedbed is a high distinctiveness habitat and therefore enhancement and creation secures a high number of area habitat biodiversity units. It would appear therefore that while the metric for 20/00400/FULPP is dependant upon delivery of reedbed in three locations, permission 24/00465/FULPP removes this delivery from one of the three locations.

If the applicant implements permission 24/00465/FULPP, the Biodiversity Gain Plan submitted for this application will embed the reedbed retained in current condition with no scope for creation or enhancement. The question therefore arises whether permission 20/00400/FULPP will be deliverable. Delivery of permission 20/00400/FUL in totality requires creation of reedbed in all three locations in order to deliver an above 10% biodiversity net gain. The applicant has not demonstrated that if 24/00465/FULPP plus remaining parts of 20/00400/FULPP are implemented together, whether the remaining parts of 20/00400/FULPP

can still deliver above 10% net gain. This is a difficult calculation because of the difference in approaches to calculations submitted for both applications due to the passage of time and subsequent changes in statutory obligations for Biodiversity net gain.

I therefore recommend that in order to be certain that delivery of either scheme will not compromise the other, that the provision of high distinctiveness reedbed creation at the northern tip of the northern lake is included within proposals for scheme 24/00465/FULPP, to the same quantum as stated within documentation submitted for 20/00400/FULPP. This will remove the most significant conflict in biodiversity net gain delivery proposals between schemes and provide comfort that gains are deliverable in view of current ambiguity. I recommend that delivery of the reedbed at the northern tip of the northern lake is secured within Biodiversity Gain Plans submitted in discharge of the deemed biodiversity net gain condition for 24/00465/FULPP.

Protected Species and Habitats : The above referenced report 'R005 Ecology Appraisal' (and previous ecological surveys) have identified a number of legally protected species present at the development site. Section 6 'Mitigation measures and proposed Ecological Enhancements' presents a suite of impact avoidance and mitigation measures. Should the Council be minded to grant permission of this current application, that the development should be implemented only in strict accordance with the Mitigation measures set out in Section 6. The species enhancement measures presented in Section 6 should also be implemented in order to demonstrate that the development seeks to maintain protected species populations as a result of development.

I draw attention to other ecological protection measures within the decision notice of permission 20/00400/FULPP, in particular condition 24, 25, 26, 27 and 31. These protection measures remain relevant to the current application (24/00465/FULPP) which should also be required to progress in accordance with the wording of these conditions.

External Lighting : I note that the applicant has submitted the following document in support of the proposed development;
'Lighting Impact Assessment', author Strenger, dated July 2024.

The above report identifies and evaluates the potential impacts on ecological receptors at the development site and makes a suite of impact avoidance and mitigation measures. The report appears appropriate in impact identification and mitigation measures are appropriate as far as they are presented. Tables 7.4 and 8.4 present pre- and post-curfew light spill levels at identified ecological receptors and presents levels below 1.0 lux which is appropriately taken as best practice maximum light levels to be achieved at a sensitive ecological receptor. These tables therefore indicate that impact avoidance and mitigation measures presented are effective in avoiding light spill above 1.0 lux where sensitive receptors are present, in line with best practice. However, the report does not provide the isolux plans which underpin and inform the conclusions reached in

Tables 7.4 and 8.4. I therefore advise that should the Council be minded to grant permission for the proposed development, that the lighting for the development is implemented in full accordance with the mitigation measures presented in Section 6 'Mitigation' of the above referenced Lighting Impact Assessment Report.

Neighbours notified

In addition to posting a site notice and press advertisement, 36 individual letters of notification were sent to properties in Hollybush Lane, Slim Close and Gort Close, being properties located nearest to the application site within Rushmoor BC's area.

Neighbour comments

No comments have been received as a result of neighbour notification and all other usual planning application publicity.

Policy and determining issues

The application site is land located wholly outside the defined built-up areas of the Borough on land that is identified as 'Countryside'. With the exception of the land proposed to be occupied by the main car park and most of Hollybush Lane itself, the site is also identified as being in a 'flood zone'. The entirety of Lake 1 (including sections at the north end that are now infilled) is also identified as being a Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC), a local non-Statutory nature conservation designation. The Hollybush Park Local Nature Reserve within Rushmoor BC's area to the south of land in the Applicants ownership beyond Lakes 3 & 4 is also designated as a SINC, albeit this is situated some distance from the #2 Scheme proposals the subject of the current application. Lakes 2 and 5 located near the application site on the east side of the River Blackwater are within Guildford BC's area are also designated as a 'Site of Nature Conservation Importance' (SNCI), which is an equivalent nature conservation designation to a SINC as defined by Surrey Local Authorities. The A331 Blackwater Valley Road and the Blackwater River are both identified as 'green corridors'.

Policies SS1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development), SS2 (Spatial Strategy), IN2 (Transport), IN3 (Telecommunications), DE1 (Design), DE4 (Sustainable Water Use), DE6 (Open Space, Sport & Recreation), DE10 (Pollution), PC8 (Skills, Training & Employment), NE1 (Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area), NE2 (Green Infrastructure), NE3 (Trees & Landscaping), NE4 (Biodiversity), NE5 (Countryside), NE6 (Managing Fluvial Flood Risk), NE7 (Areas at Risk of Surface Water Flooding), NE8 (Sustainable Drainage Systems) of the adopted Rushmoor Local Plan (2014-2032) are relevant.

Also relevant is the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) "Parking Standards" adopted in 2023. Since the SPD was subject to extensive public consultation and consequent amendment before being adopted by the Council, some significant weight can be attached to the requirements of this document. The advice contained in the National Planning Policy Framework most recently updated in December 2024 (NPPF) and National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) are also relevant.

It was the conclusion of the Council's most recent Screening Opinion (24/00485/SCREEN) in September 2024 that similar proposals in nature, scope and scale to those now being proposed with the current application (i.e. Scheme #1) did not require the submission of an Environmental Impact Assessment as an 'urban development project' under Schedule 2 of the Town & Country

Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) (England and Wales) Regulations.

Since the #2 application is configured as a smaller area of land within both the applicants wider ownership and the larger application site area of the already approved #1 Scheme, in the event that the #2 Scheme were also to be approved the Applicants would have a number of implementation options, primarily comprising:-

Options A1 & A2 : Implement the already approved #1 Scheme in its entirety with (Option A1) or without (Option A2) the additional 12 floating holiday lodges the subject of the s73 amendment, if approved; or

Option B : Part-implement either Options A1 or A2 in respect of the floating holiday lodges, but with the #2 Scheme [comprising smaller Aquatic Sports Centre building incorporating the Golf-Driving Bays and adjacent Driving-Range target/hole area] instead of implementing the already approved Aquatic Sports Centre building [incorporating large bar/restaurant, external deck areas and an Indoor Childrens' Play Area] and entire Equine Centre of the #1 Scheme; or

Option C : Discard (i.e. not at all implement) the #1 Scheme entirely and simply implement the #2 Scheme proposals alone.

Whilst it is necessary for the current #2 proposals to be assessed and determined as a stand-alone development scheme; the Council must also consider whether or not implementation of the #2 scheme would compromise those elements of the #1 Scheme that would remain and be implemented within the wider original application site in any way(s) that would cause material and unacceptable planning harm.

Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) : s149 of the Equality Act 2010 requires all public authorities to “*have due regard to*” (a) the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation; (b) advance equality of opportunity; and (c) foster good relations between people with protected characteristics and those without as an essential element of their decision-making, which includes the consideration and determination of Planning Applications. ‘Protected characteristics’ are: age, disability, gender re-assignment, marriage/civil partnership, pregnancy/maternity, race, religion/belief, sex and sexual orientation. In the context of the current planning application it is considered that the primary PSED consideration that is identified is the need to have due regard to access for people with disabilities within the proposed development. Whilst sex, sexual orientation and gender re-assignment could potentially have implications for the provision of appropriate toilet and changing facilities within the proposed development these are not main determining issues for planning applications and it is considered that the detailed internal arrangements for toilet and changing facilities within the proposed development would not be prejudiced by the granting of planning permission because flexibility in the internal layout of the proposed floorspace would remain.

In the context of all of the above, the main determining issues are considered to be:-

1. The Principle of the Proposals, including the Flood Risk Sequential and Exception Tests;
2. The Visual Impact upon the Countryside, including the surrounding landscape and trees;
3. Impacts on Neighbours;
4. Highways Considerations;
5. Ecology and Biodiversity;
6. Flooding and Drainage Issues;
7. Sustainability;
8. Access for People with Disabilities; and

Commentary

1. Principle -

Planning Policy : The site is, as existing, and with the exception of the existing coarse fishing activity, currently vacant and unused previously-developed land that, partly, has no current lawful or authorised planning use at all.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) advises that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. In this respect, there are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. These roles are defined as:-

- *"contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy by ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and co-ordinating development requirements including the provision of infrastructure;*
- *supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; and*
- *contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy."*

The NPPF also advises that these roles should not be taken in isolation because they are mutually dependent, and the planning system should play an active role in guiding development to sustainable locations. The proposed development is seeking to make more efficient use of previously-developed land, which, within reason, also continues to be a clear objective of both Government planning guidance and current adopted local planning policy.

Local Plan Policy SS1 sets out a general presumption in favour of sustainable development in line with central Government policy and guidance. In this respect, any adverse impacts of granting planning permission must be significantly and demonstrably outweighed by the benefits. There is a general presumption that development within 'countryside areas' of the Borough should be strictly limited, with Local Plan Policy SS2 stating:

"SS2 : New development will be directed to within the defined urban areas as shown on the Policies Map. In the countryside surrounding Aldershot and Farnborough, new development will be strictly limited in line with Policy NE5."

Local Plan Policy NE5 then states the specific circumstances under which limited development in countryside areas could be considered acceptable in principle :

"NE5 : Development within the countryside (outside the Defined Urban Area of Aldershot and Farnborough) will only be permitted where:

- a. The location is considered sustainable for the proposed use;***
- b. It preserves the character and appearance of the countryside; and***

c. It does not lead to harmful physical or visual coalescence between Aldershot and Farnborough and neighbouring settlements.

The Council will encourage schemes that result in environmental and landscape improvement, enhance biodiversity and nature conservation, and support better accessibility.”

The #2 Scheme application site is an existing location used for small-scale leisure/recreational use and contains a coarse fishing lake, together a large adjacent area of concrete hardstanding within a bunded enclosure. Lakes lend themselves to water-based recreation and leisure activities. Indeed, the existence of a water body is clearly a necessary requirement for the undertaking of water-based activities. Such uses are undertaken at a number of other sites elsewhere within the Blackwater Valley outside the Borough. The bunded concrete hardstanding area is of a size and shape that lends itself to the proposed golf-driving range and seems likely to be a more attractive business proposition than the Equine Centre of the #1 Scheme, which would have had limited on-site stabling capacity and be an unsuitable base for horse-riding off-site due to lack of direct access to bridledways.

The application is accompanied by a Leisure Needs Assessment that identifies other leisure uses for which there is considered to be a surrounding catchment demonstrating a need; and, indeed, that the overall revised mix of proposed uses would be complementary and, overall, create a viable commercial proposition. It is, however, inappropriate for the Council to question the commercial judgement of the applicants for the facilities proposed - the Council must consider the proposals solely on their planning merits.

In the circumstances it is considered that the proposed development would be appropriate in principal in terms of sustainability, leaving consideration of the proposals having regard to Policy NE5 in respect of criteria b. and c : whether or not the proposals would preserve the character and appearance of the countryside; and not lead to harmful physical or visual coalescence between surrounding built-up areas. These matters are considered in the **Visual Impact** section of this report later in this report.

Site Investigation : By its very nature and position, the #2 Scheme application site has a direct and proximal relationship with the water environment, whether this be fluvial-, surface- and/or ground-waters. The application site has been used historically for commercial purposes for mineral extraction and/or minerals processing. The section of the site to the west of Lake 1 and Hollybush Lane is an historic former landfill site displaced by the construction of the Blackwater Valley Road (A331). Some land within the application site has historically also been subject to unauthorised tipping/disposal of waste materials from elsewhere and the extent, nature and content of the tipped material is unknown; as is the extent to which this material was, or was not, removed from the land when it has, occasionally, been cleared. The former Lafarge site was developed and used on an unauthorised basis for, inter alia, reception and assessment of crash-damaged vehicles; the storage of motor vehicles; storage of de-polluted motor vehicle bodies and vehicle parts; all being uses that may have, or have, resulted in ground contamination. The extent of contamination arising from the unauthorised vehicle and vehicle parts storage use removed by Council enforcement action is equally unknown. The site has also been subject to extensive disturbance, clearance, and parts used, from time to time, for burning of other materials with large bonfires with the last 15 years.

The Preliminary Environmental Risk Assessment submitted and approved with the #1 Scheme identified an appropriate range of ground contamination sources that may exist; and the attendant environmental risks that could arise as a result of the mobilisation of such

contamination into the wider water environment. As before, the proposed water sports activities clearly give rise to some potential risk of users of the development coming into contact with the ground and, especially, the water environment. However, the proposed Golf-Driving Range and café facilities would have users that would remain indoors within the proposed building and, as such, likely have limited or no contact with the ground or water environment. With the #1 Scheme, the Council's Environmental Health Team requested that intrusive site investigation be undertaken to establish the nature and extent of any contamination and, if found, appropriate remediation commensurate with the level of risk to the environment having regard to the proposed construction activities to be involved and to future occupiers/visitors to the development. It is considered that this requirement should be replicated in respect of the #2 Scheme by imposition of the same usual standard site investigation planning conditions.

Flood Risk Sequential Test : The Council cannot waive or relax the requirements of the Flood Risk Sequential Test in favour of other suggested planning considerations or benefits relating to development proposals – it is a stand-alone technical consideration. Development should not be permitted as a matter of principle if there are reasonably available sites appropriate for the proposed development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. How the Council applies and considers the Sequential Test is subject to regular scrutiny by others and it is considered that the Council cannot prejudice its position in dealing with other cases by failing to properly and appropriately apply the Test under any circumstances. The Council has to decide whether or not the Sequential Test has been satisfactorily discharged, so any submissions prepared on behalf of applicants must be a demonstration of a robust and genuine search for alternative sites – and the Council needs to be convinced that this has been the case.

The process involved with the Flood Risk Sequential Test is set out in Government Planning Policy and Guidance. Consideration of the Sequential Test is applicable in this case simply because the proposed development involves land at elevated risk of fluvial and/or other flooding; i.e. it is situated on land within Flood Risk Zones 2 and/or 3 and also from surface-water and ground-water flooding. It is for applicants to address the Sequential Test by submitting appropriate evidence to seek to demonstrate that there are no suitable alternative sequentially preferable sites for the proposed use(s) the subject of their planning application in flood risk terms. *“For individual planning applications subject to the Sequential Test, the area to apply the test will be defined by local circumstances relating to the catchment area for the type of development proposed. For some developments this may be clear, for example, the catchment area for a school. In other cases, it may be identified from other Plan policies. For example, where there are large areas in Flood Zones 2 and 3 (medium to high probability of flooding) and development is needed in those areas to sustain the existing community, sites outside them are unlikely to provide reasonable alternatives.”* Paragraph: 027 Reference ID: 7-027-20220825.

The current application is supported by a Sequential Test Report that reprises and updates the findings of the Sequential Test Report submissions accepted by the Council with the #1 Scheme application. This identified and considered a search area of variable radius (to take account of competing aquatic sports facilities elsewhere in the region) that measured approximately 1500 square km (579 square miles) encompassing land within four counties; and substantial land areas within ten local planning Authorities in addition to Rushmoor : namely Basingstoke & Deane BC, Bracknell Forest DC, East Hampshire BC, Guildford BC, Hart DC, Mole Valley DC, Surrey Heath BC, Waverley BC, Woking BC, and Wokingham BC. This search area accepted and used for the consideration of the #1 Scheme continues to be used with the current application since, as before, the Aquatic Sports activities still command the largest catchment radius. This is considered to be a reasonable assumption given that, whilst the #2 Scheme proposals include a proposed Golf-Driving Range, the existence of a number of existing competing Ranges within the search area renders the catchment for this new proposed use to

be somewhat smaller than that for aquatic sports.

The updated Sequential Test report sets out the consideration of 32 potentially available sites situated within the site search area following an initial screening process from several hundred possible sites originally identified, most of which being screened out due to being sites that are too small. However, none of the 32 potentially available sites identified from the screening have been found to be suitable alternatives to the current application site too, on account of either being subject to restrictive policy designations that would preclude development, but also sites that are also subject to the same level of flood risk; or, crucially, sites that do not have an open water that could be used for aquatic sports. It is therefore considered that the updated Sequential Test submissions are a reasonable and appropriately robust attempt at identifying and assessing alternative sites and, as such, it is considered that the Flood Risk Sequential Test has been passed.

Exception Test : The applicability of the Flood Risk Exception Test must also be considered where it is the conclusion of the Flood Risk Sequential Test, as in this case, that suitable sites at lower risk of flooding are not available. The Exception Test requires two additional elements to be satisfied before allowing development to be permitted. If applicable, the Exception Test should demonstrate that: (a) development that has to be in a flood risk area will provide wider sustainability benefits to the community that outweigh flood risk; and (b) the development will be safe for its lifetime taking account of the vulnerability of its users, without increasing flood risk elsewhere, and, where possible, will reduce flood risk overall. Table 2 of the relevant Government Guidance sets out the circumstances within which the Exception Test must be applied based upon the flood risk vulnerability classifications of the various elements of the proposed development. In this case all of the proposed development would be located on land situated within Flood Risk Zone 2, where Table 2 says that the Exception Test is only required in respect of forms of development designated as **'Highly Vulnerable'**. However, it is considered that none of the elements of the proposed development would fall into this vulnerability classification. *"Buildings used for shops; financial, professional and other services; restaurants, cafes and hot food takeaways; offices; general industry, storage and distribution; non-residential institutions not included in the 'more vulnerable' class; and assembly and leisure uses"* are all classified as 'Less Vulnerable'. Furthermore ***"Water-based recreation and amenity open space, nature conservation and biodiversity, outdoor sports and recreation and essential facilities such as changing rooms"*** are classified as 'Water-compatible development'. Accordingly, it is considered that no element of the proposed development is designated as 'Highly Vulnerable'. In the circumstances it is concluded that the Flood Risk Exception Test is not applicable to the consideration of the development the subject of the current planning application.

Subject to the caveats and issues to be considered in forthcoming paragraphs of this report, it is considered that the proposed development is acceptable in principle having regard to planning policy, ground contamination and flood risk.

2. Visual Impact –

The application site is isolated from the remainder of the Borough by the A331 road and has limited visibility from publicly-accessible places, albeit the proposed re-opening of the original line of the Blackwater Valley Path to the east of the application site would enable people to pass the site at close quarters. In a wider context, the Blackwater Valley contains a substantial suburban conurbation of closely adjoining built-up areas containing the towns of Farnham, Aldershot, Farnborough, Camberley and Sandhurst and a number of expanded villages. The countryside gaps between these built-up areas are narrow and vulnerable to development,

especially so with the corridor of land alongside and occupied by the River Blackwater itself. The application site occupies a central position in a narrow ribbon of more natural/naturalising land use separating the built-up areas of Farnborough and Aldershot (including the Military Town) from those in Surrey at Frimley Green, Mytchett, Ash Vale, Ash and Tongham. This gap is partly occupied by the A331 road and also railway lines, which further reduce the extent of more open and natural land within the gap. As a result it is clearly not a location where significant built development can or should be permitted since this would erode what remains of the gap both physically and visually.

According to Local Plan Policy NE5, development within countryside areas, such as including the application site, must preserve the character and appearance of the countryside; and must not lead to a harmful physical or visual coalescence between the adjoining urban areas. In this latter respect, it is clear that it is not simply necessary for the proposed development to remain largely unseen, since the physical presence of buildings occupying significant land in the countryside would be sufficient alone to render development in conflict with the policy, even if they were not visible. Furthermore, the proposed development would involve activity both on-site involving outdoor pursuits; and also vehicle movements to and from the site along Hollybush Lane such that it could not be expected to operate entirely silently and unobtrusively. The development would also involve the provision and use of a variety of lighting, since some of the elements of the scheme are clearly intended to be operated in the evening and all year around; and, indeed, the existence of the proposed development would be likely to be more evident in the autumn/winter months when leaf-cover on surrounding trees is absent. As a result, people passing the site and using the Blackwater Valley for recreational purposes are likely to be aware that elements of the proposed development exist and are operating. In this context, bearing in mind that the use of the land for open recreational use(s) is entirely appropriate, the key question is whether or not, in the circumstances, the proposed built elements of the development would be likely to give rise to material and harmful physical and visual intrusion into the Blackwater Valley countryside gap.

However, in this respect, it is considered that the applicants propose a design and layout of development that does have due regard to the countryside policy constraints applicable to the site – and indeed, has been scaled down from what has already been approved with the #1 Scheme. A Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment report has been submitted with the application to consider the impacts of the proposed development on the surrounding landscape. The proposed development is designed to minimise both its visibility, and also its physical presence in terms of the extent to which the proposed buildings would occupy land and be evident to passers-by, having regard to its vulnerable gap location. The proposed Aquatic Sports Centre building is a smaller and simpler design from that already approved. Furthermore, the #2 Scheme proposes that the bunded area of the site be used as a largely open area as existing as the target/hole area for the Driving Range in substitution for the approved Equestrian Centre including covered menage and stables buildings. Although the target/hole area would be provided with netting, fencing and lamp columns around its perimeter, it is considered that this would have limited visibility and, combined with the retention of existing mature trees and vegetation beyond, would not be readily visible from Hollybush Lane and the A331 beyond. Due to intervening existing and proposed trees and planting, the vegetated earth bund enclosure and distance from the Blackwater Valley Path it is not considered that the proposed Driving-Range would be readily visible from the Blackwater Valley Path beyond the east side of the site also.

As is the case with the approved #1 Scheme, the proposed re-designed Aquatic Sports Centre building would be the only two-storey structure within the development; and, indeed, with the replacement of the Equine Centre buildings with the Golf-Driving range, the largest building on site. It would have a flat green roof tapering from approximately 10.5 to 9.5 metres in height

above ground level, thereby projecting approximately 6 metres above the existing earth bunds into which it would be built. Accordingly, it is considered that it would be the proposed first-floor that would be partially visible from outside the site, however it is not considered that this would be to such an extent that this would be a material and harmful visual and physical intrusion in the visual context of the much larger scale of the site that would remain open. As approved with the #1 Scheme, the proposed building would also be finished externally with a palette of materials designed to blend into its surroundings.

As already approved with the #1 Scheme, various ancillary elements of the proposed development, most notably the proposed parking areas, would potentially be partially visible, however they would be obscured by existing vegetation and additional planting such that they would blend into their surroundings. In addition to conditioning the provision and maintenance of landscape planting and means of enclosure, it is considered appropriate to impose controls on the extent of external lighting at the site in order to maintain the naturalistic character and appearance of the site.

A Lighting Impact Assessment has been submitted with the application that assesses the impact of the external lighting required for the site, particularly including for the proposed Golf-Driving Range. This makes recommendations for the design of a lighting scheme that would minimise light glare, skyglow and spillage from the Range target/hole area and to be sensitive to ecology issues/impacts. The use of LED light technology enables lighting to be much more accurately directed so that it only illuminates the areas required and with minimal light spillage and glare beyond, thereby enabling dark corridors to be retained for wildlife movement. The Council's Environmental Health Team consider the proposed design principles set out in the submitted Assessment report to be appropriate to the location.

Ultimately the leisure use of the site will be apparent to people passing by the site on the Blackwater Valley Path, however it is considered unlikely that the proposed development would be evident from the A331 road and only fleetingly and distantly visible from the North Camp interchange footbridge. The use of the land for leisure uses would not, in itself, be an unusual or unexpected use for land within the Blackwater Valley. Due to the careful design of the proposed buildings and their small scale within the extent of land involved, it is considered that the proposed development would be sympathetic to its surroundings and not give rise to any unacceptable visual and physical intrusion into the Blackwater Valley countryside gap. As such, the proposals are considered to be acceptable having regard to Local Plan Policy NE5.

The Blackwater Valley in general is identified as a 'green corridor' by the Local Plan. It is considered that the proposed development provides clear proposals and opportunities for the amenities of the Valley to be enhanced and, as such, the proposals are considered acceptable having regard to Local Plan Policy NE2.

No trees worthy of retention would be removed as a result of the proposed development, albeit that elements of the proposals will require the removal of a small number of trees, clearance of existing overgrowth of vegetation (such as the reinstatement of the Blackwater Valley Path) and the management of existing vegetation. The proposals involve the introduction of new landscape planting where required; and the retention and enhancement of existing vegetation for ecology and biodiversity purposes. It is considered that the proposals are acceptable having regard to Local Plan Policy NE3.

In summary, it is considered that the proposals would have an acceptable visual impact.

3. Impacts on Neighbours –

As with the #1 Scheme, the current application site has no immediate neighbours and any impacts on neighbours arising from the proposed development, such as nuisance issues of noise, cooking odours and general activity would be diminished by the separation distances from neighbours and, indeed, are considered likely to be surpassed by existing nuisances arising from their even closer proximity to the A331 road and the railway lines.

The nearest neighbours to the proposed Aquatic Sports Centre and main car park area are industrial premises on the far side of the railway lines off Lysons Avenue, Ash Vale, a minimum of approximately 180 metres distant to the east. The Old Ford Public House (which includes residential accommodation over) and North Camp railway station are approximately 270 metres to the north. The proposed Aquatic Sports Centre building is also approximately 270 metres distant from the nearest residential property within the Avondale Estate, Ash Vale, situated on the far side of the railway lines; Within Rushmoor, the nearest residential neighbours are houses within the Ramilles Park military housing estate a minimum of approximately 100 metres from the proposed nearest part of the proposed Golf-Driving Range beyond a wooded area on the far side of the A331 road; and approximately 250 metres from the proposed Aquatic Sports Centre building containing the Driving Bays. There is also a small number of residential properties on Hollybush Lane south of the Hollybush Park hill, which are situated over 300 metres from the south boundary of the application site.

The Council's Environmental Health Team have considered the Noise Impact Assessment report submitted with the application. This concludes that road traffic noise associated with the proposed development would be insignificant alongside the noise generated by road traffic on the A331. It is also noted that the watersports activities would be primarily kayaking and the water assault course, neither of which are known to generate high and undue levels of noise at the significant separation distances from all neighbours that arise with this site – and, of course, the existing intervening noise generated by the A331 road and the railway is also a factor to consider. The EH Team agree with the assessment of the Applicants' acoustic consultants and it is considered that the separation distances involved and other existing nearer noise sources would render any such nuisance insignificant for the same reasons. The acoustic consultants have specifically considered noise emissions associated with the proposed Golf-Driving Range with the same overall conclusions. The main potential noise emissions would be from music, amplified voices/announcements and/or players' voices emanating from the individual driving bays; however, given the distance to the nearest residential premises, noise from these sources are predicted to be significantly below existing ambient noise levels even during the evenings when background acoustic conditions may be somewhat quieter. As with the already approved #1 Scheme, the EH Team consider that noise from the venue can be satisfactorily addressed by suitable conditions imposed separately under the Licensing regime. In any event, EH also recommend that conditions be attached to ensure external plant noise is controlled as imposed with the #1 Scheme previously.

With the #1 Scheme, the Council's EH Team also considered whether it would be prudent to restrict opening hours of the proposed restaurant to prevent disturbance at night, however they were comfortable that such matters could be addressed more appropriately by the Licensing regime. Indeed, the granting of planning permission does not remove the obligations on the developer/operator to ensure on-going compliance with Environmental and Nuisance legislation and that action could be taken should material nuisance issues arise in this respect outside of the scope of Planning legislation. The #2 Scheme also proposes uses of the site that, although different, would still have the potential to generate noise disturbance, however it is not considered that there is any need to impose any more stringent Planning restrictions in respect

of the current #2 Scheme over those already imposed in respect of the #1 Scheme.

Subject to conditions it is considered that the proposed development would have acceptable impacts on neighbours.

4. Highways Considerations –

Local Plan Policy IN2 sets out a number of criteria on which proposed developments are to be assessed in terms of highways impacts, including that the proposal:-

“b. provides safe, suitable and convenient access for all potential users;

d. provides appropriate parking provision;

f. does not have a severe impact on the operation of, safety of, or accessibility to the local or strategic road networks;”

In order to raise reasons for refusal to planning applications on highways grounds it is necessary for the Local Planning Authority to demonstrate with clear evidence that the proposals would give rise to a ‘severe’ impact to the safety and/or convenience of highway users. Accordingly, it is not possible to merely cite an adverse impact on highway safety and/or convenience : the adverse impact must be demonstrably ‘severe’ and this is reflected in the wording of Policy IN2. The various elements of the proposals conceivably impacting upon highways issues are considered in the following paragraphs:-

Access/Egress Arrangements and Traffic Generation: The existing vehicular entrance into the application site from the North Camp Station Approach section of Lynchford Road would, as now, be the sole means of vehicular access and egress from the proposed development. It has good direct access to the national highway network via the A331. The Highway Authority (Hampshire County Council) is satisfied that this junction and its sight-lines are adequate to serve the proposed development and its anticipated associated traffic generation. As a result, the Highway Authority have confirmed that they are satisfied that the traffic generation arising from the proposed development would not result in severe detrimental impact on the operation or safety of the local highway network.

Bus Stop: Within the #1 Scheme it was proposed to create a bus lay-by on the Lynchford Road station approach frontage of the site by using a small piece of land within the application site. This was intended to enable buses to pull-over without blocking traffic flow along the station approach road whilst the bus is stationary. It would have required some minor works to the margin of the public highway at this point to provide a revised pavement and the cutting back of some vegetation to maintain adequate sight-line visibility from the adjacent site access road junction. The Highway Authority was content that this work, insofar as it related to the public highway and that it could be dealt with separately under a Section 278 Highway Works Agreement between the developer and themselves, together with a standard Planning condition being imposed to require the provision and retention of the bus stop.

However, whilst the #2 Scheme application initially indicated that it would continue to provide a bus stop, HCC Highways initially responded to consultation to indicate that they did not consider this facility to be unnecessary. Buses already stop at the adjacent North Camp Railway Station and private coaches can be accommodated within the application site layout. Accordingly, the proposed plans have been amended to delete the proposed bus lay-by from the scheme on this basis.

Internal Site Layout: As with the #1 Scheme, it is considered that the access and layout of the proposed development is satisfactory in terms of the arrangement and accessibility of parking

spaces, sight-lines, vehicle parking, accessibility for bin collections etc. It is considered that conditions can be imposed to require the provision and retention of these elements of the proposed development.

On-Site Parking Provision: The proposed development makes provision for a main parking area comprising 143 spaces north of the proposed Aquatic Sports Centre building and Golf-Driving Range. It is considered that this parking provision is sufficient to meet the functional parking needs of the proposed #2 Scheme development and the construction and retention of this on-site parking can be secured by planning condition.

Outside of, and unaffected by the #2 Scheme application site, a total of 42 separate parking spaces would be provided south of the proposed Golf-Driving Range bunded enclosure for the use of occupiers of the floating holiday lodges permitted with the #1 Scheme. An additional smaller area of 22 parking also outside of the #2 Scheme site would also be provided on the land between lakes 4 and 6 that appear likely to be reserved for staff parking.

The proposed development also has good access for users that would travel to and from the site using non-car modes of transport, whether this be via train, bus, bicycle or on foot. It is considered that acceptable provision is made for bicycle parking on-site and this can be secured and retained using a planning condition.

Overall, it is considered that the proposed development makes acceptable provision for on-site parking.

Refuse Collection and Service Deliveries: All of the refuse generated by the site would be commercial waste subject to private contract collection arrangements and, as such, is a matter for arrangement and management by the developer/operators. The proposed café and bars would require servicing and deliveries – and provision is also made for these activities within the layout design of the development.

Transport Contributions: The Highways Authority does not seek a Transport Contribution in this case because the traffic generation potential of the proposed development is not considered to be significantly different from that potentially arising from the existing uses of the application site. Nevertheless, as with the #1 Scheme, in response to the submitted Framework Travel Plan, HCC Highways indicate that the implementation and monitoring of a Travel Plan will need to be secured, together with the usual Travel Plan Approval and Monitoring fees. HCC has indicated that the amended version of the Framework Travel Plan that has been submitted by the Applicants is satisfactory.

Construction Access and Arrangements : Although the construction and other impacts of the implementation of a planning permission cannot be taken into material account in the determination of a planning application, the Highway Authority have recommended the preparation and submission to the Council for approval of a Construction Management Plan to be required by condition. It is considered that this is entirely appropriate given the large scale and likely duration of the proposed development works.

Highways Conclusions : The Highway Authority are satisfied that, subject to the Travel Plan being secured with a s106 Planning Obligation, the proposed development would not have a severe impact on the operation of, safety of, or accessibility to, local or strategic road networks. Accordingly, it is considered that the proposals comply with the requirements of Local Plan Policy IN2 and are acceptable in highways terms.

5. Ecology and Biodiversity-

The overall Hollybush Lakes site has significant existing ecological value dominated by several fishing lakes surrounded by rough grassland and trees. The overall site is also situated within the Blackwater Valley alongside the River Blackwater. The northern part of the #2 site (including Lake 1 and the surrounding terrestrial habitats), is of County importance for ecological features, formally selected as the Ramillies Park/North Camp Lakes Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC); and, at the time of selection, supported an assemblage of aquatic plants, including floating, submerged, and emergent plant species.

A second County-important SINC, the Hollybush Hill Country Park, is located beyond Lakes 3 & 4 some distance to the south of the #2 application site, but adjoining the south margin of the wider #1 site. This is designated on the basis of the grasslands that it contains. Additionally, to the east of the site (within Surrey and outside the application sites, but also within the ownership of the Applicants), Lakes 2 & 5 are designated as the Ash Vale Gravel Pits Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI : the Surrey equivalent of a SINC); and are described as *"Former gravel pits supporting a mosaic of open water (with developing fen swamp margins) interspersed by secondary Oak-Birch woodland"*.

Detailed Ecological Surveys of the lakes and surrounding terrestrial habitats have been undertaken on behalf of the Applicants in order to assess both the current ecological condition of the application site and the impacts of the proposed development. These have been prepared by suitably qualified ecological consultants. In this respect, the current versions of the submitted ecology documents are up-to-date, having been produced in 2024 shortly before the current application was submitted. Whilst the nature conservation interest of the lakes and margins that prompted SINC designation have been degraded, the lakes are continuing to recover following the cessation of the unauthorised commercial uses on the site, albeit not necessarily reverting with all of the qualities and nature conservation interest that previously existed. Much new vegetation is colonising the wider application site generally and the Applicants undertook some significant tree planting alongside their unauthorised works; and also, later, to comply with the requirements of the subsequent Enforcement Notice. Notwithstanding the overall ecological value of the wider site, the portion of the site comprising the current #2 application site largely comprises land of less ecological value, containing an extensive area of concrete hardstanding and bare ground. The wider application site therefore remains in a state of transition in terms of habitat development and the wildlife species present.

Biodiversity:

The Environment Act 2021 introduced a statutory footing for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity, requiring a 10% minimum uplift post-development. Although the #1 scheme was submitted some time before mandatory BNG requirements came into effect (in February 2024), the National Planning Policy Framework required that *"opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements in and around developments should be encouraged, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity"*. Accordingly, a Biodiversity Impact Calculation Metric was submitted with the #1 application demonstrating that there would be no net loss of biodiversity at the site as a result of the proposals, and that it would be possible to achieve at least a 10% biodiversity net gain. In the circumstances presented by the #1 scheme case, namely relatively limited biodiversity loss arising from overall modest proposed development to be constructed within a substantial site where alternative biodiversity enhancement could be readily accommodated, it was considered that the imposition of conditions variously requiring the submission of a biodiversity enhancement scheme for the site alongside ecological protection measures and management would be an appropriate response to meet the

requirements of Local Plan Policy NE4.

The #2 application was submitted after the advent of mandatory BNG requirements and, as such, must be considered on a statutory footing having regard to the BNG Regulations. The Council's adopted Biodiversity Net Gain SPD (2024) publishes the Council's expectations in this respect; and also sets out the various requirements and procedures to be followed to secure the necessary Biodiversity Net Gain with all non-exempted development proposals. The extent of the existing biodiversity features that would be lost as a result of the #2 proposals exceeds the de minimis threshold.

Additionally, Rushmoor Local Plan Policy NE4 states: *"development proposals should seek to secure opportunities to enhance biodiversity and include proportionate measures to contribute, where possible, to a net gain in biodiversity, through creation, restoration, enhancement and management of habitats and features, including measures that help to link key habitats."*

In terms of the BNG provision proposed for the #2 Scheme, the Council's Ecology Officer has carefully considered the #2 Scheme proposals in respect of the BNG Regulations. The BNG submissions of the #2 Scheme must be considered on a statutory footing having regard to the BNG Regulations; and are focussed solely upon the #2 Scheme application site. It is further noted that the parts of the #2 site on which development is proposed are those areas of land within the site of the least significant existing biodiversity value, thereby requiring relatively modest biodiversity enhancements to achieve 10% net gain. In this respect, it is proposed that all of the BNG for the #2 Scheme be provided within the #2 site. It is considered that the reports submitted with the #2 application are appropriate in scope and methodology. The Biodiversity Impact Assessment Report and associated Statutory Metric submitted with the #2 application identifies that indicative post-development habitat creation/enhancement would be compliant with the Biodiversity Net Gain statutory obligations of the Environment Act 2021. These are measures that are considered to be proportionate to the scale and opportunities provided by the proposed development and, indeed, are robustly demonstrated to achieve in excess of 10% biodiversity net gain.

The Ecology Officer has also considered how the implementation of the #2 proposals might interact with the implementation of the remnants of the #1 proposals. The #2 proposals are not easily comparable with the BNG submissions submitted and approved with the #1 Scheme : a different Ecological Consultant has been employed; and the approach taken to considering the #1 BNG proposals was different. Nevertheless, whilst the #2 Scheme has to be primarily considered as a stand-alone proposal that could be implemented independently of the #1 Scheme, it is also necessary for the Council to consider whether the #2 Scheme would harmfully compromise the BNG provision required for the approved #1 Scheme. This could conceivably arise were the implementation of proposed development the subject of the #2 Scheme to result in insufficient opportunities for biodiversity enhancement remaining to address the BNG requirements of any parts of the #1 Scheme to be implemented beyond the #2 site.

Should the #2 proposals proceed, the only elements of the #1 Scheme that would remain of it to be implemented would be the floating holiday lodges and their ancillary on-shore installations. These are the components of the approved #1 development involving only relatively minor loss of existing biodiversity value and, as such, also require modest BNG. Accordingly, it is considered that the area of the overall site excluded from the current #2 Scheme application site are likely to contain more than sufficient potential BNG enhancements to cover any biodiversity losses arising from the installation of the holiday lodges. Notwithstanding the concerns of the Ecology Officer, it is not considered that any harmful conflict would arise. The crux of the concern in this respect is that the #2 proposals do not show the enhancement of the reed beds at the

north end of Lake 1, whereas this was part of the #1 BNG provisions. However, it is not considered that there is any incompatibility since it would still be possible for the developer to implement the reed-bed enhancement in Lake 1 as part of the implementation of their #1 Scheme proposals if this were to be needed even if it is not shown by plans for the #2 Scheme. It is considered that the absence of the reedbed enhancements from the #2 Scheme plans simply arises because they are not required as part of the BNG scheme to support the #2 proposals

In conclusion, subject to the completion of a s106 Legal Agreement to secure the required statutory provisions to secure Biodiversity Net Gain on or adjoining the site for a minimum period of 30 years, together with payment of the appropriate BNG Monitoring fees it is considered that the #2 proposals would be provided with adequate BNG on-site. Furthermore, the #2 proposals would not harmfully compromise the implementation of what would remain of the #1 Scheme; and the developer would be able to submit the necessary details to the Council for consideration and approval pursuant to the Biodiversity Gain Plan planning condition imposed with the #1 Scheme planning permission.

Special Protection Area : The #2 Scheme does not involve the provision of any residential accommodation that would trigger consideration of SPA impact and the need for SPA mitigation and avoidance in the form of SPA SANGS and SAMMs financial contributions. The #1 planning permission s106 Agreement secures the necessary SPA contributions in respect of the proposed floating holiday lodges element of the #1 Scheme. Furthermore, whilst the proposed leisure uses proposed with the #2 Scheme seek to encourage people to undertake leisure activities on site, it is not considered likely that they would encourage additional leisure use of the nearest parts of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (SPA), not least because the nearest component part of the SPA (the Ash Ranges) is situated some distance away and is only indirectly linked via the surrounding footpath network.

Ecology & Biodiversity Conclusions : Subject to conditions, the Ecology Officer has concluded that the Applicants' have presented sufficient information and proposals to understand the likely impacts upon protected wildlife and ensure that ecological and biodiversity matters are appropriately addressed with the proposed development. Consequently, it is therefore recommended that planning permission can be granted subject to conditions in respect of ecology and biodiversity matters having regard to the relevant adopted Local Plan Policies and Government Guidance.

6. Flooding and Drainage Issues –

The ***Principle*** section of this report has considered the Flood Risk Sequential Test and Exception Test matters of principle raised by the proposals, concluding that these Tests are passed and do not apply respectively. As such, the proposed development is considered to be appropriate for the site having regard to flood risk considerations. However, what follows below is consideration of the flooding and surface water drainage issues having regard to whether or not the proposed development can be made safe throughout its lifetime without increasing flood risk elsewhere. Indeed, that any measures to avoid, control, manage and mitigate flood risk do not also increase flood risk elsewhere.

Fluvial Flood Risk : As a result of the flood risk status of the application site, the application is accompanied by a full Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). The site is located on land largely at intermediate risk of fluvial flooding (Flood Risk Zone 2), with some smaller areas of land at highest risk of flooding (Flood Risk Zone 3 : functional flood plain), including at the north end of Lake 1. The only parts of the site that are situated within Flood Risk Zone 1 (land at lowest risk

of fluvial flooding) are Hollybush Lane itself, and the area to the west of Hollybush Lane to the west of Lake 1. In this latter case, this is land currently at a higher level than the remainder of the site (excluding the existing bunds), but is proposed to be partly reduced in level to construct the proposed main car park.

In addition to passing the Sequential and Exception Tests, adopted Local Plan Policy NE6 (Managing Fluvial Flood Risk) states that development proposals in areas at identified risk of flooding, such as the current application site, will be appropriately flood resilient and resistant, including safe access and escape routes where required, and ensure that any residual risk can be safely managed. Furthermore, such proposals should include an assessment of the impact of climate change using appropriate climate change allowances over the lifetime of the proposed development so that future flood risk is taken into account.

Although the Environment Agency (EA) has not, to date, responded to the Council's consultation in respect of the current #2 Scheme proposals, the EA carefully considered the FRA and the subsequent amended plans and details submitted at their request with the #1 Scheme— and indicated that they were satisfied that the amended #1 proposals had overcome their initial concerns. Firstly, a proposal for a commuter car park at the north end of Lake 1 within Flood Risk Zone 3 was deleted from the #1 Scheme. Secondly, short-comings in the original submitted FRA concerning the extent of flood-plain storage to be retained as a result of the bunded area to be used for the then proposed Equestrian Centre were resolved with the clarification that openings were to be provided to allow the movement of flood water into this area in the event of river flooding. The nature of the enclosure of the proposed development site near the River Blackwater, which was the retention of the existing 2.5 metre high palisade fencing was clarified and confirmed and agreed to be permeable to floodwater. NE also confirmed that the impact upon their 8-metre river wildlife buffer zone is also considered satisfactory as a result of proposals to ensure that the fence is also permeable to wildlife, including with the provision of animal underpasses under the fence and appropriate management measures. Overall, the EA raised no objection subject to the imposition of a number of conditions subsequently incorporated into the #1 Scheme planning permission decision notice. The proposed #1 development was thereby concluded to be acceptable having regard to fluvial flood risk considerations taking into account an appropriate allowance for climate change for the lifetime of the development, and, in doing so, would not give rise to an unacceptable risk of flooding elsewhere.

The proposed #2 Scheme proposes some changes, largely involving the deletion of the #1 Scheme Equestrian Centre use of the bunded area and the use of this area, instead, as a Golf-Driving Range. However, the #2 Scheme proposals would not materially alter the physical form of the site and proposed development from that already approved with the #1 Scheme. Crucially, the #2 Scheme makes no changes to the bunded enclosure and would continue to retain the openings in the bunded area that the EA has previously identified that need to be retained.

The EA also noted with the #1 Scheme that, in accordance with Paragraph 167 of the NPPF (and to meet the requirements of adopted Local Plan Policy NE6), the Council must ensure that 'the development is appropriately flood resistant and resilient' and that 'safe access and escape routes are included where appropriate, as part of an agreed emergency plan...'. In terms of flood resistance and resilience it is noted that the majority of the wider site is open land or water not subject to development and to be used for outdoor leisure purposes. The current proposed Aquatic Sports Centre and Golf-Driving Range building would, as with the approved #1 Scheme, have two-storeys. Even taking into account climate change, it is not anticipated that the proposed Golf-Driving Range target/hole area (where only staff would have access for the retrieval of golf balls) would be situated towards the west side of the site near Hollybush Lane,

such that it would only be subject to flooding with the most severe, and thereby least likely and most predictable, fluvial flooding events. As a result, it is considered that the proposed overall development subject to the #2 Scheme changes continues to be designed with appropriate flood resilience and resistance in mind. The Applicants have submitted a Flood Management Evacuation Plan (FMEP) that considers the depths of flood-water for several flood scenarios in order to inform the means of evacuation of the site in the event of flooding or the receipt of a flood alert. The application site is located within the area within which the EA's free 24-hour flood warning service is provided. It is stressed that the FMEP is a 'living document' to be evolved and subject to regular review, and especially in the light of any lessons to be learned from any flood events that may occur. It is considered that the content and means and measures set out in the FMEP are satisfactory and, as such, subject to an appropriately-worded condition to require the proposed development to be used and operated at all times in accordance with the content of the FMEP, that an appropriate flooding emergency evacuation plan would be in place.

Surface Water Drainage : The surface water drainage of the proposed development is subject to licencing (in this case by seeking a Land Drainage Consent from the LLFA) that is subject to entirely separate consideration under other legislation and, as such, is not a matter for direct and technical consideration by the Council with a planning application. Nevertheless, adopted Local Plan Policy NE8 (Sustainable Drainage Systems) requires that developments include the implementation of integrated and maintainable Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) in all flood zones for both brownfield and greenfield sites.

There have been some amendments to the #2 Scheme proposals in order to address initial queries raised by the Lead Local Flood Authority (HCC : LLFA). The LLFA has, however, confirmed no objections to the proposals as amended in December 2024. The LLFA noted in raising no objections to the #1 Scheme that the wider site is, and would remain, vulnerable to flooding from both fluvial and surface water sources; and proximity to the River and Lakes mean that groundwater levels within the wider site can be extremely high in places, even in the summer months. This is considered to be inevitable given the general low-lying site topography and the consequent close relationship that the site has with the water environment. As a result, whilst there is some limited opportunity to provide infiltration drainage for the more elevated parts of the site, lower areas may not always, if ever, drain effectively by this method. Generally, the proposed drainage features for the site comprise infiltration trenches and wet or dry swales. The parking areas as already approved with #1, but now proposed in a modified form with the current #2 Scheme, are indicated to be constructed with permeable surfacing. Additionally, the large expanse of existing concrete hardstandings on the land proposed to be the Golf-Driving Range target/hole area are indicated to be removed and replaced with a more permeable grassed surface. The proposed #2 revised drainage scheme takes account of the poor drainage characteristics of the site by providing defined paths for surface water drainage into the Lakes when or where infiltration drainage would be ineffective. The LLFA noted, in accepting the #1 Scheme, that this approach did not accord with their best practice principles for surface water drainage schemes. However, because it was evident that there is no effective means of draining low-lying ground that is at risk of flooding, the LLFA conceded that the wider application site is, in part at least, a brownfield previously-developed site where there would be a reduction in the existing extent of impermeable surfacing at the site as a result of the proposed development. Furthermore, that green roofs were proposed, which are a form of SUDS feature that would also help to apply some control and improvement to surface water run-off rates from the proposed buildings. The basic objective of the LLFA is to ensure that proposed developments do not cause harm as a result of changes in the drainage characteristics of sites arising from new development. Accordingly, because of the likely volumetric improvements in the drainage characteristics of the site arising from the proposed development, the LLFA concluded that the overall proposals would not materially increase run-off or increase downstream flood-risk :

further any issues in this respect would be contained within the site and a matter for site management. The current #2 proposals are not considered to materially alter this conclusion. Further, it is noted that the Flood Management Evacuation Plan (FMEP) for the site takes into account the impact of surface-water flooding in addition to flooding from a fluvial source.

The long-term maintenance and management of drainage schemes is important to ensure that they continue to operate as originally specified at all times. In this respect, the submitted Flood Risk & Drainage Strategy document indicates that a management company would be set up by the developer for this purpose; and notes the need for a SUDS Maintenance Plan to be produced. It is considered that the indicated approach, which was accepted in respect of the #1 Scheme, is equally sound in principle and can be secured by planning condition in respect of the #2 Scheme also.

Whilst the technical details/specification of the proposed surface-water drainage installations for the site as modified by the #2 Scheme amendments are the subject of separate consideration and licence approval by the LLFA, it is considered that the proposed indicative drainage scheme submitted with the current planning application is feasible, credible and acceptable in principle and would deliver an improvement on the existing site drainage situation, thereby meeting the objectives of Local Plan Policy NE8.

Foul Drainage and Contamination of the Water Environment : The vulnerability of the site to flooding gave rise to an on-going risk of water contamination primarily as a result of the production of horse manure at the Equestrian Centre, thereby requiring imposition of conditions to deal with this matter. However this concern does not arise with the #2 Scheme since the proposed Equestrian use is deleted in favour of a Golf-Driving Range instead, which would not generate any significant water contamination. This is a clear benefit of the #2 Scheme when compared with the approved #1 Scheme.

In terms of foul drainage facilities for the proposed development, the application site has no connection into a public foul sewerage system and no such connection would be feasible. As a result, as approved with the #1 Scheme, it is proposed that a package treatment plant be installed on site. As with the #1 Scheme, it is considered that details of the proposed treatment plan, in addition to full details of the proposed drainage scheme for the proposed #2 development, can be secured with a planning condition.

7. Sustainability -

Criterion b. of Policy DE1 requires new developments to *“promote designs and layouts which take account of the need to adapt to and mitigate against the effects of climate change, including the use of renewable energy”*. Criterion n. then requires that *“All development proposals will demonstrate how they will incorporate sustainable construction standards and techniques.”* And: *Major commercial developments over 1,000 sqm gross floorspace will be required to meet BREEAM ‘very good’ standard overall (or any future national equivalent) and BREEAM ‘excellent’ standard for water consumption (or any future national equivalent).”* In this respect, the application is supported by a BREEAM Pre-Assessment Report that demonstrates that it would be possible for the proposed development to achieve BREEAM ‘Very Good’ rating.

Local Plan Policy DE4 also requires new non-residential development of 1000 square metres gross external area or more, which applies in respect of the proposed Aquatic Sports Centre, to provide evidence on completion of achievement of the BREEAM ‘excellent’ standard for water consumption. This can typically be achieved by undertaking measures such as the installation of water fittings with restricted flow rates.

It is considered that, as with the #1 Scheme, appropriate conditions can be imposed to secure compliance with the requirements of this policy.

8. Access for People with Disabilities –

It is considered that there is no reason why the proposed development would be unable to provide adequate access for people with disabilities within the proposed development, as necessary and appropriate, in accordance with the Building Regulations. Furthermore, in doing so, that there would not be any adverse and material planning consequences. In the circumstances it is considered that adequate facilities would be provided for people with disabilities using the proposed development.

9. Other Issues -

Blackwater Valley Path : The Blackwater Valley Path (BVP) is a 23-mile long route that is used and promoted for use by both pedestrians and cyclists.. It comprises a mixture of paths and tracks that follow the River Blackwater from near its source at Rowhill Nature Reserve to Swallowfield near the Wellington Country Park south of Reading, where the Blackwater joins the River Loddon. Much of the sections of the BVP in Rushmoor were created as a consequence of the construction of the Blackwater Valley Road (A331) and the BVP (in Rushmoor BC's area at least) is not a public right of way recorded on the Hampshire County Council definitive rights of way map. Instead, much of the BVP has been formed using 'permissive' rights of way agreed with private landowners. The section of the Blackwater Valley Path crossing the application site is a permissive pedestrian right of way created as a result of a peppercorn Leasehold Deed of Grant dated 16th August 1989 by the then landowner (Redland Aggregates Limited) to Rushmoor Borough Council. It is the only section of the BVP that, technically, has no rights for use by cyclists. This leasehold deed of grant is for a term of 50 years, thereby expiring after 16 August 2039. Responsibility for the on-going maintenance of the original line of the BVP crossing the site lays with the Council and is work undertaken by the Blackwater Valley Countryside Partnership.

The original line of the BVP crossing the application site ran along the west side of the River and, as such, within the eastern margin of the #1 Scheme application site. However, the applicants, having acquired the land at the application site in 2011, closed the section of the BVP crossing the site in 2014. When the original line of the path was closed, the applicants provided an alternative route to maintain the BVP as a long-distance route. This diversion route runs along the south side of the application site to join Hollybush Lane, then turning north to re-join the open section of the Path at Lynchford Road west of North Camp railway station.

The line of the closed section of the BVP still remains intact, but has become overgrown due to the lack of access for maintenance. This largely involved vegetation management, albeit there may be some need for the provision and maintenance of gates and fencing. There may also be need for some vegetation clearance and maintenance of a timber footbridge over the River located beyond the north end of the application site beside the Old Ford Public House car park. This is because, although technically remaining open, this section of the BVP was rendered a dead-end by the closure of the applicants' portion of the Path and the opening of the diversion route, thereby by-passing this small section of the Path outside the application site.

The #1 Scheme application proposed that the original line of the BVP crossing the application site be re-opened because the proposed leisure uses of the site necessitate better connectivity

into the remainder of the Valley and, as such, it is an essential element of the proposals. Additionally, the #1 Scheme proposed that traffic be re-introduced to the section of Hollybush Lane that is currently used to provide the diversion route, in order to serve the proposed floating holiday lodges and it is clearly desirable to separate vehicular traffic from pedestrians and cyclists or, at least, provide a vehicle-free leisure route to, from and past the proposed development.

The restoration and on-going retention for the lifetime of the proposed development of the original line of the BVP crossing the site accords with the requirements of Local Plan Policy NE2 (Green Infrastructure), which identifies the Blackwater Valley as a principal Green Corridor and states that: *“Development proposals within or adjoining green corridors, as shown on the Policies Map, will be expected to enhance their landscape and amenity value.”* The re-opening of the currently closed section of the BVP would play an important part in re-integrating the application site into its surroundings and enhance the leisure use and amenities of the Blackwater Valley. It is a proposal that was supported by the Blackwater Valley Countryside Partnership in their comments on the #1 Scheme application, whom also asked for use of the re-instated route by cyclists to be formalised, and for vehicular access to be provided to facilitate their resumed maintenance of the Path.

Given the circumstances and the existing time-bound arrangements under which the section of the BVP crossing the site are currently provided, the restoration and retention for the lifetime of the proposed development of the original river-side route of the BVP across the application site was secured with the s106 Planning Obligation. Completed with the #1 Scheme planning permission. Once restored and re-opened, the on-going maintenance of the original river-side line of the BVP at the application site would return to being undertaken by the Blackwater Valley Countryside Partnership on behalf of the Council. This on-going work would be facilitated by provision of vehicular access, the details of which would be a matter for discussion and agreement between the applicants/operators of the proposed development and the Council and the Blackwater valley Countryside Partnership. Nevertheless, vehicular access routes to the vicinity of the BVP within the application site are to be retained intact as a result of the proposed development whether in #1 or #2 form.

The proposed BVP reinstatement proposals made with the #1 Scheme application remain necessary for the wider development as modified by the #2 Scheme; to accord with the requirements and objectives of adopted Local Plan policy; and are also directly, fairly and reasonably related to the scale and nature of the proposed development. Accordingly, it is considered appropriate to replicate the s106 restoration and retention requirements in granting permission for the #2 Scheme.

Employment & Skills : The Council holds National Skills Academy for Construction status and works in partnership with the construction industry to generate skills, training and employment opportunities on large development sites in the Borough. In addition to benefitting local employment opportunities, this initiative also benefits employers, especially where there are skill shortages that make it difficult to find appropriately skilled staff. Where it is considered appropriate to do so, early engagement with developers is fostered, often through commencing a dialogue with developers even when planning applications are still under consideration : consequently his process must generally operate outside of the planning system and the consideration of planning applications. In this case the Council’s Employment & Skills Officer has previously contacted the applicants’ agent to seek to explore what employment opportunities may arise from the proposed development. The advent of the #2 Scheme proposals provides continued encouragement for this work to continue. In this case the proposed development may generate opportunities for local employment such that it is

considered appropriate to impose a condition to encourage the developer to engage on this matter at the appropriate time.

Overall Conclusions –

It is considered that the #2 Scheme proposals would not materially and harmfully alter or compromise the #1 Scheme development as already approved and they are, as such, acceptable in principle. The #2 Scheme proposals are equally acceptable in highways terms; would have no material and harmful impact upon the overall visual character and appearance of the area and trees worthy of retention; would not give rise to any material and adverse visual and physical intrusion into the Blackwater Valley countryside gap; neighbours; would have acceptable impacts on neighbours; satisfactorily address the Flood Risk Sequential Test; are acceptable having regard to fluvial flood risk considerations taking into account an appropriate allowance for climate change for the lifetime of the development, and, in doing so, would not give rise to an unacceptable risk of flooding elsewhere; provide appropriate proposals for the surface water drainage of the site; robustly address the ecology & biodiversity impacts of the proposed development; would have no significant impact upon the nature conservation interest and objectives of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. The proposals are therefore considered to be acceptable having regard to the criteria of Policies SS1, SS2, DE1, DE2, DE3, IN2, DE1, DE2, DE3, IN2, NE1, NE2, NE3, NE4, NE5, NE6, NE7 and NE8 of the adopted Rushmoor Local Plan (2014-2032).

Full Recommendation

It is recommended that subject to the completion of a satisfactory s106 Planning Agreement between the applicants, Rushmoor Borough Council and Hampshire County Council to secure:-

- (a) the required statutory provisions to secure Biodiversity Net Gain on or adjoining the site for a minimum period of 30 years;
- (b) the provisions required by Hampshire County Council concerning formulation, administration and monitoring of a Travel Plan; and
- (c) appropriate clauses to secure the restoration and retention for the lifetime of the development of the original line of the Blackwater Valley Path through the application site

the Executive Director of Planning & Growth, in consultation with the Chairman, be authorised to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the following recommended conditions and informatives:-

Recommended Conditions

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason - As required by Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by Section 51 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

- 2 The permission hereby granted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings and documents:

BACA Architects' Drawing Nos.279-200-001 Rev.B; -002 Rev.B; -100 Rev.c; -101 Rev.D; -102 Rev.C; -110 Rev.C; -111 Rev.C; -112 Rev.C; -113 Rev.C; -114 Rev.C; -115 Rev.C; -116 Rev.C; -117 Rev.C; -118 Rev.C; -139 Rev D; -200-EA Buffer Rev.C; and Design & Access Statement, Planning Statement, Transport Assessment,

Framework Travel Plan (December 2024), Flood Risk & Drainage Assessment incorporating Flood Management Evacuation Plan and response to HCC Lead Local Flood Authority December 2024, (Flood Risk) Sequential Test Update, Landscape & Visual Impact Assessment, Lighting Impact Assessment, Noise Impact Assessment, Arboricultural Impact Assessment, Business Needs Assessment, Ecological Appraisal, Ecology Survey Reports, BREEAM Pre-Assessment Report, Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment, BNG Metric, & BNG Statement Form.

Reason - To ensure the development is implemented in accordance with the permission granted.

- 3 Construction of the following elements of the development hereby approved shall not start until a schedule and/or samples of the materials to be used in them have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Those elements of the development shall be carried out using the materials so approved and thereafter retained:
- External walls
 - Roofing materials
 - Window/door frames
 - Balustrades
 - Ground surfacing materials
 - Fencing and other means of enclosure
 - Lighting columns

Reason - To ensure satisfactory external appearance. *

- 4 Prior to occupation or use of the development hereby approved, screen and boundary walls, fences, hedges or other means of enclosure shall be installed in accordance with the details submitted with the application hereby approved and approved. The development boundary treatment shall be completed and retained thereafter at all times as approved.

Reason - In the interests of visual amenity. *

- 5 Prior to occupation or use of any part of the development hereby approved, details of satisfactory provision for the storage and removal of refuse from the premises shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall be carried out and retained in accordance with the details so approved.

Reason - To safeguard the amenities of the area. *

- 6 Construction or demolition work of any sort within the area covered by the application shall only take place between the hours of 0800-1800 on Monday to Fridays and 0800-1300 on Saturdays. No work at all shall take place on Sundays and Bank or Statutory Holidays.

Reason - To protect the amenities of neighbouring residential properties and to prevent adverse impact on traffic and parking conditions in the vicinity.

- 7 Prior to first occupation or use of the development hereby approved a fully detailed landscape and planting scheme in respect of both landscape planting, visual screening and ecological enhancement shall be first submitted to and approved in writing by the

Local Planning Authority. All planting, seeding or turfing comprised in the approved details of landscaping shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the occupation of the buildings or the practical completion of the development, whichever is the sooner and shall be so retained. [See also the requirements of Condition Nos.20 and 21 below.]

Reason - To ensure the development makes an adequate contribution to visual amenity and biodiversity. *

- 8 The development hereby approved shall not be occupied until the vehicle parking and bicycle facilities shown on the approved plans have been completed, surfaced, marked-out and made ready for use by the occupiers/users of the development. The parking facilities shall be thereafter retained solely for parking purposes (to be used by the occupiers of, and visitors to, the development). The on-site parking hereby approved shall not be used for commuter parking. *

Reason - To ensure the provision and availability of adequate off-street parking to serve the functional parking needs of the development hereby approved.

- 9 No lift housing rooms, tank rooms, plant or other structures shall be erected on the roof of the buildings hereby permitted without the prior permission of the Local Planning Authority.

Reason - To ensure that the appearance of the premises is satisfactory and to safeguard the appearance of the surrounding Blackwater Valley countryside.

- 10 No works pursuant to this permission shall commence until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority: -

i. a desk top study carried out by a competent person documenting all previous and existing uses of the site and adjoining land, and potential for contamination, with information on the environmental setting including known geology and hydrogeology. This report should contain a conceptual model, identifying potential contaminant pollutant linkages.

ii. if identified as necessary; a site investigation report documenting the extent, scale and nature of contamination, ground conditions of the site and incorporating chemical and gas analysis identified as appropriate by the desk top study.

iii. if identified as necessary; a detailed scheme for remedial works and measures shall be undertaken to avoid risk from contaminants/or gas identified by the site investigation when the site is developed and proposals for future maintenance and monitoring, along with verification methodology. Such scheme to include nomination of a competent person to oversee and implement the works.

Where step iii) above is implemented, following completion of the measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report that demonstrates the effectiveness of the remediation shall be submitted for approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason - To ensure that the site is safe for the development permitted and in the interests of amenity and pollution prevention. *

- 11 In the event that unforeseen ground conditions or materials which suggest potential or actual contamination are revealed at any time during implementation of the approved development it must be reported, in writing, immediately to the Local Planning Authority. A competent person must undertake a risk assessment and assess the level and extent of the problem and, where necessary, prepare a report identifying remedial action which shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority before the measures are implemented.

Following completion of measures identified in the approved remediation scheme a verification report must be prepared and is subject to approval in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason - To ensure that the site is safe for the development permitted and in the interests of amenity and pollution prevention.

- 12 No sound reproduction equipment, conveying messages, music, or other sound which is audible outside the application site shall be installed and/or used on the site.

Reason - To protect the amenities of neighbours and the area in general.

- 13 All plant and machinery to be installed at any time in connection with the development hereby permitted shall be enclosed with soundproofing materials and mounted in a way which will minimise transmission of structure- and air-borne sound in accordance with a scheme to be first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason - To protect the amenities of the area. *

- 14 Provision shall be made for services to be placed underground. No overhead wire or cables or other form of overhead servicing shall be placed over or used in the development of the application site.

Reason - In the interests of visual amenity.

- 15 No construction works pursuant to this permission shall take place until detailed surface and foul water drainage schemes for the site along the lines shown illustratively with the Flood Risk & Drainage Assessment Report and Appendices submitted with the planning application has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details should also include details for the long-term maintenance arrangements for the surface water drainage and/or SUDS systems together with appropriate maintenance schedules for each drainage feature type and its ownership.

Such details as may be approved shall be implemented in full prior to the first occupation and use of the new development and retained thereafter in perpetuity.

Reason - To reflect the objectives of Policy NE8 of the New Rushmoor Local Plan (2014-2032). *

- 16 No works shall start on site until existing trees and shrubs/hedges to be retained on and adjoining the site have been adequately protected from damage with appropriate protective fencing during site clearance and works in accordance with the detail

indicated within the submitted Aspect Ecology Revised Ecological Appraisal (January 2021) hereby approved. Furthermore, no materials or plant shall be stored and no buildings erected within protective fencing to be erected at the margins of the root protection area of each tree/shrub/hedge to be retained as appropriate.

Reason - To ensure that existing trees are adequately protected in the interests of the visual amenities and ecology/biodiversity interest of the site and the locality in general.

- 17 The occupation and use of the development hereby permitted shall not commence until a Sensitive Lighting Management Plan (SLMP) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in accordance with industry best practice guidance in respect of all external lighting. The SLMP shall:

(a) be designed in accordance with the principles for mitigation of adverse lighting impacts set out in the Strenger Lighting Impact Assessment R010 (July 2024) hereby approved to ensure that light spillage, glare, skyglow and ecological impact are minimised;

(b) identify the areas or features on the site that are particularly sensitive for bats and identify the aspects of the development that would be likely to cause disturbance in or around the breeding sites and resting places of these species or along important routes used to access key areas of their territory, for example for foraging and commuting; and

(c) show how and where all the proposed external lighting will be installed and demonstrate (through the provision of appropriate lighting plans and technical specifications) that those areas to be lit will not disturb or prevent the above species using their territory or gaining access to their breeding sites, resting places and foraging areas.

The SLMP as may be approved shall be implemented in full in accordance with the specifications and locations set out and retained as required thereafter at all times. No other external lighting shall be installed without prior express consent from the Local Planning Authority.

No external lighting, with the exception of lighting identified to be required solely and specifically justified for security purposes, shall be used between 2300 hours and 0800 hours.

Reason - To ensure that there is no inappropriate or unnecessary use of lighting at the site in the interests of the character and appearance of the Blackwater Valley countryside; and to ensure the protection of wildlife in the interests of nature conservation in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. *

- 18 No fish stocking shall take place within Lakes 1 and 6.

Reason - In the interests of preserving and enhancing the ecology and biodiversity of these lakes.

- 19 Leisure visitor access to the open water and northern banks of Lake 1 shall be restricted in accordance with a scheme of means and measures to be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the first use of the leisure facility hereby permitted. The details subsequently approved in this respect shall be implemented in full and retained thereafter at all times.

No motorised water-craft shall be used or motorised water sports activities take place within the application site.

Reason - In the interests of preventing undue disturbance of the wildlife and biodiversity enhancement features to be provided in these locations; and in the interests of the ecology and biodiversity value of the site in general; and to prevent the potential undue disturbance of neighbours with noisy outdoor sports activities.

- 20 Any openings in the bund shall remain open to floodwater for the lifetime of the development hereby permitted. If gates are installed in the openings they shall be permeable to floodwater. Details of fencing for the bunds shall be submitted to the local planning authority for approval prior to installation.

Reason - To ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere. This condition is supported by paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). *

- 21 Fencing and boundary treatments within land shown to be within Flood Risk Zone 3 shall be permeable to floodwater.

Reason - To ensure flood risk is not increased elsewhere. This condition is supported by paragraph 170 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

- 22 Prior to first occupation of the development hereby approved, the recommendations and actions set out in the Flood Management Evacuation Plan (FMEP) hereby approved shall be implemented in full and retained thereafter at all times whilst the site is occupied and/or in use.

Reason – In the interests of ensuring that occupiers and users of the site are protected from the potentially harmful impacts of fluvial and/or surface water flooding arising at the development site.

- 23 Prior to the first use and occupation of the development hereby approved appropriate biosecurity controls and monitoring measures in respect of the suppression, isolation and, if possible, elimination of any non-native invasive plant species at the site (such as Himalayan balsam, Japanese knotweed and New Zealand pygmyweed), shall be put in place and operated in accordance with details to be first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Those means and measures as may subsequently be approved shall be operated at all times thereafter at the site.

Reason – To prevent non-native invasive plant species spreading within and from the application site in the interests of ecology and biodiversity interests.

- 24 On completion of the Aquatic Sports Centre building within the development hereby approved, certification of the compliance of this building with the BREEAM 'Very Good' rating overall and 'excellent' rating for water consumption shall be submitted to, and approved by, the Local Planning Authority.

Reason - To ensure the development is sustainable and in order to meet the requirements of Policies DE1 and DE4 of the adopted Rushmoor Local Plan (2014-2032).

- 25 No development shall take place (including demolition, ground works, vegetation clearance) until a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) has been submitted to and include the following:-
- a) the provision to be made for the parking and turning on site of operatives and construction vehicles during construction and fitting out works;
 - b) the arrangements to be made for the delivery of all building and other materials to the site;
 - c) the provision to be made for any storage of building and other materials on site;
 - d) measures to prevent mud from being deposited on the highway;
 - e) the programme for construction;
 - f) Construction methods;
 - g) Any necessary pollution prevention methods;
 - h) Risk assessment of potentially damaging construction activities;
 - i) Identification of 'biodiversity protection zones';
 - j) Any necessary mitigation for protected wildlife species;
 - k) Practical measures (both physical measures and sensitive working practices) to avoid or reduce nuisance, wildlife disturbance and other adverse impacts that may arise during construction (this may be provided as a set of method statements);
 - l) The location and timing of sensitive works to avoid harm to wildlife and biodiversity features;
 - m) The times during construction when a specialist ecologist needs to be present on site to oversee works;
 - n) Responsible persons and lines of communication;
 - o) The role and responsibilities on site of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) or similarly competent person; and
 - p) Use of protective fences, exclusion barriers and warning signs.

The approved CEMP shall be adhered to and implemented throughout the construction period strictly in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

Reason - Reason: To ensure a satisfactory development and the protection of wildlife in the interests of nature conservation in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework. *

- 26 No development shall take place including demolition, ground works and vegetation clearance, until an Ecological Design Strategy has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, addressing how adverse impacts to biodiversity are to be avoided, adequately mitigated for, or, as a last resort, compensated for, in line with best practice guidance. The Ecological Design Strategy shall demonstrate in detail how a quantified net gain in biodiversity is secured in line with Environment Act ambitions.

The Ecological Design Strategy shall include, but not be limited to following:-

- a) Identification of baseline habitat ecological conditions as at application submission, including extent and location/area of habitats on appropriate scale maps and plans;
- b) Evaluation of how permitted development activities will result in loss or deterioration of baseline habitat ecological conditions including extent and location/area of habitats on appropriate scale maps and plans;
- c) Details of measures to be implemented in line with the mitigation hierarchy, to secure biodiversity net gain for a minimum of 30 years;

- d) Appropriate success criteria, thresholds, triggers and targets against which the effectiveness of these measures will be monitored;
- e) Appropriate management options for achieving biodiversity net gain;
- f) Preparation of a work schedule implementing management (including an annual work plan capable of being rolled forward over a five year period); and
- g) Monitoring strategy, including details of how contingencies and/or remedial action will be identified, agreed and implemented so that the development still delivers the fully functioning biodiversity objectives of the originally approved scheme.

The approved Ecological Design Strategy shall be adhered to and implemented throughout a 30-year timeframe strictly in accordance with the approved details, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the local planning authority.

The Ecological Design Strategy shall also include details of the legal and funding mechanisms by which the long-term implementation of the plan will be secured by the developer with the management body responsible for its delivery specified. Biodiversity losses and gains referenced within the Strategy should be supported by a suitably detailed metric using best practice quantification methodologies.

Reason - In the interests of safeguarding protected wildlife species from harm and disturbance; and to comply with the requirements of the NPPF and Local Plan Policy NE4. *

- 27 No development shall take place until a Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP), including long-term design objectives, management responsibilities and maintenance schedules for all landscaped areas has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The LEMP shall be carried out as approved and any subsequent variations shall be agreed in writing by the local planning authority. The scheme shall include the following elements:

- Details of maintenance regimes;
- Details of treatment of site boundaries and/or buffers around water bodies;
- Details of any new habitat created on site; and
- Details of management responsibilities.

Reason - To ensure the protection of wildlife and supporting habitats and to secure opportunities for enhancing the site's nature conservation value in line with national planning policy and local policies.

- 28 No development shall take place until a scheme for the provision and management of an 8-metre wide buffer zone alongside the River Blackwater watercourse has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme. Any subsequent variations shall be agreed in writing by the local planning authority, in which case the development shall be carried out in accordance with the amended scheme. With the sole exception of the provision of the proposed wildlife fence underpasses, the buffer zone shall be kept free from further built development including lighting and formal landscaping, and will need to be referred to in the CEMP and LEMP for the development required by Condition Nos.25 and 27. The scheme shall include:

- plans showing the extent and layout of the buffer zone;
- details of any proposed planting scheme. This should native species and ideally of local provenance, with an aim to create a mosaic of different habitats;

- details of how the non-native species such as Himalayan balsam will be eradicated from the site;
- details demonstrating how the buffer zone will be protected during development and managed over the longer term including adequate financial provision and named body responsible for management plus production of detailed management plan for nature conservation;
- details of any proposed footpaths, fencing, etc; and
- details of how the river channel morphology and bankside habitat will be enhanced for nature conservation e.g. with gravel, large woody material, deflectors, native planting.

Reason - Land alongside watercourses is particularly valuable for wildlife and it is essential this is protected.

- 29 Prior to the first commencement of the use hereby permitted a Skills & Employment Plan to be implemented shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved Skills & Employment Plan shall be implemented in full and the measures introduced retained thereafter.

Reason - To maximise opportunities for associated of skills and employment in the local area. *

Informatives


- 1 INFORMATIVE - The Council has granted permission because:-

It is considered that the #2 Scheme proposals would not materially and harmfully alter or compromise the #1 Scheme development as already approved and they are, as such, acceptable in principle. The #2 Scheme proposals are equally acceptable in highways terms; would have no material and harmful impact upon the overall visual character and appearance of the area and trees worthy of retention; would not give rise to any material and adverse visual and physical intrusion into the Blackwater Valley countryside gap; neighbours; would have acceptable impacts on neighbours; satisfactorily address the Flood Risk Sequential Test; are acceptable having regard to fluvial flood risk considerations taking into account an appropriate allowance for climate change for the lifetime of the development, and, in doing so, would not give rise to an unacceptable risk of flooding elsewhere; provide appropriate proposals for the surface water drainage of the site; robustly address the ecology & biodiversity impacts of the proposed development; would have no significant impact upon the nature conservation interest and objectives of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. The proposals are therefore considered to be acceptable having regard to the criteria of Policies SS1, SS2, DE1, DE2, DE3, IN2, DE1, DE2, DE3, IN2, NE1, NE2, NE3, NE4, NE5, NE6, NE7 and NE8 of the adopted Rushmoor Local Plan (2014-2032).

It is therefore considered that subject to compliance with the attached conditions, and taking into account all other material planning considerations, including the provisions of the development plan, the proposal would be acceptable. This also includes a consideration of whether the decision to grant permission is compatible with the Human Rights Act 1998.

- 2 INFORMATIVE - This permission is subject to a planning obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended). If your legal obligations includes a payment of sums, then you must contact the Council (at plan@rushmoor.gov.uk) at least 20 days prior to the commencement of development both stating your intended date of commencement and requesting an invoice to pay such funds. The payment of all contributions as required by such s106 must be received prior to the commencement of development.
- 3 INFORMATIVE - Your attention is specifically drawn to the conditions marked *. These condition(s) require the submission of details, information, drawings etc. to the Local Planning Authority BEFORE a certain stage is reached in the development. Failure to meet these requirements is in contravention of the terms of the permission and the Council may take enforcement action to secure compliance. As of April 2008 submissions seeking to submit details pursuant to conditions or requests for confirmation that conditions have been complied with must be accompanied by the appropriate fee.
- 4 INFORMATIVE - The applicant is recommended to achieve maximum energy efficiency and reduction of Carbon Dioxide emissions by:
 - a) ensuring the design and materials to be used in the construction of the building are consistent with these aims; and
 - b) using renewable energy sources for the production of electricity and heat using efficient and technologically advanced equipment.
- 5 INFORMATIVE - No materials produced as a result of site preparation, clearance, or development should be burnt on site. Please contact the Council's Environmental Health Team for advice.
- 6 INFORMATIVE - The applicant is advised that during the construction phase of the development measures should be employed to contain and minimise dust emissions, to prevent their escape from the development site onto adjoining properties. For further information, please contact the Council's Environmental Health Team.
- 7 INFORMATIVE - In the UK protected wildlife species, which includes badgers and all species of bats and nesting birds, are afforded statutory protection such that un-licensed harm and/or disturbance would constitute an offence. The grant of planning permission does not supersede the requirements of this legislation. If any protected species or signs of them are encountered at any point during development then all works must stop immediately and you should contact Natural England.
- 8 INFORMATIVE – Industry best practice guidance for avoidance of adverse impacts on nocturnal species as a result of artificial lighting is set out in BCT & ILP (2018) Guidance Note 08/18 Bats and Artificial Lighting in the UK. Bats and the Built Environment. Bat Conservation Trust, London & Institution of Lighting Professionals, Rugby.
- 9 INFORMATIVE - The applicant is requested to bring the conditions attached to this permission to the attention of all contractors working or delivering to the site, in particular any relating to the permitted hours of construction and demolition; and where practicable to have these conditions on display at the site entrance(s) for the duration of the works.
- 10 INFORMATIVE - The Local Planning Authority's commitment to working with the applicants in a positive and proactive way is demonstrated by its offer of pre-application discussion to all, and assistance in the validation and determination of

applications through the provision of clear guidance regarding necessary supporting information or amendments both before and after submission, in line with the National Planning Policy Framework.




6/9/2025, 12:00:36 PM


 Planning Application


Building

 Buildings


 <all other values>











This page is intentionally left blank

Section D

The following applications are reported for INFORMATION purposes only. They relate to applications, prior approvals, notifications, and consultations that have already been determined by the Executive Head of Planning & Growth and where necessary, in consultation with the Chairman, in accordance with the Council's adopted Scheme of Delegation.

If Members wish to have more details about the decision on any of the applications on this list please contact David Stevens (01252 398738) or Jake Hamilton (01252 398791) in advance of the Committee meeting.

Application No	24/00650/FULPP	Ward: Knellwood
Applicant:	Andrew Skinner	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	05 June 2025	
Proposal:	Erection of a first floor side extension and single storey side extension	
Address	28 The Crescent Farnborough Hampshire GU14 7AS	

Application No	24/00674/LBCPP	Ward: Wellington
Applicant:	Mr Matthew Woolven	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	29 May 2025	
Proposal:	LISTED BUILDING CONSENT: Internal alterations to re-model first floor ensuite: Form opening between dining room and breakfast kitchen: Re-configure first floor boiler cupboard: Creation of new bathroom on 2nd floor landing, with storage beneath stairs: Creation of new bedroom with en-suite in 3rd floor (formerly a bathroom): Formation of gallery landing above 4th floor: Remove alternating tread stair and install new staircase up to clocktower: Removal of clock room fixed ladder and replace with pull-down ladder and Install air conditioning to with observation level with condenser in clock room	
Address	10 The Cambridge Mccarthy Crescent Wellesley Aldershot Hampshire GU11 4ES	

Application No	24/00685/FULPP	Ward: Rowhill
Applicant:	Mr Peter Williams	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	09 June 2025	
Proposal:	Formation of a first floor front dormer following removal of existing front dormer and changes to fenestration	
Address	17 Cranmore Gardens Aldershot Hampshire GU11 3BG	
Application No	25/00005/FULPP	Ward: Fernhill
Applicant:	Mr Ketan Petal	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	16 May 2025	
Proposal:	Erection of single storey rear extension and relocation of front door to side elevation and insertion of new window on front elevation	
Address	22 Sandy Lane Farnborough Hampshire GU14 9EU	
Application No	25/00028/ADVPP	Ward: Cove And Southwood
Applicant:	Motor Fuel Group Limited	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	03 June 2025	
Proposal:	Display of internally illuminated totem sign	
Address	Morrisons 1 Southwood Village Centre Links Way Farnborough Hampshire GU14 0NA	
Application No	25/00029/FULPP	Ward: Wellington
Applicant:	Mr Bhasker Gurung	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	28 May 2025	
Proposal:	Installation of an external extraction chimney on rear elevation and erection of two canopies in the rear yard to facilitate formation of new ground floor restaurant (Use Class E) with ancillary outside customer area to rear [amended description following receipt of amended plans 2 May 2025]	
Address	6 Union Street Aldershot Hampshire GU11 1EG	

Application No 25/00039/CONDPP Ward: Wellington

Applicant: Mr Jan and Amid MANDOZAI & YUSSOU

Decision: **Permission Granted**

Decision Date: 06 June 2025

Proposal: Approval of conditions pursuant to condition 3(external materials), 5 (construction management plan), 6 (Biodiversity enhancement measures), 12 (foul water capacity), 13 and 19 (surface water drainage and SUDS) of permission 23/00519/FULPP dated 19.06.2024 for erection of 4 storey rear extension and accommodation in new mansard roof over all to facilitate change of use of mixed use building to residential flat building (updated information received)

Address **Unit 1 Coltwood Business Centre 3 Pickford Street Aldershot Hampshire GU11 1TY**

Application No 25/00055/CONDPP Ward: Wellington

Applicant: Mr Riggs

Decision: **Permission Granted**

Decision Date: 23 May 2025

Proposal: Submission of details part pursuant to condition 19 (existing and proposed levels) of hybrid outline planning permission 12/00958/OUT dated 10th March 2014 in relation to part reserved matters application area 24/00517/REMPP.

Address **Military Police Barracks Headquarters Fourth Division Steeles Road Wellesley Aldershot Hampshire**

Application No 25/00058/REVPP Ward: Knellwood

Applicant: Mr O Alexander

Decision: **Permission Granted**

Decision Date: 16 May 2025

Proposal: Section 73 Application to vary condition no. 15 of planning permission ref. 17/00250/FULPP (Demolition of existing garage and partial demolition of existing front boundary walls and erection of two storey side extensions to 7 and 10 Church Circle, single storey side extension to 8 Church Circle and a part single part two storey link extension with alterations to access, parking and front boundary walls (renewal of planning permission 14/00286/FUL) to allow for Rose Collection heritage windows rather than timber windows

Address **Park View Residential Home 7 - 10 Church Circle Farnborough Hampshire GU14 6QH**

Application No	25/00080/FULPP	Ward: Aldershot Park
Applicant:	Dr Ismaeel Mohammed	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	13 June 2025	
Proposal:	Part single part two storey rear extension to end terrace dwelling	
Address	425 Stockbridge Drive Aldershot Hampshire GU11 3RT	

Application No	25/00090/CONDPP	Ward: Empress
Applicant:	Mr W Burrell	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	29 May 2025	
Proposal:	Submission of details pursuant to conditions 8 (Construction Environmental and Traffic Management Plan), 10 (BREEAM Certification), 14 (Surfacing of driveways) 16 (Communal aerial system) of application 23/00742/FULPP dated 30 January 2024 for the addition of one storey to existing building and extension for conversion to 18no. 1 bed flats with part retention of ground floor retail unit	
Address	34 - 36 Victoria Road Farnborough Hampshire GU14 7PQ	

Application No	25/00095/CONDPP	Ward: Wellington
Applicant:	Other Grainger (Aldershot) Ltd and Secret	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	14 May 2025	
Proposal:	Submission of details pursuant to condition 12 (trees) attached to Outline Planning Permission 12/00958/OUT dated 10th March 2014 consisting of various proposed tree works within Wellesley (Site Wide Survey 6 and 12 Months)	
Address	Aldershot Urban Extension Alisons Road Aldershot Hampshire	

Application No	25/00097/FULPP	Ward: Knellwood
Applicant:	Lawsh Limited	
Decision:	Permission Refused	
Decision Date:	23 May 2025	
Proposal:	Demolition of existing workshop/garage building and erection of 3no. 3-bed dwellings	
Address	70 Guildford Road East Farnborough Hampshire GU14 6PX	

Application No	25/00103/ADVPP	Ward: Wellington
Applicant:	Mr T Mackenzie	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	20 May 2025	
Proposal:	Installation of three internally illuminated fascia signs and two non illuminated hanging signs	
Address	Unit B Union Yard Aldershot Hampshire GU11 1FU	

Application No	25/00124/CONDPP	Ward: Aldershot Park
Applicant:	Ash Road Developments Ltd	
Decision:	Conditions details approved	
Decision Date:	03 June 2025	
Proposal:	Submission of details pursuant to Condition Nos.3 (External Materials), 8 (Landscaping), 9 (Drainage), 15 (Levels) and 17 (Construction Method Statement) of planning permission 24/00429/FULPP dated 11 November 2024	
Address	Garages To The Rear Of 13 To 23 Ash Road Aldershot Hampshire	

Application No	25/00131/NMAPP	Ward: St Mark's
Applicant:	Ms Iris Wong	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	23 May 2025	
Proposal:	NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: To application 23/00292/FULPP (Erection of a detached two storey building for use as a private terminal and lounge with associated offices, screening room, and flights observations, along with associated parking) to alter the proposed door and window arrangement.	
Address	Farnborough Airport Farnborough Road Farnborough Hampshire GU14 6XA	
Application No	25/00139/TELE	Ward: Cherrywood
Applicant:	BT Payphones	
Decision:	No Objection	
Decision Date:	29 May 2025	
Proposal:	CONSULTATION FROM BT: Removal of payphone	
Address	BT Payphone Mayfield Road Farnborough Hampshire	
Application No	25/00140/TELE	Ward: West Heath
Applicant:	BT Payphones	
Decision:	No Objection	
Decision Date:	29 May 2025	
Proposal:	CONSULTATION FROM BT: Removal of payphone	
Address	Telephone Box Giffard Drive Farnborough Hampshire	
Application No	25/00141/FULPP	Ward: St John's
Applicant:	Mr C Jeyam	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	13 June 2025	
Proposal:	Erection of 2-bedroom detached bungalow to rear of existing dwelling at 42 St Johns Road to replace existing dilapidated outbuilding in same approximate position	
Address	42 St Johns Road Farnborough Hampshire GU14 9RN	

Application No	25/00148/FULPP	Ward: St Mark's
Applicant:	Phoenix Core Propco Limited	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	03 June 2025	
Proposal:	External alterations to the front and rear facade, including new entrance canopy and replacement curtain walling systems alongside new plant screening at roof level and associated works	
Address	A1 Building Cody Technology Park Ively Road Farnborough Hampshire	
<hr/>		
Application No	25/00150/FULPP	Ward: Knellwood
Applicant:	Krishna Pabbisetty	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	20 May 2025	
Proposal:	Removal of existing plastic store and new ground floor side extension and garage conversion to form additional ground floor granny annex.	
Address	3 Old Rectory Gardens Farnborough Hampshire GU14 7BS	
<hr/>		
Application No	25/00152/FULPP	Ward: Knellwood
Applicant:	Mrs Lawes	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	12 May 2025	
Proposal:	Erection of a single storey infill rear extension	
Address	108 Canterbury Road Farnborough Hampshire GU14 6QN	
<hr/>		
Application No	25/00155/FULPP	Ward: Knellwood
Applicant:	Mrs Hannah Whiteley	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	14 May 2025	
Proposal:	Erection of a single storey rear extension	
Address	1 Tregolls Drive Farnborough Hampshire GU14 7BN	

Application No	25/00156/FUL	Ward: St Mark's
Applicant:	Ms Karen Young	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	14 May 2025	
Proposal:	Removal of existing conservatory and erection of rear single storey conservatory	
Address	22B Cross Street Farnborough Hampshire GU14 6AB	

Application No	25/00159/FULPP	Ward: Knellwood
Applicant:	Mrs Laura Reed	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	14 May 2025	
Proposal:	Erection of a two storey side and part first floor side extension	
Address	18 Cunnington Road Farnborough Hampshire GU14 6PN	

Application No	25/00163/FULPP	Ward: Aldershot Park
Applicant:	Mr Isaac Jones	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	10 June 2025	
Proposal:	Erection of a two storey side extension	
Address	65 Morland Road Aldershot Hampshire GU11 3SE	

Application No	25/00164/FULPP	Ward: Wellington
Applicant:	Mr T Mackenzie	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	13 June 2025	
Proposal:	Installation of three rooftop level air conditioning condenser units	
Address	Unit B Union Yard Aldershot Hampshire GU11 1FU	

Application No	25/00167/FULPP	Ward: St Mark's
Applicant:	Mr Steve McSpirit	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	14 May 2025	
Proposal:	Erection of a new front bay window with a parapet roof and new front door along with new off/white render finish to property following removal of existing front bay window with pitched roof	
Address	73 Peabody Road Farnborough Hampshire GU14 6EB	

Application No	25/00168/CONDPP	Ward: St Mark's
Applicant:	Miss Tilly Whishaw	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	20 May 2025	
Proposal:	Submission of details pursuant to Condition 3 (Materials) (RMA Final Phase) of reserved matters approval 24/00661/REMPP dated 14/02/2025.	
Address	Blandford House And Malta Barracks Development Site Shoe Lane Aldershot Hampshire	

Application No	25/00170/FUL	Ward: Fernhill
Applicant:	Snug Nursery Schools Ltd	
Decision:	Permission Refused	
Decision Date:	21 May 2025	
Proposal:	Demolition of existing day nursery and erection of new nursery and associated landscaping parking including new vehicular access from Woodlands Walk	
Address	Proposed Access Road To Hawley Hurst School Woodlands Walk Blackwater Camberley Hampshire	

Application No	25/00171/FULPP	Ward: Empress
Applicant:	Dom Michael Vician	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	22 May 2025	
Proposal:	Installation of handrails to existing main entrance steps	
Address	St Michaels Abbey Church Farnborough Road Farnborough Hampshire GU14 7NQ	

Application No	25/00172/LBCPP	Ward: Empress
Applicant:	Dom Michael Vician	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	22 May 2025	
Proposal:	Installation of fixed metal handrails to main entrance steps	
Address	St Michaels Abbey Church Farnborough Road Farnborough Hampshire GU14 7NQ	

Application No	25/00173/FULPP	Ward: Knellwood
Applicant:	Rebekah / Collis Wooff / Collis	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	16 May 2025	
Proposal:	Erection of two storey side/rear extensions	
Address	36 The Grove Farnborough Hampshire GU14 6QS	

Application No	25/00176/FULPP	Ward: Empress
Applicant:	Mr Steven Morrell	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	16 May 2025	
Proposal:	Erection of a single storey side and rear extension, following demolition of existing single storey rear extension	
Address	35 High View Road Farnborough Hampshire GU14 7PU	

Application No	25/00178/FULPP	Ward: Knellwood
Applicant:	Mr & Mrs Yorke	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	27 May 2025	
Proposal:	Erection of single-storey front extension including adjacent roof works, replace existing side extension flat roof to pitched roof, erection of single storey rear extension and formation of raised decking area to rear and alterations to fenestrations	
Address	Morland House 26 Pirbright Road Farnborough Hampshire GU14 7AD	

Application No	25/00180/FULPP	Ward: Rowhill
Applicant:	Arifa Haque	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	16 May 2025	
Proposal:	Conversion of double garage to habitable room, demolition of existing conservatory, erection of single storey rear extension and facade alterations	
Address	35 Cranmore Lane Aldershot Hampshire GU11 3AJ	

Application No	25/00181/FULPP	Ward: North Town
Applicant:	Mr Rafal Brzezinski	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	22 May 2025	
Proposal:	Erection of a two storey front extension, external changes to the main house to include external wall insulation in light coloured render and replacement windows with dark Grey coloured frames	
Address	98 Brookfield Road Aldershot Hampshire GU12 4UT	

Application No	25/00182/FULPP	Ward: Empress
Applicant:	Mrs Libby Kelly	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	22 May 2025	
Proposal:	Demolition of existing outbuilding and conservatory, erection of single storey rear and side extension	
Address	The Limes 53 Highgate Lane Farnborough Hampshire GU14 8AA	
Application No	25/00196/FULPP	Ward: Empress
Applicant:	Ms S Lee	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	28 May 2025	
Proposal:	Demolition of existing garage, stores and conservatory and erection of a single storey side and rear extension	
Address	Jalna 15 Napoleon Avenue Farnborough Hampshire GU14 8LZ	
Application No	25/00202/TPOPP	Ward: St John's
Applicant:	Mr Lance Nevill	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	22 May 2025	
Proposal:	One Sycamore (T2 of TPO 254) crown reduce by no more than 2 metres	
Address	1 Sunnybank Road Farnborough Hampshire GU14 9QD	
Application No	25/00205/PDCPP	Ward: St Mark's
Applicant:	Mr Ed Allen	
Decision:	Development is Lawful	
Decision Date:	16 May 2025	
Proposal:	LAWFUL DEVELOPMENT CERTIFICATE - Installation of two roof windows to the front elevation and formation of a dormer window to the rear to facilitate a loft conversion to a habitable room	
Address	121 Park Road Farnborough Hampshire GU14 6LP	

Application No	25/00206/TPOPP	Ward: St John's
Applicant:	Mr Matthew Carey	
Decision:	Split decision	
Decision Date:	27 May 2025	
Proposal:	One Oak (T22 of TPO 409A) crown reduce by no more than 6 metres overall	
Address	10 Tarragon Close Farnborough Hampshire GU14 9XF	

Application No	25/00207/FUL	Ward: Cherrywood
Applicant:	Mr A Kandangwa	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	02 June 2025	
Proposal:	Erection of a single storey side extension	
Address	18 Greatfield Road Farnborough Hampshire GU14 8HJ	

Application No	25/00208/FULPP	Ward: Aldershot Park
Applicant:	Mr Valerio Esposito	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	02 June 2025	
Proposal:	Demolition of the existing garden room and carport and erection of outbuilding with pergola and formation of block paved driveway with dropped kerb for vehicular access	
Address	108 Morland Road Aldershot Hampshire GU11 3SF	

Application No	25/00212/EDCPP	Ward: St John's
Applicant:	Ms Mrula	
Decision:	Development is Lawful	
Decision Date:	04 June 2025	
Proposal:	Change of use to a Smaller House In Multiple Occupation (Use Class C4), with a maximum of 5 residents	
Address	37 Twelve Acre Crescent Farnborough Hampshire GU14 9PW	

Application No	25/00216/FULPP	Ward: Wellington
Applicant:	Rekhiram Rana	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	12 June 2025	
Proposal:	Installation of perforated internal security grilles, extension at the rear and Proposed installation of extractor fan with a flue on the roof (alternative to development approved under planning permission 24/00205/FULPP)	
Address	15 Union Street Aldershot Hampshire GU11 1EG	

Application No	25/00218/NMAPP	Ward: St Mark's
Applicant:	Secretary Of State For Defence	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	14 May 2025	
Proposal:	NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT : To application 23/00879/FULPP for demolition of existing office building and erection of a new build workshop for military vehicles, together with hardstanding areas and associated drainage, infrastructure and landscaping - amendments to elevations to add two windows to the north elevation and amend dimensions of a third, amendment to design of external doors on east and south elevations, amend colour and location of louvres on north and south elevations and amendment to finished colours and materials of external cladding, sectional doors, rainwater goods, external heat recovery plant, stairs and oil storage tanks	
Address	Mons Barracks Princes Avenue Aldershot Hampshire GU11 2LF	

Application No	25/00219/TPOPP	Ward: Empress
Applicant:	Mrs Warden	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	22 May 2025	
Proposal:	Remove to ground level one Scots Pine T153 on submitted plan (part of group G3 of TPO 422A)	
Address	Lynx Court Wallis Square Farnborough Hampshire	

Application No	25/00220/FULPP	Ward: St Mark's
Applicant:	BECCI RYAN	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	19 May 2025	
Proposal:	Erection of a single storey rear extension following removal of existing rear extension	
Address	42 Winchester Street Farnborough Hampshire GU14 6AW	

Application No	25/00221/NMAPP	Ward: St Mark's
Applicant:	Ms Tilly Whishaw	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	16 May 2025	
Proposal:	NON MATERIAL AMENDMENT: To application 24/00661/REMPP for the development of 83 dwellings (Final Phase RMA), including the conversion of Blandford House (into 5 apartments) and the retention of 2 existing dwellings, including internal access roads, public open space and landscaping, parking, lighting and associated infrastructure, following demolition of existing building and hardstanding, pursuant to Condition 3 (1-24) of Hybrid Outline Planning Permission 17/00914/OUTPP dated 15th May 2020 to allow for changes to the layout of Plot 140 (Blenheim House Type).	
Address	Blandford House And Malta Barracks Development Site Shoe Lane Aldershot Hampshire	

Application No	25/00224/TPOPP	Ward: Empress
Applicant:	Mrs Michelle House	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	27 May 2025	
Proposal:	One Sweet Chestnut T1 on submitted plan (T18 of TPO 194V) remove the lower lateral growth on the East side, pruning back to the main stem to remove stub cuts and epicormic development. One Silver Birch T2 on plan (T19 of TPO 194V) reduce lower lateral branches by no more than 1 metre to suitable growth point	
Address	Communal Garden 4 - 7 Queen Victoria Court Farnborough Hampshire	

Application No	25/00225/ADVPP	Ward: Cherrywood
Applicant:	Shurgard UK LNS Trading LTD	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	12 June 2025	
Proposal:	1 x externally illuminated wall mounted sign to north elevation	
Address	112 Hawley Lane Farnborough Hampshire GU14 8JE	
<hr/>		
Application No	25/00230/FULPP	Ward: West Heath
Applicant:	Julie Burrell	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	09 June 2025	
Proposal:	Demolition of existing garage and erection of an outbuilding	
Address	57 Giffard Drive Farnborough Hampshire GU14 8PX	
<hr/>		
Application No	25/00233/FULPP	Ward: Fernhill
Applicant:	Mr Alwiyan D'Mello	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	13 June 2025	
Proposal:	Retention of an outbuilding to the rear	
Address	384 Pinewood Park Farnborough Hampshire GU14 9LJ	
<hr/>		
Application No	25/00235/TPO	Ward: North Town
Applicant:	Mr Daryl Jepp	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	13 June 2025	
Proposal:	One Oak (T1 of TPO 66) crown thin by no more than 15% and canopy lift to no more than 6 metres from ground level	
Address	57 Newport Road Aldershot Hampshire GU12 4PW	

Application No 25/00238/FULPP Ward: Cherrywood

Applicant: Michael Bernard

Decision: **Permission Granted**

Decision Date: 11 June 2025

Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension

Address **14 Hurst Road Farnborough Hampshire GU14 8HF**

Application No 25/00242/FUL Ward: Empress

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Dowle

Decision: **Permission Granted**

Decision Date: 09 June 2025

Proposal: Erection of a conservatory to the rear

Address **14 Pierrefondes Avenue Farnborough Hampshire GU14 8NF**

Application No 25/00244/PDCPP Ward: West Heath

Applicant: Mr Jeremy Upton

Decision: **Development is Lawful**

Decision Date: 09 June 2025

Proposal: Lawful Development Certificate for a proposed development: Erection of a single storey rear extension

Address **16 Giffard Drive Farnborough Hampshire GU14 8PU**

Application No 25/00246/DEMOPP Ward: Cherrywood

Applicant: Tungsten Properties

Decision: **Prior Approval Required and Granted**

Decision Date: 27 May 2025

Proposal: PRIOR APPROVAL: Demolition of existing building

Address **Building 4.3 Frimley Business Park Frimley Camberley Hampshire GU16 7SG**

Application No	25/00252/MISC28	Ward: Empress
Applicant:	Natalia Satterthwaite	
Decision:	No Objection	
Decision Date:	27 May 2025	
Proposal:	Notification under the Electronic Communications Code Regulations of the intention to install Electronic Communications Apparatus at Farnborough Road.	
Address	Telecommunication Mast 78479 Farnborough Road Farnborough Hampshire	

Application No	25/00254/EDCPP	Ward: Manor Park
Applicant:	Mr Stuart Wyeth	
Decision:	Development is Lawful	
Decision Date:	09 June 2025	
Proposal:	Lawful Development Certificate for an existing development: Retention of dormer windows to rear to facilitate a loft conversion	
Address	13 East Station Road Aldershot Hampshire GU12 4LA	

Application No	25/00256/TPO	Ward: St John's
Applicant:	Claire Porter	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	06 June 2025	
Proposal:	Three Oaks (part of group G20 of TPO 355V) trees T1 and T2 on plan, reduce to previous pruning points and tree T3 remove to ground level	
Address	59 Kingfisher Close Farnborough Hampshire GU14 9QX	

Application No	25/00261/FULPP	Ward: Cherrywood
Applicant:	Samantha Marshall	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	05 June 2025	
Proposal:	Retention of a single storey rear extension	
Address	64 Austen Road Farnborough Hampshire GU14 8LF	

Application No	25/00262/MISC28	Ward: Fernhill
Applicant:	Natalia Satterthwaite	
Decision:	No Objection	
Decision Date:	05 June 2025	
Proposal:	Notification under the electronic communications code regulations 2003 (as amended) relating to permitted development at existing telecoms mast site (replacement of one cabinet), Fernhill Road streetworks, Fernhill Road, Farnborough, Hampshire, GU14 9HP (ngr e: 485460 n: 157410)	
Address	Telecommunication Mast Fernhill Road Farnborough Hampshire	
<hr/>		
Application No	25/00263/MISC28	Ward: Cove And Southwood
Applicant:	Natalia Satterthwaite	
Decision:	No Objection	
Decision Date:	20 May 2025	
Proposal:	Notification under the electronic communications code regulations 2003 (as amended) relating to permitted development at existing telecoms mast site (replacement of one cabinet) at Old Southwood Road Footpath And Cycleway Farnborough(ngr e: 483820 n: 155395)	
Address	Telecommunication Mast Old Southwood Road Footpath And Cycleway Farnborough Hampshire	
<hr/>		
Application No	25/00264/MISC28	Ward: Empress
Applicant:	Natalia Satterthwaite	
Decision:	No Objection	
Decision Date:	05 June 2025	
Proposal:	Notification under the electronic communications code regulations 2003 (as amended) relating to permitted development at existing telecoms mast site (replacement cabinet),Telecommunication Mast 78480 Union Street (ngr e: 486290 n: 155930)	
Address	Telecommunication Mast 78480 Union Street Farnborough Hampshire	

Application No	25/00265/MISC28	Ward: St John's
Applicant:	Natalia Satterthwaite	
Decision:	No Objection	
Decision Date:	09 June 2025	
Proposal:	Notification under the electronic communications code regulations 2003 (as amended) relating to permitted development at existing telecoms mast site,(replacement cabinet)Telecommunication Mast 78482 Fleet Road (ngr e: 484131 n: 155657	
Address	Telecommunication Mast 78482 Fleet Road Farnborough Hampshire	
<hr/>		
Application No	25/00269/TPOPP	Ward: St Mark's
Applicant:	Napier School	
Decision:	Permission Granted	
Decision Date:	13 June 2025	
Proposal:	One Sweet Chestnut, T1 on submitted plan, (part of group G1 of TPO 341V) reduce the original main stem to a pollard at approximately 15ft and then reduce all remaining growth on surrounding stems by approximately 50%, as per submitted photo	
Address	Land Affected By TPO 341V - Studio Forty 40 Lynchford Road Farnborough Hampshire	
<hr/>		
Application No	25/00279/COND	Ward: Knellwood
Applicant:	Mr Phil King	
Decision:	Conditions details approved	
Decision Date:	11 June 2025	
Proposal:	Submission of details pursuant to Condition 3 (details of external brick and roof tiles and colour of external render finish) attached to planning permission 24/00349/FULPP dated 29 October 2024	
Address	4 Tregolls Drive Farnborough Hampshire GU14 7BN	

Application No 25/00290/COND

Ward: North Town

Applicant: P. Davey Developments

Decision: **Conditions details approved**

Decision Date: 11 June 2025

Proposal: Submission of details pursuant to Condition Nos.17 (construction tree protection details) and 22 (biodiversity enhancement details) of planning permission 21/00645/FULPP dated 18 May 2022

Address **170 Holly Road Aldershot Hampshire GU12 4SG**

This page is intentionally left blank