

# Public Document Pack



## RUSHMOOR BOROUGH COUNCIL

### DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

*at the Council Offices, Farnborough on  
Wednesday, 23rd May, 2018 at 7.00 pm*

**To:**

#### **VOTING MEMBERS**

Cllr Mrs. D.B. Bedford  
Cllr D.M.T. Bell  
Cllr R.M. Cooper  
Cllr P.I.C. Crerar

Cllr Sue Dibble  
Cllr Jennifer Evans  
Cllr C.P. Grattan  
Cllr Mara Makunura

Cllr J.H. Marsh  
Cllr A.R. Newell  
Cllr B.A. Thomas

#### **NON-VOTING MEMBERS**

Cllr M.J. Tennant (Cabinet Member for Environment and Service Delivery) (ex-officio)

#### **STANDING DEPUTIES**

Cllr Veronica Graham-Green  
Cllr P.F. Rust

Enquiries regarding this agenda should be referred to Marion Young,  
Democratic and Customer Services, 01252 398827 [marion.young@rushmoor.gov.uk](mailto:marion.young@rushmoor.gov.uk)

# **A G E N D A**

1. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST – (Pages 1 - 2)**

All Members who believe they have a disclosable pecuniary interest in any matter to be considered at the meeting may not participate in any discussion or vote taken on the matter and if the interest is not registered it must be disclosed to the meeting. In addition, Members are required to leave the meeting while the matter is discussed.

2. **MINUTES – (Pages 3 - 6)**

To confirm the Minutes of the meeting held on 25th April, 2018 (copy attached).

3. **PLANNING APPLICATIONS – (Pages 7 - 64)**

To consider the Head of Planning's Report No. PLN1814 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:

<b>Item</b>	<b>Reference Number</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
1	16/00981/FULPP	Aldershot Bus Station, 3 Station Road, Aldershot	For information
2	18/00140/FULPP	Meudon House, Meudon Avenue, Farnborough	For information
3	18/00117/REMPP	Zone B – Coruna, Aldershot Urban Extension, Alisons Road, Aldershot	For information
4	18/00225/LBCPP	Ramsden Garden Wall Memorial – Montgomery Lines, Aldershot	For information
5	18/00251/FULPP	Willow House, 23 Grosvenor Road, Aldershot	For information

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

<b>Item</b>	<b>Pages</b>	<b>Reference Number</b>	<b>Address</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
6	13-42	18/00264/FULPP	La Fontaine Public House, 92 Windmill Road, Aldershot	Grant

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

**4. APPOINTMENTS TO STANDING CONSULTATION GROUP –**

To appoint the Chairman or Vice-Chairman and one representative from each of the political groups to the Standing Consultation Group.

**5. APPOINTMENTS TO DEVELOPMENT MONITORING GROUPS –**

**(1) Farnborough Town Centre**

To appoint the Chairman or Vice-Chairman and the three Empress Ward Councillors to the Farnborough Town Centre Development Monitoring Group set up by the Committee during the 2008/2009 Municipal Year.

**(2) North Town – Aldershot**

To appoint the Chairman or Vice-Chairman and the three North Town Ward Councillors to the North Town Development Monitoring Group.

**(3) Wellesley – Aldershot Urban Extension**

To appoint the Chairman or Vice-Chairman and the three Wellington Ward Councillors to the Wellesley Development Monitoring Group.

**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  
23rd May 2018

Head of Planning

Declarations of interest

Name: Cllr \_\_\_\_\_

*N.B. A declaration is not required for items that appear either in Section D of the Planning Report or the Appeals Progress Report as such items are for noting only.*

Agenda Item No.	Planning Application No.	Application Address	Reason

This page is intentionally left blank

# DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Meeting held on Wednesday, 25th April, 2018 at the Council Offices, Farnborough at 7.00 pm.

## **Voting Members**

Cllr B.A. Thomas (Chairman)  
Cllr J.H. Marsh (Vice-Chairman)

Cllr Mrs. D.B. Bedford  
Cllr D.M.T. Bell  
Cllr R.M. Cooper  
Cllr Sue Dibble  
Cllr Jennifer Evans  
Cllr D.S. Gladstone  
Cllr C.P. Grattan  
Cllr A.R. Newell

Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Cllr P.I.C. Crerar.

Cllr S.J. Masterson attended the meeting.

## **Non-Voting Members**

Cllr M.J. Tennant (Environment and Service Delivery Portfolio Holder) (ex officio)

### **66. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

### **67. MINUTES**

The Minutes of the meeting held on 28th March, 2018 were approved and signed by the Chairman.

### **68. PLANNING APPLICATIONS**

**RESOLVED:** That

- (i) the applications dealt with by the Head of Planning, where necessary in consultation with the Chairman, in accordance with the Council's Scheme of Delegation, more particularly specified in Section "D" of the Head of Planning's Report No. PLN1810, be noted;
- (ii) the following application be determined by the Head of Planning, in

consultation with the Chairman:

- \* 18/00025/FULPP (Block 3, Queensmead, Farnborough);
- (iii) the current position with regard to the following applications be noted pending consideration at a future meeting:

16/00981/FULPP (Aldershot Bus Station, No. 3, Station Road, Aldershot);  
18/00140/FULPP (Meudon House, Meudon Avenue, Farnborough);  
18/00264/FULPP (La Fontaine Public House, No. 92 Windmill Road, Aldershot);

- \* The Head of Planning's Report No. PLN1810 in respect of this application was amended at the meeting

**69. APPLICATION NO. 18/00025/FULPP - BLOCK 3, QUEENSMEAD, FARNBOROUGH**

The Committee considered the Head of Planning's Report No. PLN1810 (as amended at the meeting) regarding the partial demolition of Kingsmead shopping centre (existing Debenhams store), erection of an extension (Block 3) comprising retail use on the ground floor (3710sqm), leisure use on the first floor (2414sqm), 68 apartments over eight floors, private amenity space, 58 car parking spaces, 118 bicycle parking spaces, a bridge link and alterations to the existing car park on Block 2, a new entrance to The Meads shopping centre and associated works.

It was noted that the recommendation was to grant permission subject to the completion of an appropriate Planning Obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

**RESOLVED:** That

- (i) subject to the completion of an appropriate Planning Obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 by 18th June, 2018 in respect of open space, affordable housing and highway matters as set out in the Head of Planning's Report No. PLN1810 (as amended at the meeting), the Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chairman, be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the conditions and informatives set out in the Report (as amended at the meeting).
- (ii) In the event of failure to complete the appropriate Planning Obligation by 18th June, 2018 the Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chairman, be authorised to refuse planning permission on the grounds that the proposal fails to make appropriate provision for open space and affordable housing nor mitigates its impact in highway terms contrary to development plan policies and the provisions of the Council's supplementary planning document Planning Contributions –



Transport 2008.

70. **ENFORCEMENT AND POSSIBLE UNAUTHORISED DEVELOPMENT - FORMER LAFARGE SITE AND ADJOINING LAND AT HOLLYBUSH LANE NORTH, SOUTH OF NORTH CAMP RAILWAY STATION**

The Committee received the Head of Planning's Report No. PLN1811, which provided an update with regard to the position of the former Lafarge site and adjoining land at Hollybush Lane North, south of North Camp railway station.

The Committee was informed that an Enforcement Notice was served in September 2015 in respect of unauthorised material change of use of land to: (a) commercial car spares/car sales use; and (b) storage of scrapped cars; both with associated development comprising construction of bunds, hard surfaces, roads, fences and siting of structures on the land. This Enforcement Notice was subject to an appeal heard at a Public Inquiry in October 2016. This appeal was dismissed by two subsequent Inspector's decisions dated 30th November, 2016 and 23rd August, 2017 and an amended Enforcement Notice took effect from 23rd August, 2017. This Notice required staged compliance within three months (by 23rd November, 2017), within six months (by 23rd February, 2018) and within twelve months (by 23rd August, 2018).

The Committee was advised that an inspection of the site was undertaken on 6th April, 2018 as a check at an intermediate stage on the landowner's progress towards compliance with the requirements of the Enforcement Notice. This inspection revealed that substantial progress had been made and the site was now largely empty and the breaches of planning control had mostly been rectified. As a result of this progress, the Committee noted that it was not currently considered expedient for the Council to commence prosecution proceedings in respect of the residual non-completion of some requirements due to have been completed by 23rd November, 2017 and 23rd February, 2018.

**RESOLVED:** That the Head of Planning's Report No. PLN1811 be noted.

71. **APPEALS PROGRESS REPORT**

The Committee received the Head of Planning's Report No. PLN1812 concerning the following appeal decision:

<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Decision</b>
17/00707/PRIOR	Against the Council's refusal of prior approval under Class M of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, as amended, for a proposed change of use of the ground floor from a shop (Class A1) to a use falling within Use Class C3 (dwellinghouse) namely two flats at No. 55 High Street, Aldershot	Allowed

**RESOLVED:** That the Head of Planning's Report No. PLN1812 be noted.

72. **PLANNING (DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT) SUMMARY REPORT FOR THE QUARTER JANUARY - MARCH 2018 AND FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR 2017-2018**

The Committee received the Head of Planning's Report No. PLN1813 which provided an update on the position with respect to achieving performance indicators for the Development Management section of Planning and the overall workload of the section for the quarter from 1st January to 31st March, 2018. The Report also provided summary figures for the financial year 2017-2018.

**RESOLVED:** That the Head of Planning's Report No. PLN1813 be noted.

The meeting closed at 7.40 pm.

CLLR B.A. THOMAS (CHAIRMAN)

-----

Development Management Committee  
23rd May 2018

Head of Planning  
Report No.PLN1814

## 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 Planning, 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 Plan Core Strategy (October 2011), the Hampshire Minerals and Waste Plan adopted October 2013, saved policies of the Rushmoor Local Plan Review (1996-2011), and saved Policy NRM6 of the South East Plan. Relevant also as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications is the emerging Draft Submission Rushmoor Local Plan, June 2017.
- 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 Co-ordinator 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.

Keith Holland  
Head of Planning

---

### *Background Papers*

- *The individual planning application file (reference no. quoted in each case)*
- *Rushmoor Core Strategy (2011).*
- *Rushmoor Local Plan Review (1996-2011)[Saved policies].*
- *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).*
- *Draft Submission Rushmoor Local Plan, June 2017.*

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
1	16/00981/FULPP	<p>Demolition of existing bus station and re- development of site with the erection of a mixed use building comprising three ground floor commercial units with flexible use falling within Use Classes A1, A2, A3, A4, A5 or laundrette (sui generis); and upper floor residential use (Use Class C3) comprising 32 market residential flats (18 X 1-bedroom, 12 X 2- bedroom &amp; 2 X 3-bedroom units) with associated on- site servicing and parking areas.</p> <p><b>Aldershot Bus Station, 3 Station Road, Aldershot, Hampshire</b></p> <p>The Council has agreed to an extension of time for the determination of this application until 20 December 2018 to allow time for proposals for improvements to the adjoining Station forecourt to be more certain in terms of both design and timescales, and thereby to address representations lodged in respect of this planning application.</p>
2	18/00140/FULPP	<p>Demolition of existing structures and erection of 205 dwellings comprising 93 one bedroom flats; 80 two bedroom flats and 32 three bedroom townhouses with associated access, parking and landscape arrangements.</p> <p><b>Meudon House, Meudon Avenue, Farnborough, Hampshire</b></p> <p>The consultation period has now expired and responses are under consideration including an objection from Natural England in respect of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. The application will be presented to the Development Management committee in due course.</p>

3	18/00117/REMPP	<p>PART APPROVAL OF RESERVED MATTERS: for the construction of 456 residential dwellings (including six supported housing units) together with associated landscaping, access and parking, in Development Zone B (Corunna B3 &amp; B4) pursuant to Condition 4 (1 to 21), attached to Hybrid Outline Planning Permission 12/00958/OUT dated 10th March 2014.</p> <p><b>Zone B – Coruna, Aldershot Urban Extension, Alisons Road</b></p> <p>Consultation responses are under consideration and amendments to the scheme are under discussion.</p>
4	18/00225/LBCPP	<p>Soft and hard landscape works within the setting of the Ramsden Garden Wall Memorial</p> <p><b>Ramsden Garden Wall Memorial - Montgomery Lines Aldershot</b></p> <p>Consultation is still in progress on this application.</p>
5	18/00251/FULPP	<p>Demolition of existing building and erection of part 3, part 4 and part 5-storey building containing 23 flats (2 x studios, 13 x one bedroom and 8 x two bedroom) and 2 retail units, with associated bin and cycle storage.</p> <p><b>Willow House, 23 Grosvenor Road, Aldershot</b></p> <p>Consultation responses are under consideration.</p>

**Section B**

**Petitions**

Item	Reference	Description and address
		There are no petitions to report.



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. 18/00264/FULPP

Date Valid 3rd April 2018

Expiry date of consultations 26th April 2018

Proposal Erection of replacement rear extension, installation of two dormer extensions in rear roof slope and other external elevational alterations to facilitate change of use from Public House (Use Class A4) to residential use (Use Class C3) comprising 6 x 1-bedroom flats, together with creation of bin store and on-site parking to rear with vehicular access from Holly Road

Address **La Fontaine 92 Windmill Road Aldershot**

Ward Manor Park

Applicant Mr B A & Mrs T A Thomas

Mr Thomas is Councillor Bruce Thomas, Ward Councillor for Manor Park Ward and Chairman of the Development Management Committee.

Agent Lawson Architecture Limited

Recommendation **GRANT** subject to s106 Planning Obligation

### Description

La Fontaine Public House is located at the junction of Windmill Road and Holly Road, near the top of Redan Hill. The property comprises a Public House with ancillary cellar facilities, together with 5 bedsitting rooms on the upper floors. There is a small grassed garden area to the rear. The site is located in an elevated position with a notable fall in ground levels to the south-east such that the basement level is above ground level at the rear of the building. The building therefore has three-storeys to the front (comprising two full storeys plus rooms in the roof), but is almost a storey higher above ground level at the rear.

The proposal, as amended by plans received by the Council on 11 May 2018, is for the demolition of an existing rear extension and the erection of a new rear extension and other minor extensions and alterations to facilitate conversion of the entire building to six 1-bedroom flats. Three flats (Flats 1-3) are proposed for the ground floor; two for the first floor (Flats 4 & 5); and one at second floor level within the roof extended with dormers (Flat 6). The basement

area is shown to be sub-divided to provide individual storage areas for each of the proposed flats.

Also proposed is the formation of a vehicular entrance from Holly Road to the site to serve an on-site parking area of five parking spaces in place of the existing garden area. A further (sixth) on-site parking space would be provided to the front of the building with access from Windmill Road to serve Flat 2, which it would directly adjoin. An enclosed bin storage area would be provided on the Holly Road frontage to serve Flats 3-6; with Flats 1 and 2 (which front Windmill Road) having their own bin and bicycle storage. Communal bicycle storage would be provided for Flats 3-6 to the rear of the proposed on-site parking area.

A small grassed area of communal amenity space is shown to the rear of the site in the south corner. Separate private outdoor amenity areas are shown to be provided for Flats 1 and 3.

The plans show that the existing road dropped-kerb area to the side of the building fronting Holly Road where deliveries to the pub cellar take place would be reinstated with normal height kerbs, thereby returning some on-street parking.

The application is accompanied by a Planning, Design & Access Statement, a Preliminary Bat Roost and Nesting Birds Assessment Report, a Sustainability Checklist, and a separate Planning Statement dealing specifically with the Public House Policy issue. In this latter respect, the Public House Planning Statement seeks to address the requirements of the Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) "*Development Affecting Public Houses*". To do so, it is accompanied by appendices comprising the Pub accounts from 2014 to 2017, a letter from the applicant's accountant in this respect, a letter from the commercial property agents whom have marketed the property; and also a personal statement made by the applicants. This material was amended with revised and additional material received by the Council on 11 May 2018 in response to representations received by the Council in respect of the application from Aldershot Civic Society and CAMRA.

The applicants are seeking to prepare a s106 Planning Obligation in the form of a Unilateral Undertaking to secure a financial contribution in respect of the SPA Mitigation and Avoidance.

## **Consultee Responses**

Environmental Health      No objections subject to conditions and informatives.

Community - Contracts  
Manager                      No objections.

HCC Highways  
Development Planning      Holding Objection : The parking standards for the site are laid down by Rushmoor Borough Council (RBC) as the local parking authority, in accordance with their Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) as adopted in November 2017. These standards require six car parking spaces and secure storage for six cycles. It should be noted that cycle storage should be secure, weather proof and accessible. The proposals meet the required parking quantum for both cars and cycles. The turning area for the shared car park is deemed acceptable to allow access and egress in forward gear.

The proposed cycle storage, whilst sufficient in quantity, is inadequate in design as it is neither secure nor weather proof, and should be redesigned.

The access is deemed suitable for the expected intensity of traffic. The Highway Authority is in agreement with bringing the existing dropped kerb up to level, as this will assist with the street scene and allow additional off road parking.

The applicant should be aware that as the proposals include the formation of a new or altered access onto the highway, which will include works within the highway, these works will be required to be undertaken in accordance with standards laid down by, and under a license agreement with, the Highway Authority. Full details of how to apply can be found at:

<https://www.hants.gov.uk/transport/licencesandpermits/roadopening>.

The visibility splay drawings do not show either the distance, nor the points which the splays are measured to in relation to the surrounding highway. These should be redrawn for clarity, clearly showing the point on the carriageway the splays are measured to, and the achievable distance marked on the plans.

The proposed level of trips generated by the site has been compared to that of existing. It is agreed that there will be a negligible impact on the local road network, and therefore no contributions will be sought by the Highway Authority.

The Highway Authority has no objection in principle to the proposals, but would place a holding objection until such time that adequate cycle storage and visibility splays have been provided.

[Officer Note: Amended plans received on 11 May 2018 provide the requested information concerning the sight-lines; and also confirm that the proposed cycle storage would be both secure and weatherproof.]

Natural England	No objections provided that an appropriate SPA mitigation financial contribution is secured with a s106 Planning Obligation.
Hampshire & I.O.W. Wildlife Trust	No response received.
Thames Water	No response received.
Hampshire Fire & Rescue Service	No objection, but provides some generic fire precautions advice.
Crime Prevention Design Advisor	No objection: But makes a number of detailed suggestions for improving the security of the communal basement storage area, cycle storage and on-site parking area.

[Officer Note: the applicant's agent has been made aware of this comment and, in response, it has been confirmed that the cycle storage would be enclosed and secure. The other suggested security measures have been noted.]

## Planning Policy

No planning policy objections. The “*Development Affecting Public Houses*” SPD provides additional guidance to Policy CP10 of the Rushmoor Core Strategy in terms of demonstrating that there is no longer-term need and that alternative public houses are readily available. The Planning Policy Team are satisfied that the criteria of the SPD are adequately addressed and consequently no policy objection is raised to the proposals.

## Neighbours notified

In addition to posting a site notice and press advertisement, 15 individual letters of notification were sent to properties in Holly Road and Windmill Road, including all properties adjoining the application site.

## Neighbour comments

### 88 Windmill Road

Objection : I disagree that the rear extension will not cause any loss of light, and that the 2 dormer windows will overlook at least half of the gardens of adjacent properties. Potentially 6 cars and more parked on the street, (Holly Road is on a bus route). 6 new households is too many, 4 would be acceptable. The neighbours received a brief letter outlining plans, and a 5 minute doorstep conversation regarding general opinions. This is not a consultation.

### Aldershot Civic Society

Objection: Aldershot Civic Society oppose changes of use of public houses when they have not fully complied with the councils adopted SPD on Public Houses.

Council SPD on Public Houses: *"Reasonable efforts have been made to preserve the facility (including diversification options explored - and evidence supplied to illustrate this) but it has been demonstrated that it would not be economically viable to retain the building or site for its existing use class."*

There is no evidence of any marketing to promote or improve the footfall of the business. There is no official Facebook page, twitter page or up to date functioning web site, and there is no evidence of any promotional signage, flyers or advertising in the local area. There is little evidence of items in the councils SPD on public houses Annex B being submitted in the application. It would be wrong to assume that a new owner would be unable to do the above and make the premises work.

The accounts seem to have missed out accommodation charges, even though the personal statement says "The letting rooms have been let on a near constant basis". A decision on whether the business is viable or not cannot be made without these figures.

The pub has been put up for sale well over its value at £525,000 if you compare to freeholds of pubs that have sold recently in the immediate area (Farnham generally more expensive than Aldershot) the Bull Inn in Farnham has accommodation and car parking yet

was sold recently for £125,000 less than what La Fontaine is being marketed as.

Given the fate of pubs in the area recently, the Royal Staff is now privately owned and seems to have separated the pub business from the accommodation upstairs. We would not be confident in it remaining as a pub for the foreseeable future until it has run as a business for a few years. It would be unwise to count this business as an alternative to La Fontaine whilst they are both at risk, and the council should not be making a decision as to which pub it desires to keep out of the two, making it all the more important that all parts of the SPD are fulfilled if a decision to change the usage is approved.

Pubs Officer, Surrey  
Hants Borders CAMRA

Objection: La Fontaine is an important community pub for Aldershot and is often the first impression visitors get of the town when coming to support their local football team, so I would have hoped it could remain a successful business.

Whilst I am not submitting an objection to the proposal this is only because the Royal Staff is currently open and trading. If that situation were to change before this planning application were to be determined then I would wish to this representation to be considered as an objection for the reasons set out below.

I consider that this area of Aldershot probably only has the demand to sustain one pub and as the Royal Staff is trading then it this pub alone that is suitable to serve the local market.

I do however have serious reservations about the evidence produced to you and feel that you may need to stay this application in order to obtain fuller evidence that the pub is indeed economically unviable and thus meets the terms of the pubs policy and is eligible for conversion.

We note the comments on viability of the business and that the accounts provided combined with the letter from the accountants paint a picture of a business which is struggling to be successful and that income continues to reduce and that the owners are taking little or no money from the business. However:-

1. We also note the comment that they have to fund a mortgage on a private house as well. However, this is clearly their choice and is not something that should be considered when assessing the viability or otherwise of the business.
2. We further note the accountants comment that the loss of trade in recent years is probably due to restrictions on opening hours. We would remind you that these were imposed after a licencing review called by the police. We are uneasy that this could set a dangerous precedent for any landlord who wants to convert a pub locally and needs to prove they are not trading successfully. If this application is granted we would welcome a

statement that this does not set any precedent.

3. We also advise that you seek clarification on whether the trading figures include rent obtained from letting out the upstairs accommodation. We have been informed that this has happened in the not too distant past however we cannot find any provision for rental income in the declared figures. If it is true that areas of the property have been rented out we believe this income needs to be included in the profit/loss accounts for the public house. Failure to do so would skew the income figures received through owning the property.
4. We would welcome clarification of what price the business was marketed at and proof that this is a reasonable price for the local public house market and that it has not been marketed at a prohibitive cost. Whilst we accept that the current business may not be sustainable, we do however feel further proof is required to ensure the terms of the pub protection policy are met.

Planning Statement: Public House Policy: We also wish to comment on the planning statement [submitted with the application] which I consider to be deeply flawed and to contain errors that demonstrate a significant lack of understanding of the Aldershot pub scene, resulting in a document that cannot be viewed as fit for purpose. It suggests that the assessment carried out, with the exception of the Royal Staff where the research appears to have been undertaken by the applicants, has simply been a desktop exercise, with no attempt made to assess whether there are reasonable alternatives to La Fontaine. I would expect an assessment to be carried out in a far more comprehensive and reasoned manner to meet the requirements of the SPD.

For example the pubs' listed in Section 2.9 include 'Mytighar', which operates as a Nepalese Club/venue for hire rather than a pub and rarely seems to be open; 'Popworld' a night club which has been closed nearly a year ago and ran very restricted hours when it was open. Venues such as the George, Queen Victoria, Funky End, or Famous Door have virtually nothing in common with the offering at La Fontaine and really cater for a different clientele, especially in the peak evening periods on Friday and Saturday, when it is most likely people who drink in the La Fontaine will want to go out. The report appears to simply list all licensed venues in the area with scant regard to whether they offer a reasonable alternative. The suspicion must be that this has been researched via Google and not in the real world.

Similarly I find the suggestion that pubs such as Willems Park and the Duke of York are easily accessible and offer any type of alternative facility to La Fontaine is incredulous (sic), they are both located the other side of Aldershot and at a change of altitude of almost 200 feet!

Notwithstanding this I would accept that there are establishments in reasonable proximity to La Fontaine particularly the Royal Staff that do offer a reasonable and comparable provision and for this reason I am not objecting to the view that alternative provision does currently exist. This conclusion however is reached through our personal knowledge of the Aldershot pub scene and not due to the assessment presented in this deeply flawed document. This conclusion should not be considered in anyway as acceptance or agreement with much of the analysis carried out and we would welcome a statement that better evidence of meeting your pub protection policy will be required in future.

Personal Statement from the Applicants: Whilst I accept most of what is said with regards the efforts by the owners to sell the pub as a going concern and the lack of viability of the business, I would contend with the assertion from the applicants that they "have spoken with CAMRA regarding our situation and they are supportive of our methods taken previously and our decision to propose converting the property following no success selling the Public House." This is not really a true representation of our position. CAMRA last discussed the future of La Fontaine with the applicants in January 2017 and have had no contact regarding the pub since then. At that meeting they were very open about the poor state of business and the fact that though they were trying to sell the pub as a going concern but if that was unsuccessful then they would look at other possible options. At that time we understood their personal situation and that given the pub was in private ownership, it differed from the Royal Staff and therefore CAMRA agreed not to pursue an Asset of Community Value application for this pub. At no point have we suggested any support for conversion of the property to residential use. Our position as indicated above is that we consider this area of Aldershot probably only has sufficient demand to sustain one public house and we have no strong view as to whether this should be La Fontaine or the Royal Staff. Whilst we are not objecting to the application CAMRA certainly does not support the proposed conversion to flats, as has been suggested.

## **Policy and determining issues**

The site is located within the built-up area of Aldershot. It is not in a Conservation Area, nor located adjoining a Listed Building. The building is not identified as a Building of Local Importance as a result of the "Buildings of Local Importance" SPD. Furthermore, the property has not been subject to any nomination for "Asset of Community Value" (ACV) status under the Localism Act. As a result, the property has no status providing any protection from permitted development changes of use away from Public House (and thereby community) use. This is considered to be an important material consideration in this case, since it is open to an owner of the property to effect a permitted development change of use of the property to A1 (retail) or A2 (financial & professional services) use subject solely to their intentions in this respect being notified to the Council in advance and a 56 day period then passing before the change of use is implemented.

The adopted Rushmoor Core Strategy (October 2011) is the current Development Plan for the area. Core Strategy Policies CP1 (Sustainable Development Principles), CP2 (Design

and Heritage), CP3 (Renewable Energy and Sustainable Construction), CP4 (Surface Water Flooding), CP5 (Meeting Housing Needs and Housing Mix), CP10 (Infrastructure Provision), CP11 (Green Infrastructure Network), CP12 (Open Space, Sport and Recreation), CP13 (Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area), CP15 (Biodiversity), CP16 (Reducing and Managing Travel Demand) and CP17 (Investing in Transport) are relevant to the consideration of the current proposals.

A number of Rushmoor Local Plan Review (1996-2011) policies continue to be 'saved' and will therefore remain in use for the time being until they are replaced by future tranches of local planning policies. In this respect, Local Plan Policies ENV17 (general development criteria), H14 (amenity space), ENV41-43 (flood risk) and OR4/OR4.1 are 'saved' policies that remain relevant to the consideration of this application.

Also relevant are the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) "Housing Density and Design" and "Sustainable Design and Construction" both adopted in April 2006; 'Transport Contributions' adopted in April 2008; and "Parking Standards" adopted in 2017. Since these documents were subject to extensive public consultation and consequent amendment before being adopted by the Council, some significant weight can be attached to the requirements of these documents. The advice contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG) is also relevant.

Core Strategy Policy CP6 requires, subject to viability, provision of 35% affordable housing with developments of 15 or more net dwellings. However, since the scheme proposes only six additional units, the requirements of this policy do not apply in this case.

In this context, the key determining issues are considered to be:

1. The Principle of the proposals;
2. Design and Visual Impact including impact on trees;
3. Impact on Neighbours;
4. The Living Environment Provided;
5. Highways Considerations;
6. Impact on Wildlife;
7. Drainage Issues;
8. Renewable Energy and Sustainability; and
9. Public Open Space.

## **Commentary**

### **1. Principle -**

The Council's Planning Policy Team has considered the proposals in the light of current adopted planning policy as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework, National Planning Policy Guidance, the Rushmoor Core Strategy and the Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) "*Development Affecting Public Houses*", adopted by the Council in June 2015.

Core Strategy Policy CP10 (infrastructure provision) seeks the retention of community facilities unless specific circumstances can be shown to exist. Specifically the policy states that community facilities "*....will be protected unless:*

- (i) *It can be proven that there is no longer term need for the facility, either for its original*



*purpose or for another facility that meets the need of the community; or  
(ii) It is to be re-provided elsewhere to the satisfaction of the Council.”*

Although the Policy does not define a public house as being a ‘community use’, Paragraph 70 of the NPPF states, inter alia, that:-

*“To deliver the social, recreational and cultural facilities and services the community needs, planning policies and decisions should:*

- *Plan positively for the provision and use of shared space, community facilities (such as shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship) and other local services to enhance the sustainability of communities and residential environments;*
- *Guard against the unnecessary loss of valued facilities and services, particularly where this would reduce the community’s ability to meet its day-to-day needs;”*

The recognition of public houses as a community facility in the NPPF means that any policies in the Rushmoor Plan referring to community facilities should also cover properties in Public House use.

The National Planning Policy and Guidance and Core Strategy Policy CP10 set out the context and justification within which the *“Development Affecting Public Houses”* SPD was adopted by the Council in 2015. The SPD sets out the approach to be taken for an applicant seeking to demonstrate that there is no longer-term need for a Public House, including a further requirement to demonstrate that alternative Public Houses are accessible to serve the needs of the community. These requirements must be met if proposals resulting in the loss of a Public House are to be permitted. The La Fontaine Public House is identified as a safeguarded former Pub site, to which the SPD relates; and the current proposals would result in the loss of the Public House.

The SPD also provides guidance for the requirements of emerging New Rushmoor Local Plan Policy LN8 (Public Houses), currently in submission draft form and to be considered at the Local Plan Inquiry that commenced on 8 May 2018. Emerging Policy LN8 states that *“development proposals resulting in the loss of a public house will be permitted where it can be proven that there is no longer-term need for the facility”*.

**Marketing Evidence** : The applicants have submitted details of a marketing exercise that has been undertaken. A property agent has confirmed that the marketing of the property began in July 2016, with a ‘For Sale’ board affixed to the front of the property. Advertisements have also been placed within the local press and within a Pub trade publication, both in print and online. In addition, the property agent has stated that the asking price for the property is ‘reasonable’ and reflects the specific nature of the business. The property has been marketed without tie or covenant and has been on the market for in excess of 20 months to date. The length of time that the property has been on the market is significantly in excess of the minimum marketing time period specified by the SPD, which is 12 months.

The applicants have confirmed that only limited viewings of the property have taken place and that no offers have been received. A schedule of interest has been provided within the applicants’ Design and Access Statement which provides some detail related to the enquiries which have been received to date, which span the period from August 2016 to December 2017. A total of 13 enquiries have been received to date, most of which appear to have been

from potential property developers/investors. Four property viewings have taken place, yet none of the enquiries has resulted in any further contact or dialogue with the enquirers to date.

The SPD states that the sale of both the freehold and leasehold should be made available, yet it is noted that only the freehold of the premises has been offered for sale. However it is considered that the leasehold option is not relevant in this case given that the applicants, whom are the current freeholders, are seeking to retire. It is considered that it would be unreasonable for the Council to expect and require that a leasehold interest be marketed in the circumstances.

Objection is raised by Aldershot Civic Society in respect of the marketing of the application property on the basis of the suggestion that the asking price has been set too high. This opinion is advanced solely in the form of some marketing details for the Bull Inn near Bentley, Hampshire. These indicate an asking price of £400K, whereas the Civic Society note that La Fontaine was marketed with an asking price of £525K. It is not, however, considered that the two properties are comparable and/or that a simplistic comparison of the asking prices provides any proof of over-optimistic property pricing. The Bull Inn is located in a relatively isolated countryside position adjoining a main road (A31) where it has to rely largely upon passing vehicle-borne trade, whereas La Fontaine is located in an urban location where there is a larger potential pool of local non-driving customers available. Furthermore, it is not considered likely that an unrealistic asking price would deter prospective purchasers since, if they were interested in the application property as a Public House, they would have been likely to simply submit offers below the asking price. On this point, the applicants comment on the Civic Society objection by repeating that there have been enquiries about the application property as a result of the marketing exercise, yet none of the enquirers indicated that the asking price was a disincentive.

It is considered that, had the application property been considered an attractive public house business, it would have been subject to bids regardless of the asking price. It is noted that the CAMRA representation does not criticise the asking price for the property in the marketing campaign. On balance, it is considered that there is no evidence that the asking price for La Fontaine is unrealistic. To the contrary, it appears that the property has been of interest, but not for continuing use as a Public House.

In the circumstances, it is considered that the marketing criteria have been adequately met.

**Efforts to preserve the Public House :** The applicants have submitted evidence seeking to demonstrate that the public house is no longer economically viable. They have described and provided evidence of the diversification options that they have explored and implemented, including attempts to promote the Pub, serve food, and the letting of the upper floor accommodation. They have also submitted financial accounts, compiled by an accountant, which cover the last four years of trading (2013/14-2016/17). It is noted that turnover has declined since 2015 and that profit in the last financial year dropped by 40%.

Objection is raised to the submitted evidence in this respect, with the suggestions that:-

- the applicants' promotional activities have been inadequate and/or insufficiently exhaustive, since they have not used on-line social media or, for example, taken advantage of the opportunities to cater for away football supporters on match days at the nearby Recreation Ground;
- the current licencing restrictions for the premises affecting the profitability of the Pub may not persist if the Pub were in new ownership/tenure;

- a new owner, with new ideas, may be able to turn the Pub business around;
- the accounts fail to include the revenue from the letting of the upper floor accommodation; and that
- the owners have been taking too much money out of the Pub business, specifically to fund a mortgage on their private home.

The applicants and their agent have responded to these criticisms. First, it is considered unlikely that further on-line promotional activity would significantly increase the Pub business, especially since the Pub largely serves the local area. It is not located on a main road or other thoroughfare where passing trade could be encouraged and exploited. In these respects, the applicants believe that the promotional activities that have been undertaken have been appropriate to their customer base and 'catchment'.

With respect to catering for away football supporters during Aldershot FC home games, this occurs on approximately 25 days in the year and to a considerable extent is dependent upon the Football Club using the away supporters' entrance and promoting/suggesting La Fontaine as a nearby Pub venue that they could use. However the applicants report that the Football Club's arrangements for handling away supporters are variable; and that there have been occasions when extra staff and security have been made ready at La Fontaine in anticipation of an influx of away football fan customers, only for the Club to receive the away supporters at the main entrance on High Street and conduct them directly into the stadium. Further, in order to keep home and away fans apart, it is not unknown for the Police to escort away fans directly to and from the railway station and, as such, they have little opportunity to visit local Pubs.

Finally, the applicants confirm that the Pub accounts do incorporate the revenue earned from the letting of the upper floor accommodation of the application property. In spite of the regular income gained from these residential lettings, the accounts demonstrate that this is insufficient to sustain or substitute for the diminishing returns from the operation of the Pub. Furthermore, that the mortgage payment referred to in the Pub accounts is a mortgage that the applicants are paying in respect of their ownership of the Pub and, as such, that it is entirely appropriate and legitimate that this appears in the Pub accounts as an expense to be borne by the business. Whilst the applicants advise that they also have a separate mortgage to pay for their private home elsewhere, it is explained that this is solely mentioned in the supporting information submitted with the application to emphasise the point that it is unreasonable to expect anyone to operate a Pub without deriving income from the business to cover their living expenses.

It is considered that the customer profile for La Fontaine largely comprises 'local' customers either from business or residential properties within a limited radius around (i.e. walking distance) that is unlikely to be expanded significantly by the types of additional promotional activity suggested in the objections or, indeed, in the SPD. The Pub does not have any on-site parking, is physically small and constrained by neighbours, is not on a main road and, therefore, not well located to exploit passing trade. Other factors entirely beyond the control of the applicants can and have had a negative impact upon Pub trade. The applicants report, as an example, that they have recently lost regular customers from some local business either when the business moved away, or the management of other local businesses have discouraged lunchtime drinking by their employees. Additionally, as is acknowledged by the CAMRA representation, the nearby Royal Staff is also competing for the same limited and diminishing customer base in the same catchment. Although the Royal Staff closed for some time last year, this does not appear to have boosted trade for La Fontaine. It is considered that 'Local' pubs are unlikely to achieve and sustain significant food sales or, due to limited space and facilities, to provide and maintain a unique range of entertainment capable of

attracting and sustaining customers from further afield. Sales of beer and cider are therefore likely, as is the case with La Fontaine, to form the main income stream with ancillary sales of wines, spirits and soft drinks : the returns from this business are insufficient to sustain the Pub.

Other Pubs have had only limited success in attracting increased custom despite energetic on-line promotional activities. Sustaining any increased custom on an on-going basis is even more difficult. Nationally, the Pub trade is contracting. Seeking to attract and sustain additional custom through attempting to provide a range of entertainment, or introduce food sales, or expand the customer base, exposes Pub operators to significant financial risk with no guarantee that the hoped-for additional customers will actually materialise. In this context, it is considered that it is unreasonable for the Council to expect Pub operators to be exhaustive in their pursuit of dwindling Pub custom; or, indeed, to relentlessly pursue at additional financial risk new areas of Pub business that are likely to be neither sustainable nor profitable; in order to satisfy the requirements of the SPD.

For the Council to refuse planning permission citing the SPD on the basis of the assertion that a different Pub operator might be more successful and energetic in promoting the business, or less risk averse when seeking to introduce new entertainment ideas, or able to inject new money into the Pub business would render any attempt to satisfy the requirements of the SPD unattainable. There can also be no guarantee that the licencing restrictions imposed upon La Fontaine would be any less strict if the Pub were in different ownership. The Licencing restrictions are/were imposed in the interests of the amenities of the occupiers of adjoining and nearby residential properties that surround La Fontaine. There is clearly a conflict between increasing the intensity, nature and range of activities associated with the Pub use and the impacts that these could have on local residents that would remain. This would be the case even if the Pub were in different ownership.

The objections appear to suggest that the owners of Pubs are required to keep them operating at their own expense, or at least foregoing the ability to derive any significant income from them. It is argued that the personal financial commitments that people have are irrelevant to the consideration of Pub viability. However, it is considered that this issue goes to the heart of the consideration of financial viability for Pubs, especially so in this case where the Pub is owned by individuals rather than a large company. In this case the applicants do not live at the application property and, as such, they have living expenses to pay elsewhere, including for living accommodation, whether this be in the form of a mortgage or through payment of rent. If, instead, the applicants were to live at the application property, this would have to be at the expense of losing some or all of the income derived from the residential letting of the upper floors. It is clear that La Fontaine has been operating at an effective loss for some time and that the applicants appear to have been resisting the financial decline of the business at some personal financial risk to themselves. It is not considered that there is any evidence in this case that the applicants have sought to deliberately run the Pub business down, or that there have been any obvious lost or wasted opportunities to boost Pub trade.

Ultimately the financial viability of running a Pub depends upon the financial and other commitments made by pub operators being worthwhile to them. It is also of prime importance to anyone new considering the acquisition and operation of a Pub. In this case the evidence suggests that the continued running of the Pub by the applicants is unviable and that there is no interest in it being acquired as a going concern. It is therefore considered that, on balance, the Pub is no longer financially viable.

**The availability of alternative public house facilities :** The applicants have submitted

evidence of alternative public houses that are readily accessible. The submitted study indicates that there are two alternative public houses within a 5-minute walking distance of the site, with a further three pubs and a bar within a 10-minute walk. It is noted that the two closest alternatives, The Royal Staff (which is 0.1 miles from La Fontaine and within a 2-minute walk) and Mytighar (which is within 0.2 miles and a 4-minute walk), offer similar facilities. The applicants have stated that they have visited The Royal Staff and that several customers in this establishment frequent or have frequented La Fontaine.

The way in which the applicants and their agents have researched, presented and argued their case in respect of this issue has been criticised in the representations received. Nevertheless, it is noted that the representation from CAMRA concedes that there is, in this case, an alternative Pub venue (the Royal Staff) providing equivalent facilities nearby and, indeed, that there is probably insufficient Pub trade to sustain both Pubs. CAMRA do not object to the current application on the basis that the Royal Staff remains available. Additional criticism is directed at the way in which the applicants have identified other Pub establishments that have diversified into venues more focussed on food or entertainment than meeting the needs of the traditional 'local' Pub trade. However it is not considered that the applicants are seeking to suggest that they are direct alternatives to La Fontaine. It is considered that the existence of these other venues simply demonstrates the way in which Pub premises have rapidly changed and diversified into other uses.

Whilst the onus for addressing the requirements of the SPD lies with applicants, it is not considered that this means that planning permission should be refused on the basis of critical opinion that the applicants could have constructed a better case on the alternative public house issue. The fact is that there is an alternative Public House in the vicinity that is competing for the same Pub trade. The Royal Staff has Asset of Community Value (ACV) status and has been the subject of a community campaign seeking to keep it open. By contrast, ACV status has not been sought in respect of La Fontaine and there has been no community campaign for its retention as a Pub despite it being marketed for sale at about the same time as the Royal Staff.

Aldershot Civic Society argue that the determination of the current planning application be delayed until it is known whether or not the Royal Staff pub will remain open and/or a properly informed choice has been made between the loss of La Fontaine or the Royal Staff. However this is not the way that the Planning System operates. It would seem that the choice has already been made, since ACV status has not been sought to date for La Fontaine and it is the Royal Staff that has been the subject of campaigning from the community for its retention. The Council currently has under consideration a planning application that proposes the loss of La Fontaine public house by conversion into flats that it is obliged to determine objectively on its relevant planning merits. It would be unreasonable for the Council to withhold planning permission or delay determination of the application on the basis suggested.

**Conclusions** : The decline in number of Public Houses is a national phenomenon. If Pubs are to survive it is because they remain a profitable business that is supported by a customer base that regularly uses them. Pubs are collectively simply not as popular or regularly used as they have been in the past and this trend shows no sign of abating. As Pub trade has diminished, so have the number of Pubs. Even if permission were to be refused for the current application it is likely the Pub would close.

In line with many other Councils, Rushmoor has in place planning policies and a supporting Supplementary Planning Document aimed at seeking to prevent the loss of Public Houses. However the implementation of planning policy cannot dictate or deflect the economic

realities for the Pub trade and it would be unreasonable for the planning system to expect pub operators to keep Pubs open at their own expense. The operation of planning policy in this respect is more geared to ensuring that Pubs are not subject to the loss through speculative acquisition by property developers, since the existence of protective planning policies provides a degree of discouragement to this activity.

This particular planning application case is unusual in that the Pub in question is currently still open and trading despite the evident poor trading position. There have not been any other planning applications to date where the Pub has not already ceased trading. The case is also unusual in that the application property is privately owned by individuals, rather than being owned by a large company or Pub Chain. Planning legislation ultimately outranks guidance since it is possible to change the use of a Public House (Use Class A4) to other A-Class uses as 'permitted development'. In the absence of ACV status the application site could therefore change away from its present use without requiring planning permission.

Given the circumstances of this particular case, it is considered that the relevant criteria of the SPD are adequately addressed and, consequently, that there is no planning policy objection in principle to the proposals.

## **2. Visual Impact -**

The vicinity has a mixed character, with a variety of conventional dwelling types, ages and external materials. The application property is located in a prominent elevated position where it is readily visible from the adjoining streets for some distance. The application property is an old building and clearly in need of some cosmetic attention. It is proposed to demolish an existing rear extension and replace this with a new extension, together with a number of other more minor extensions and alterations to the existing building consequential to the proposed residential conversion. Matching external materials would be used. It is considered that the proposed extensions and alterations are entirely conventional in design, construction and appearance. The proposed on-site parking area would be largely enclosed by existing and new boundary enclosures. The enclosure of the existing paved terrace area to the front of the building would also be conventional and acceptable. There is some scope for the introduction of landscape planting to soften the appearance of the development in the street. It is considered that the design and external appearance of this proposed development would accord with the already varied design and external appearance of existing development in the locality. Accordingly, it is considered that the proposed development would integrate effectively into its surroundings and not significantly detract from the character and appearance of the area. It is therefore considered that the proposals are acceptable in visual terms.

## **3. Impact on Neighbours -**

Active public house sites located embedded within residential areas such as in this case often cause, or have considerable potential to cause, regular noise and disturbance to neighbours. It is therefore considered that the proposed deletion of the public house use of the site would result in a general improvement in the amenities of adjoining and nearby residential properties.

It is considered that the proposed development would have a conventional relationship with neighbours. In this case, the application property is attached to No.90 Windmill Road to the south-west; with No.2 Holly Road adjoining the rear of the site to the south-east. Nos.1-7 (odd inclusive) Holly Road are opposite. Due to a combination of design, orientation and separation distances, it is considered that no unacceptable relationships with any of these

neighbouring properties would result from the proposal.

Although objection has been raised by the occupier of No.88 Windmill Road partly on the grounds that the proposal would give rise to loss of light and privacy to some of the gardens of adjacent properties, the upper floors of the application property are already occupied residentially. The proposal would result in the deletion of one existing first-floor window in the rear elevation. Furthermore, although two new windows would be provided by dormer extensions on the rear roof slope, one would provide light for the access stairway and neither would give rise to any material or harmful loss of privacy to neighbours over and above what already exists.

#### **4. Living Environment Created -**

All the proposed flats would provide accommodation meeting or exceeding the Government minimum internal floorspace standards appropriate for their occupancy. The proposed conversion is also able to provide some communal on-site amenity space, including separate private areas for Flats 1 and 3. The Redan Hill and Gardens public open spaces are directly opposite the site. The internal layout of a development is a functional matter between a developer and his client and is to some extent covered by the Building Regulations. It is a matter for prospective purchasers/occupiers to decide whether they choose to live in the proposed development. Nevertheless, it is considered that the living environment created would be acceptable.

#### **5. Highways Considerations -**

Since the existing lawful planning use of the site is as a Public House with no on-site parking provision, the application site is clearly capable of generating on-street parking. The traffic generation potential for the existing use is the base position from which to consider any highways impacts of the proposed development. It is considered that the proposed residential use would generate fewer vehicle movements than the existing Pub use.

As a result of the proposals, six parking spaces (one for each proposed flat in full accordance with the requirements of the Council's current adopted Parking Standards SPD) would be provided on-site. It is considered that the dimensions, position and arrangement of the proposed parking spaces are satisfactory. The Highway Authority (Hampshire County Council) consider the proposed vehicular access to be acceptable in highways terms subject to confirmation of the sight-lines that are available. The applicants' agent is aware of this and amended plans are awaited.

Although no provision can be made for visitor parking on site, the works associated with the creation of the new vehicular access from Holly Road to serve the on-site parking area would also involve the reinstatement of normal height road kerbs along the Holly Road frontage of the application property to replace existing dropped-kerbs there. Consequently a number of street parking spaces are created and it is considered that this exceeds the nominal requirement for one visitor parking space to be provided with the proposed development.

Hampshire County Council Highways have requested confirmation that the bicycle storage to be provided with the development would be secure and weatherproof. This is also a query raised by the Police Crime Prevention Advisor. Cycle parking would be provided in a communal storage enclosure for the use of occupiers of Flats 3-6 and individually for Flats 1 & 2 in their own amenity areas. It is considered that there is no reason why the cycle storage to be provided would not be secure and weatherproof and, as such, that imposition of a suitably-worded planning condition would be appropriate to ensure that the cycle storage is

provided that meets these requirements. The applicant's agent has confirmed that the cycle storage would be secure and weatherproof and amended plans are awaited.

It is considered that acceptable provision for the storage and collection refuse/recycling bins for each property would be made.

No Transport Contribution can be justified in this case given that the proposed development is considered likely to generate less traffic than would arise from the resumption of the Public House use and, in any event, because the proposed development is too small to justify seeking such a contribution as a result of current Government guidance..

It is considered that the proposals are acceptable in highways terms. Although Hampshire County Council Highways has raised a holding objection to the proposals, it is considered that the matters on which this is based are matters of detail that could be addressed through imposition of conditions. A response is currently awaited from the applicants' agent to resolve these matters and an update will be provided to the Committee at the meeting.

## **6. Impact on Wildlife -**

The Rushmoor Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Interim Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy comprises two elements. Firstly the maintenance of Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspace (SANG) at Hawley Meadows in order to divert additional recreational pressure away from the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBHSPA) and secondly the maintenance of a range of Strategic Access Management and Monitoring Measures to avoid displacing visitors from one part of the TBHSPA to another and to minimize the impact of visitors on the TBHSPA. The proposal meets the criteria against which requests to allocate capacity at the Hawley Meadows SANG will be considered.

The applicant is aware of this requirement and the need to make a financial contribution of £24,234.00 to maintain the Hawley Meadows SPA mitigation scheme to be secured by way of a section 106 planning obligation. Natural England raises no objection to proposals for new residential development in the form of Standing Advice provided that it is in accordance with the above strategy. Provided the applicants submit a satisfactory completed s106 Undertaking within the timescale of the application it is considered that they would have satisfactorily mitigated for the impact of their proposed development on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area in compliance with the requirements of Core Strategy Policies CP11 and CP13. However failure to do so within the prescribed period would result in the refusal of planning permission on the grounds of the applicants not addressing SPA impact.

According to the submitted Preliminary Bat Roost & Nesting Bird Assessment Report the application property has negligible potential to host roosting bats or nesting birds and, as such, no further surveys are required prior to the demolitions and other works to be undertaken as part of the proposals. Nevertheless, on a precautionary basis, it is considered appropriate to impose a planning condition to cover the possibility of protected species being encountered on site nonetheless. It is further considered appropriate that an informative be used to advise the applicant of the requirements of the Wildlife & Countryside Act with respect to any protected wildlife species encountered on site.

## **7. Surface Water Drainage –**

The proposed development would, as a result of the proposed car parking area, marginally increase the extent of hard-surfacing at the application site. Nevertheless, the applicants



indicate that the car parking would be constructed with permeable paving to maintain natural infiltration of surface water. Due to the small urban nature of the site and proximity of the building, it is stated that it is not possible to install soakaways within the land and, as such, surface water drainage would have to continue, as now, the drain into the public piped surface water system. The site is located within Flood Zone 1, which is land at the lowest risk of flooding. As a result, the Environment Agency raise no objections as standing advice and no mitigation measures are indicated as being necessary. This being the case, it is considered that there is no requirement under Policy CP4 for mitigation measures to be incorporated into the development. Accordingly, subject to the imposition of a condition to ensure the installation of permeable car park paving, it is considered that the requirements of Core Strategy Policy CP4 would be met.

## **8. Sustainable Development and Renewable Energy -**

The application, is accompanied by a sustainability checklist to address the requirements of Policy CP3. Nevertheless, since the proposals are for the change of use of an existing building, it is not considered that the requirements of this policy are applicable in this case.

## **9. Public Open Space -**

The Local Plan seeks to ensure that adequate open space provision is made to cater for future residents in connection with new residential developments. Core Strategy Policy CP10 and saved Local Plan Policies OR4 and OR4.1 allow provision to be made on the site, or in appropriate circumstances, a contribution to be made towards upgrading facilities nearby. The policy does not set a threshold of a particular number of dwellings or size of site above which the provision is required. The site is not big enough to accommodate anything other than the development proposed. However, as a scheme for less than 10 dwelling units, this is a circumstance where a financial contribution towards the off-site provision of public open space can no longer be required as a result of the changes in Government policy and guidance.

## **Conclusions –**

Having considered the material submitted with the application seeking to address the Council's adopted "*Development Affecting Public Houses*" SPD, it is considered that the proposals are acceptable in principle. The proposed development is considered to have no material and harmful impact upon the visual character and appearance of the area, or on neighbours; to provide an acceptable living environment, and to be acceptable in highway terms. On the basis of the provision of a contribution towards the Hawley Meadows SPA mitigation and avoidance scheme, the proposals are considered to have no significant impact upon the nature conservation interest and objectives of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. The proposals are thereby considered acceptable having regard to Policies SS1, CP1, CP2, CP5, CP10, CP11, CP12, CP13, CP15, CP16, and CP17 of the Rushmoor Core Strategy and saved Local Plan Policies ENV13, ENV17, ENV41-43, TR10 and H14.

## **Full Recommendation**

It is recommended that subject to:

- A. Confirmation from Hampshire County Council Highways that their holding objection is withdrawn; and
- B. The completion of a satisfactory Planning Obligation under Section 106 of the Town

and Country Planning Act 1990 by 25 May 2018 to secure a financial contribution of £24,234.00 towards the maintenance of SPA avoidance and mitigation;

the Head of Planning in consultation with the Chairman be authorised to **GRANT** planning permission subject to the following conditions and informatives:-

However, in the event that a satisfactory s106 Agreement is not received by 25 May 2018 the Head of Planning, in consultation with the Chairman, be authorised to refuse planning permission on the grounds that the proposal does not secure a financial contribution to mitigate the effect of the development on the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area in accordance with The Rushmoor Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Interim Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy and Core Strategy Policies CP11 and CP13.

- 1 The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of one year 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, to reflect the objectives of the Council's Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Avoidance and Mitigation Strategy as amended July 2014 and to accord with the resolution of Rushmoor's Cabinet on 17 June 2014 in respect of Planning Report no PLN1420.

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

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

- 3 Construction 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 construction work at all shall take place on Sundays and Bank or Statutory Holidays, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason - To protect the amenities of surrounding residential properties and other occupiers.

- 4 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.

- 5 Prior to the first occupation of the accommodation hereby permitted, details for a communal aerial/satellite dish system shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. None of the new dwellings hereby permitted shall be occupied until the approved scheme has been installed and made operational.

Reason - In the interests of the visual amenity of the area by avoiding the unnecessary proliferation of aerial/satellite dish installations on the building.

- 6 The cycle parking facilities and refuse bin storage areas as shown on the approved plans shall be constructed, completed and made available for use in full accordance

with the approved details before any part of the development is occupied and retained thereafter for their respective purposes as approved.

Reason - In the interests of visual amenity and to ensure adequate provision of these facilities before the proposed new residential accommodation is occupied.

- 7 None of the dwelling units hereby permitted shall be occupied until all of the parking spaces shown on the approved plans, including the proposed new vehicular access and sight-lines to Holly Road, have been provided as approved. Thereafter the parking spaces shall be kept available at all times for parking purposes and shall not be used at any time for the parking/storage of boats, caravans or trailers.

Reason - To ensure the provision and retention of adequate off-street parking within the development in the interests of the safety and convenience of highway users.

- 8 Prior to the first occupation of any of the flats hereby approved, details of all external lighting to be installed within the site shall be submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The submitted details shall indicate the purpose/requirement for the lighting proposed and specify the intensity, spread of illumination and means of controlling the spread of illumination (where appropriate). The external lighting proposals as may subsequently be approved shall be implemented solely in accordance with the approved details and retained thereafter solely as such unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. With the exception of lighting identified and agreed as being necessarily required solely for maintaining the security of the site/building during night-time hours, no other external lighting shall be used/operated during night-time hours (2300 to 0700 hours daily) unless otherwise first agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. \*

Reason - In the interests of the amenities of nearby residential properties; and to ensure that there is no unnecessary use of lighting at the site.

- 9 The new on-site parking area and vehicular access hereby approved shall be constructed to be permeable to surface water.

Reason - To reflect the objectives of Policy CP4 of the Rushmoor Core Strategy. \*

- 10 Any tiles, fascia and barge-boards and rainwater goods on the existing building to be removed to facilitate the approved development shall be removed by hand and in the event that any bats or other protected species are found, works shall cease immediately and the applicant shall notify Natural England for advice and appropriate licencing of further works, if appropriate.

Reason - In the interests of the protection of bats and other protected wildlife species.

## INFORMATIVES

- 1 **INFORMATIVE - REASONS FOR APPROVAL-** The Council has granted permission because:-

Having considered the material submitted with the application seeking to address the Council's adopted "*Development Affecting Public Houses*" SPD, it is considered that the proposals are considered to be acceptable in principle. Furthermore, the proposed

development is considered to have no material and harmful impact upon the visual character and appearance of the area, have no material and adverse impact on neighbours, would provide an acceptable living environment, and, are acceptable in highway terms. On the basis of the provision of a contribution towards the Hawley Meadows SPA mitigation and avoidance scheme, the proposals are considered to have no significant impact upon the nature conservation interest and objectives of the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area. The proposals are thereby considered acceptable having regard to Policies SS1, CP1, CP2, CP5, CP10, CP11, CP12, CP13, CP15, CP16, and CP17 of the Rushmoor Core Strategy and saved Local Plan Policies ENV13, ENV17, ENV41-43, TR10 and H14.

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 - 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 WORKS START ON SITE or, require works to be carried out BEFORE COMMENCEMENT OF USE OR FIRST OCCUPATION OF ANY BUILDING.

Development started, carried out or occupied without first meeting the requirements of these conditions is effectively development carried out WITHOUT PLANNING PERMISSION.

The Council will consider the expediency of taking enforcement action against any such development and may refer to any such breach of planning control when responding to local searches. Submissions seeking to discharge conditions or requests for confirmation that conditions have been complied with must be accompanied by the appropriate fee.

- 3 INFORMATIVE - This permission is subject to a planning obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).
- 4 INFORMATIVE - No materials produced as a result of site preparation, clearance, or development should be burnt on site. Please contact the Head of Environmental Health for advice.
- 5 INFORMATIVE - The applicant is advised that there may be a need to comply with the requirements of the Party Wall (etc.) Act 1996 before starting works on site. The Party Wall (etc.) Act is not enforced or administered by the Council but further information can be found on the Planning Portal website <https://www.gov.uk/guidance/party-wall-etc-act-1996-guidance> and you are able to download The party Wall Act 1996 explanatory booklet.
- 6 INFORMATIVE - It is a legal requirement to notify Thames Water of any proposed connection to a public sewer. In many parts of its sewerage area, Thames Water provides separate public sewers for foul water and surface water. Within these areas a dwelling should have separate connections: a) to the public foul sewer to carry waste from toilets, sinks and washing machines, etc, and b) to public surface water sewer for rainwater from roofs and surface drains. Mis-connections can have serious

effects: i) If a foul sewage outlet is connected to a public surface water sewer this may result in pollution of a watercourse. ii) If a surface water outlet is connected to a public foul sewer, when a separate surface water system or soakaway exists, this may cause overloading of the public foul sewer at times of heavy rain. This can lead to sewer flooding of properties within the locality. In both instances it is an offence to make the wrong connection. Thames Water can help identify the location of the nearest appropriate public sewer and can be contacted on 0845 850 2777.

- 7 INFORMATIVE - In the UK all species of bats are protected under Schedule 5 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 (as amended) and under Schedule 2 of the conservation (Natural Habitats & c) Regulations 2004. Nesting birds and other wildlife species are also subject to statutory protection. The grant of planning permission does not supersede the requirements of this legislation and any works undertaken without appropriate consideration of its potential impact upon wildlife species would constitute an offence. If bats or signs of bats and/or other protected species are encountered at any point during development then all works must stop immediately and you should contact Natural England.
- 8 INFORMATIVE - The applicant is advised that during the demolition and construction phases 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 Head of Environmental Health & Housing.
- 9 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 new building works are consistent with these aims; and
  - b) using renewable energy sources for the production of electricity and heat using efficient and technologically advanced equipment.
- 10 INFORMATIVE - The applicant is advised to follow good practice in the demolition of the existing buildings on site including the re-use of all material arising from demolition as part of the redevelopment wherever practicable. Please contact Les Murrell, Strategy Co-ordinator (Sustainability) at Rushmoor Borough Council on 01252 398538 for further information.
- 11 INFORMATIVE - The applicant is advised to contact the Recycling and Waste Management section at Rushmoor Borough Council on 01252 398164 with regard to providing bins for refuse and recycling. The bins should be:
  - 1) provided prior to the occupation of the properties;
  - 2) compatible with the Council's collection vehicles, colour scheme and specifications;
  - 3) appropriate for the number of occupants they serve;
  - 4) fit into the development's bin storage facilities.
- 12 INFORMATIVE - The applicant is reminded that there is a requirement under the 2000 Building Regulations (Requirement E under Schedule 1) to provide sound insulation between the individual flats hereby permitted and/or adjoining properties (if a semi-detached or terraced house). The applicant is therefore advised to contact the Chief Building Control Officer for advice.
- 13 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.

- 14 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.









**LAWSON  
ARCHITECTURE**


LAWSON ARCHITECTURE LIMITED  
4 London Road, Liphook, Hampshire, GU30 7AN  
E: info@lawnarch.co.uk  
T: 01494 470000  
Direct: 01494 470000 | Company No. 10589626

<b>PROJECTS</b> Planning Application for Change of Use of the Public House to 6 x 1 bedroom flats at 82 Vermont Road, Aldershot, GU11 4JU	
<b>CLIENTS</b>	Mr & Mrs Thomas
<b>JOB NUMBER</b>	17-2350
<b>SCALE</b>	1:100 @ A3
<b>DATE</b>	22/08/2017
<b>DRAWING NUMBER</b>	17-2350-EP-01
<b>REF.</b>	A
<b>REVISION</b>	Addition of drainage & support lots
<b>DATE</b>	22/08/18
<b>BY</b>	EB


ALL DIMENSIONS TO BE CHECKED ON SITE PRIOR TO COMMENCEMENT OF CONSTRUCTION AND ANY DIMENSIONS AND CONSTRUCTION VARIATIONS SHALL BE THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CONTRACTOR. THE ARCHITECT SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY DIMENSIONS OR CONSTRUCTION VARIATIONS WHICH ARE NOT SHOWN ON THESE DRAWINGS. THE ARCHITECT SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY DIMENSIONS OR CONSTRUCTION VARIATIONS WHICH ARE NOT SHOWN ON THESE DRAWINGS. THE ARCHITECT SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY DIMENSIONS OR CONSTRUCTION VARIATIONS WHICH ARE NOT SHOWN ON THESE DRAWINGS. THE ARCHITECT SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR ANY DIMENSIONS OR CONSTRUCTION VARIATIONS WHICH ARE NOT SHOWN ON THESE DRAWINGS.



EXISTING BASEMENT PLAN -  
Scale 1:100 @ A3



EXISTING GROUND FLOOR PLAN -  
Scale 1:100 @ A3





**LAWSON ARCHITECTURE**

LAWSON ARCHITECTURE LIMITED  
 4 London Road, Uxbridge, Uxbridge, Middlesex, UB8 3PH  
 T: 01895 831111 | www.lawsonarchitecture.co.uk  
 Directors: Charles W Fee | Company No. 0090945

<b>PROJECT</b> Proposed Application for Change of Use of the Public House to 6 residential units at 52 Whitwell Road, Aldenhot, GU12 4NU		<b>CLIENT</b> Mr & Mrs Thomas
<b>JOHN NUMBER</b> 17-2350	<b>DATE</b> 09/11/2017	<b>DATE</b> 17-2350-PP-01
<b>SCALE</b> 1:100 @ A3	<b>REVISION</b>	<b>DATE</b>
	A Amendments to be done, car parking and address of coverage	25/01/16 EB
	B Amendments to be done, addition of highway status	23/03/16 CF
	C Amendments to be done, addition of highway status	10/05/16 EB

ALL DIMENSIONS TO BE CHECKED ON SITE BEFORE TO BE CONSIDERED AS APPROVED. THE ARCHITECT'S RESPONSIBILITY IS LIMITED TO THE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF THE BUILDING WORKS AND NOT TO THE ACCURACY OF THE INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE ARCHITECT BY OTHERS. THE ARCHITECT SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY OF THE INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE ARCHITECT BY OTHERS. THE ARCHITECT SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY OF THE INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE ARCHITECT BY OTHERS. THE ARCHITECT SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY OF THE INFORMATION PROVIDED TO THE ARCHITECT BY OTHERS.

**BASEMENT PLAN AS EXISTING FOR STORAGE ASSIGNED TO FLATS -**  
 Scale 1:100 @ A3



**Cycle Parking provision**


1x Short Stay spaces & 4 x Long Stay spaces using Cyclepods Fietshanger (1 unit x 5 bikes) or equivalent.

**Cyclepods Fietshanger Specification:**


- Shelter manufactured from hot dipped Galvanised steel to BS EN ISO1461
- Perforated side panels.
- Gas spring door which remains at required height.
- Height adjustable to accommodate all weather conditions.
- Placed in half a parking space.
- "Dutch" style high low rack is secured within the unit to store 5 bikes.
- Euro cylinder locks ensure security and master key access.
- Adjustable feet.

Dimensions:  
 L 2100mm x W 1800mm x H 1500mm

**PROPOSED CYCLEPODS FIETSHANGER BIKE STORE - NOT IN SCALE**



**PROPOSED GROUND FLOOR PLAN -**  
 Scale 1:100 @ A3








**LAWSON  
ARCHITECTURE**

**LAWSON ARCHITECTURE LIMITED**  
 4 London Road, Lybrook, Hemel Hempstead, GU30 7JN  
 Tel: 01494 450000 | www.lawsonarch.co.uk  
 Director: Charles W Fife | Company No. 10090545

<b>PROJECT:</b> Planning Application for Change Of Use of the Public House to 6 residential units at: 52, Whitwell Road, Aldermoor, GU12 4JU			
<b>CLIENT:</b>	<b>M &amp; Mrs Thomas</b>		
<b>JOB NUMBER:</b>	17-2350		
<b>SCALE:</b>	1:100 @ A3		
<b>DATE:</b>	06/11/2017		
<b>DRAWING NUMBER:</b>	17-2350-PP-03		
<b>REV:</b>	<b>REVISIONS</b>	<b>DATE:</b>	<b>BY:</b>
A	Amendments to be shown, car parking and addition of drainage	26/01/18	EB


ALL INFORMATION IS TO BE USED ONLY IN CONNECTION WITH THE PROJECT AND NOT FOR ANY OTHER PURPOSES. THE ARCHITECT AND/OR ENGINEER SHALL NOT BE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACCURACY OF ANY INFORMATION PROVIDED BY ANY OTHER PARTY. ALL INFORMATION IS TO BE CHECKED AGAINST THE ORIGINAL RECORD DRAWINGS AND THE SPECIFICATIONS.



PROPOSED ROOF PLAN -  
Scale 1:100 @ A3



PROPOSED SECOND FLOOR PLAN -  
Scale 1:100 @ A3







## 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 Head of Planning 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 John W Thorne (01252 398791) in advance of the Committee meeting.

---

Application No	17/00259/COND	Ward: Wellington
Applicant:	Jack Johnson	
Decision:	<b>Permission Granted</b>	
Decision Date:	26 April 2018	
Proposal:	Submission of details in respect of Corunna Zone B (Parcels B1&B2) part pursuant to condition 13 (surface water drainage) and condition 19 (ground levels) of hybrid outline planning permission 12/00958/OUT dated 10th March 2014.	
Address	<b>Zone B - Coruna Aldershot Urban Extension Alisons Road Aldershot Hampshire</b>	

---

Application No	17/00825/CONDPP	Ward: Rowhill
Applicant:	Messrs Jan Mandozai & Mohammed Cho	
Decision:	<b>Conditions details approved</b>	
Decision Date:	30 April 2018	
Proposal:	Submission of details pursuant to conditions 3 (i & ii) - Window details; 3(iii & iv) Rainwater goods and external flues, etc.; 4 - Parking areas and other hard surfacing and 5 - Landscaping - of planning permission 17/00027/FULPP dated 10 April 2017 for demolition of two-storey outbuilding at rear of site, external alterations and change of use of main building from Care Home to provide 5 self-contained flats, with parking spaces and amenity space at rear	
Address	<b>Grasmere House 33 Cargate Avenue Aldershot Hampshire GU11 3EW</b>	

---

---

Application No 18/00013/COND Ward: Cove And Southwood

Applicant: Mr John Lesser

Decision: **Conditions details approved**

Decision Date: 01 May 2018

Proposal: Submission of details to comply with condition 2 (external materials), 4 (surfacing materials), 5 (boundary treatments), 10 (cycle store), 11 (SUDS) and 12 (energy performance) attached to planning permission 17/00064/FULPP dated 21 July 2017 for the erection of a two bedroom detached chalet bungalow with associated parking, following demolition of existing garage together with the erection of a detached single garage

Address **126 Ively Road Farnborough Hampshire GU14 0LJ**

---

---

Application No 18/00032/FULPP Ward: North Town

Applicant: Mr Bob Gray

Decision: **Permission Granted**

Decision Date: 10 May 2018

Proposal: Demolition of existing garage and erection of a single storey side extension, part first floor and part two storey rear extension, formation of a dormer window to rear and roof lights to front

Address **85 North Lane Aldershot Hampshire GU12 4QJ**

---

---

Application No 18/00059/FULPP Ward: North Town

Applicant: Miss Lisa Jane Clark & Mr Luke Charles D

Decision: **Permission Granted**

Decision Date: 27 April 2018

Proposal: Erection of a detached residential annex in the rear garden for use in connection of the main dwelling to house a family member

Address **53 Roberts Road Aldershot Hampshire GU12 4RB**

---



---

Application No 18/00096/COU Ward: Knellwood  
Applicant: Mr Mark Batt-Rawden  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 26 April 2018  
Proposal: Permitted development change of use from dwellinghouse (Use Class C3) to small house in multiple occupation with 5 tenant rooms (Use Class C4)  
Address **31 Ashdown Avenue Farnborough Hampshire GU14 7DN**

---

---

Application No 18/00113/FULPP Ward: Knellwood  
Applicant: Mr Maynard  
Decision: **Permission Refused**  
Decision Date: 16 April 2018  
Proposal: Erection of three bedroom detached house on land to rear with access to the public highway via King George Close  
Address **Park End 152 Sycamore Road Farnborough Hampshire GU14 6RF**

---

---

Application No 18/00124/FUL Ward: St Mark's  
Applicant: Mr Ron Hedges  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 10 May 2018  
Proposal: Erection of an engineering hangar  
Address **The T Area Farnborough Airport Farnborough Road Farnborough Hampshire**

---

---

Application No 18/00125/FUL Ward: Rowhill  
Applicant: Mrs C Ambroziak  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 16 April 2018  
Proposal: Increase height of roof to the existing double garage and insertion of window and two roof lights to facilitate the change of use of the garage to a habitable room  
Address **Stoneleigh 33 Church Lane West Aldershot Hampshire GU11 3LH**

---

---

Application No 18/00135/TPO Ward: Knellwood  
Applicant: Mr Peter Kendall  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 10 May 2018  
Proposal: One Beech (T1 of TPO 398) overall crown reduce by no more than 2 metres  
Address **Woodcote 30 Ashley Road Farnborough Hampshire GU14 7HA**

---

---

Application No 18/00144/COND Ward: West Heath  
Applicant: Mr Trevor Harding  
Decision: **Conditions details approved**  
Decision Date: 10 May 2018  
Proposal: Submission of details pursuant to Condition 6 (SAP calculations) attached to Planning Permission 17/00921/FULPP dated 12 January 2018  
Address **Land Adjacent To 61 Cheyne Way Farnborough Hampshire**

---

---

Application No 18/00147/CONDPP Ward: Empress  
Applicant: Lothbury Property Trust Company Limited  
Decision: **Conditions details approved**  
Decision Date: 10 May 2018  
Proposal: Submission of details to comply with conditions 2 (external materials), 3 (surfacing materials) and 11 (boundary treatment) attached to planning permission 17/00866/FULPP dated 11 January 2018 for the erection of a retail unit (Class A1) for sale of bulky goods along with associated improvements to retail park access arrangements; revised car parking and servicing arrangements; and associated works  
Address **Blackwater Shopping Park Farnborough Gate Farnborough Hampshire**

---

---

Application No 18/00148/TPOPP Ward: St John's  
Applicant: Ms Sharon Spencer  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 16 April 2018  
Proposal: One Oak (T1 on submitted plan and part of group G10 of TPO 355A) to the right of garden, crown reduce all over by no more than 3 metres to suitable growth points. One Oak (T2 on submitted plan and part of group G10 of TPO 355A) in the middle of garden, crown reduce all over by no more than 3 metres to suitable growth points  
Address **23 Nightingale Close Farnborough Hampshire GU14 9QH**

---

---

Application No 18/00152/FULPP Ward: Empress  
Applicant: Ladbrokes Coral Plc  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 02 May 2018  
Proposal: Erection of sign fixing rails at high level on front elevation  
Address **Unit 2 4 Queensmead Farnborough Hampshire GU14 7GL**

---

---

Application No 18/00153/ADVPP Ward: Empress  
Applicant: Ladbrokes Coral Plc  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 08 May 2018  
Proposal: Display of an internally illuminated flex face box sign with white vinyl lettering internally applied to glazing  
Address **Unit 2 4 Queensmead Farnborough Hampshire GU14 7GL**

---

---

Application No 18/00159/FULPP Ward: Empress  
Applicant: McLagan Investments  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 03 May 2018  
Proposal: Erection of pod for retail sales outside store entrance  
Address **ASDA Westmead Farnborough Hampshire GU14 7LT**

---

---

Application No 18/00162/ADVPP Ward: Empress

Applicant: Syneos Health

Decision: **Permission Granted**

Decision Date: 02 May 2018

Proposal: Display an internally illuminated high level sign

Address **1 Pinehurst Road Farnborough Hampshire GU14 7BF**

---

Application No 18/00163/TPOPP Ward: Knellwood

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Ball

Decision: **Split decision**

Decision Date: 20 April 2018

Proposal: Fell one Norway Spruce (T53 of TPO 431A)

Address **7 Barnes Close Farnborough Hampshire GU14 7JA**

---

Application No 18/00164/REVPP Ward: Wellington

Applicant: MYF Training Ltd FAO Miss J Ouston

Decision: **Permission Granted**

Decision Date: 23 April 2018

Proposal: Variation of conditions 3 and 4 attached to planning permission 17/00120/FULPP dated 29 March 2017 to allow for changes to the cycle parking and alterations to the car parking layout

Address **78 - 82 Victoria Road Aldershot Hampshire GU11 1SS**

---

Application No 18/00167/TPO Ward: St Mark's

Applicant: Mr Rodney Raggett

Decision: **Permission Granted**

Decision Date: 23 April 2018

Proposal: One Lime (T2 of TPO 160) remove spur at 2 metres, crown reduce height by no more than 3 metres and laterally by no more than 2 metres and remove deadwood

Address **Land Adjacent To 37 To 41 Cross Street And To The Rear Of 59 To 61 Southampton Street Farnborough Hampshire**

---

---

Application No 18/00171/TPOPP Ward: Knellwood  
Applicant: Tina Parker  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 26 April 2018  
Proposal: One Oak (part of group G2 of TPO 376 tree 6 on submitted plan) remove epicormic growth on trunk. Remove faulted branch/limbs. Prune branches facing buildings by no more than 2 metres. One Birch (part of group G3 of TPO 376 tree 12 on submitted plan) prune branches facing building by no more than 2 metres. One Sweet Chestnut (T6 of TPO 376 tree 17 on submitted plan) crown lift all round to provide no more than 3 metres clearance to first foliage from ground level  
Address **Fernhill House Boundary Road Farnborough Hampshire GU14 6SU**

---

---

Application No 18/00173/FULPP Ward: Manor Park  
Applicant: Rev. Alwyn Pereira (Incumbent)  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 10 May 2018  
Proposal: Erection of a Memorial Wall and associated works  
Address **St Michaels Church Church Lane East Aldershot Hampshire**

---

---

Application No 18/00174/FULPP Ward: Fernhill  
Applicant: Mr & Mrs Ridge  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 20 April 2018  
Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension (revised scheme to planning permission 17/00095/FULPP dated 01 March 2017)  
Address **42 Lakeside Gardens Farnborough Hampshire GU14 9JG**

---

---

Application No 18/00175/TPO Ward: West Heath  
Applicant: Mrs Brigitta Turcsan  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 24 April 2018  
Proposal: Remove and replace one Alder (T8 of TPO 437)  
Address **176 West Heath Road Farnborough Hampshire GU14 8PL**

---

---

Application No 18/00176/TPO Ward: Cove And Southwood  
Applicant: Mrs Alison Dainton  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 25 April 2018  
Proposal: One Oak (T13 of TPO 416A) to rear of 28 Randolph Drive Farnborough, reduce lateral branches on North side to a length of no less than 6 metres from stem and tip reduction of lateral branches to South and West to horizontal length of no less than 8 metres  
Address **Land Affected By TPO 416A - Within Links Way, Fox Heath And Randolph Drive Farnborough Hampshire**

---

---

Application No 18/00178/TPOPP Ward: St John's  
Applicant: Mr John Follet  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 26 April 2018  
Proposal: One Oak (T1 on submitted plan, part of group G8 of TPO 355A) next to drive way, crown lift to no more than 5 metres. One Oak (T2 on submitted plan and part of group G8 of TPO 355A) crown reduce to suitable growth points by no more than 3 metres all over and and crown lift to no more than 5 metres from ground level  
Address **25 Nightingale Close Farnborough Hampshire GU14 9QH**

---

---

Application No 18/00181/FUL Ward: West Heath  
Applicant: Mr & Mrs Nicholson  
Decision: **Permission Refused**  
Decision Date: 27 April 2018  
Proposal: Erection of a two storey rear extension, single storey front extension and rooflights to front  
Address **107 Fernhill Road Farnborough Hampshire GU14 9DS**

---

---

Application No 18/00183/FULPP Ward: Knellwood  
Applicant: Mr & Mrs Beves  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 20 April 2018  
Proposal: Erection of a single storey front and side extension  
Address **49 Canterbury Road Farnborough Hampshire GU14 6QP**

---

---

Application No 18/00191/TPO Ward: Empress  
Applicant: Mrs Doris Stallard  
Decision: **Split decision**  
Decision Date: 27 April 2018  
Proposal: Two Silver Birches (T10 and T11 of TPO 444A) crown reduce back to previous reduction points  
Address **Chippings 3 Revelstoke Avenue Farnborough Hampshire GU14 8NG**

---

---

Application No 18/00194/LBCPP Ward: St Mark's  
Applicant: Mr Neil Kenny  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 02 May 2018  
Proposal: LISTED BUILDING CONSENT: Removal of 10 corrugated perspex rooflights and infilling with profile steel sheets to match the existing roof coverings  
Address **G29 Building Farnborough Airport Farnborough Road Farnborough Hampshire**

---

---

Application No 18/00195/TPOPP Ward: Knellwood  
Applicant: Mr Martin Wicks  
Decision: **Split decision**  
Decision Date: 01 May 2018  
Proposal: One Oak (T38 of TPO 432A) crown reduce overall by no more than 6 metres  
Address **25 Cedar Road Farnborough Hampshire GU14 7AU**

---

---

Application No 18/00198/TPO Ward: Fernhill  
Applicant: Mr Mark Preston  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 03 May 2018  
Proposal: Fell one Oak (T14 of TPO 426A)  
Address **374 Fernhill Road Farnborough Hampshire GU14 9EL**

---

---

Application No 18/00208/TPO Ward: Knellwood  
Applicant: Mr David Jones  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 03 May 2018  
Proposal: One Pine (part of group G12 of TPO 431A) called T1 on submitted plan, reduce back highway aspect of crown by no more than 2 metres and crown thin by no more than 10%  
Address **25 Ashley Road Farnborough Hampshire GU14 7EZ**

---

---

Application No 18/00213/FUL Ward: Knellwood  
Applicant: Mr Jory  
Decision: **Permission Refused**  
Decision Date: 08 May 2018  
Proposal: Erection of a first floor side extension, single storey rear extension, formation of new porch and alterations to existing front elevation  
Address **42 Church Avenue Farnborough Hampshire GU14 7AT**

---

---

Application No 18/00218/TPO Ward: Manor Park  
Applicant: Miss Natalie O'Sullivan  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 08 May 2018  
Proposal: One Lime tree (T13 of TPO 288A) reduce top of crown by no more than 4 metres and sides by no more than 2 metres  
Address **19 Osprey Gardens Aldershot Hampshire GU11 3FQ**

---



---

Application No 18/00230/PDCPP Ward: Manor Park  
Applicant: Mr & Mrs Firpo  
Decision: **Development is Lawful**  
Decision Date: 27 April 2018  
Proposal: Certificate of lawfulness for proposed development: Formation of three roof lights within front facing roof slope and four roof lights within the rear facing roof slope to facilitate rooms in roof  
Address **17 Bittern Close Aldershot Hampshire GU11 3FL**

---

---

Application No 18/00236/PDCPP Ward: North Town  
Applicant: Mr & Mrs Koenigsberger  
Decision: **Development is Lawful**  
Decision Date: 27 April 2018  
Proposal: Formation of a rear dormer window to facilitate a loft conversion  
Address **117 Woodland Walk Aldershot Hampshire GU12 4FF**

---

---

Application No 18/00237/TPOPP Ward: Cove And Southwood  
Applicant: Ms Etherington  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 10 May 2018  
Proposal: Group of Horse Chestnut trees near lamp column 10 (part of group G12 of TPO 420) identified as G23 on submitted plan, crown lift to no more than 5.5 metres from ground level and cut back obstructing branches from lamp column and parking bays. Remove one Horse Chestnut (part of group G12 of TPO 420) identified as T22 on submitted plan  
Address **Land Affected By TPO 420 - Between The Railway Line And Summit Roundabout And Alongside Summit Avenue Farnborough Hampshire**

---

---

Application No 18/00240/FULPP Ward: Cherrywood  
Applicant: Mr Amrit man & Mr Ashok Gurung  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 30 April 2018  
Proposal: Erection of a single storey side/rear extension  
Address **49 Oaken Copse Crescent Farnborough Hampshire GU14 8DS**

---

---

Application No 18/00242/FULPP Ward: Empress  
Applicant: Mr Choudhary  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 30 April 2018  
Proposal: Raising of the eaves and ridge height to allow rooms in the roof  
Address **148 Ship Lane Farnborough Hampshire GU14 8BJ**

---

---

Application No 18/00244/NMA Ward: Wellington  
Applicant: Carlo Tommasino Stocchetti & Anthony O  
Decision: **Conditions details approved**  
Decision Date: 20 April 2018  
Proposal: Non-Material Amendments to Planning Permission 17/00824/FULPP dated 20 December 2017 to allow alterations to tile hanging for first floor rear extension; loft level dormer set in from chimney by 400mm; alterations to internal layout and entrance of Flat 2; alterations to internal layout of Flats 1 and 3; removal of one rooflight from first floor extension; alterations to roof of ground floor extension; alteration to construction of Flat 1, addition of Soil Vent Pipes and alteration to staircase of Flat 5  
Address **73 - 77 High Street Aldershot Hampshire**

---

---

Application No 18/00245/TPOPP Ward: Knellwood  
Applicant: Mr Michael Hewlett  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 11 May 2018  
Proposal: Silver Birch (T34 of TPO 432A) crown reduce by no more than 2 metres  
Address **35 Cedar Road Farnborough Hampshire GU14 7AU**

---

---

Application No 18/00246/FUL Ward: North Town  
Applicant: Mrs N Foy  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 20 April 2018  
Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension  
Address **18 Fox Court Aldershot Hampshire GU12 4FA**

---

---

Application No 18/00249/FULPP Ward: Knellwood  
Applicant: Mr & Mrs Grainger  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 02 May 2018  
Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension  
Address **33 Fellows Road Farnborough Hampshire GU14 6NU**

---

---

Application No 18/00250/FULPP Ward: Rowhill  
Applicant: Mr Butler  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 02 May 2018  
Proposal: Erection of a single storey side and rear extension  
Address **33 Rowhill Avenue Aldershot Hampshire GU11 3LS**

---

---

Application No 18/00256/FUL Ward: St John's  
Applicant: Mr B Mason  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 30 April 2018  
Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension  
Address **34 Woodlands Road Farnborough Hampshire GU14 9QF**

---

---

Application No 18/00257/FUL Ward: Knellwood  
Applicant: Mr J Munday  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 30 April 2018  
Proposal: Erection of a first floor side extension  
Address **30 Pirbright Road Farnborough Hampshire GU14 7AD**

---

---

Application No 18/00258/FUL Ward: West Heath  
Applicant: Mr & Mrs Amero  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 30 April 2018  
Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension  
Address **46 West Heath Road Farnborough Hampshire GU14 8QR**

---

---

Application No 18/00259/REXPD Ward: West Heath  
Applicant: Mr & Mrs Hamstead  
Decision: **Prior approval is NOT required**  
Decision Date: 10 May 2018  
Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension measuring 4.1 metres x 2.4 metres to the eaves x 3.6 metres overall height  
Address **3 Tweed Close Farnborough Hampshire GU14 9NF**

---

---

Application No 18/00262/FULPP Ward: Manor Park  
Applicant: Mr C Strudwick And Miss A Karlsson  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 27 April 2018  
Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension following removal of existing conservatory  
Address **Whiteacre 4 Highfield Close Aldershot Hampshire GU11 3DF**

---

---

Application No 18/00263/FULPP Ward: Knellwood  
Applicant: Mr A Tucker & Ms J Holt  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 02 May 2018  
Proposal: Erection of a two storey rear extension with decking patio to rear and formation of a dropped kerb  
Address **26 Ashley Road Farnborough Hampshire GU14 7HA**

---

---

Application No 18/00265/TPO Ward: Knellwood  
Applicant: Mr Ian Kaynes  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 10 May 2018  
Proposal: Two Lime Trees T1 and T2 (G10 of TPO431A) to front of 7 Ashley Road Farnborough reduce overall crowns back no further than the previous pruning points.  
Address **7 Ashley Road Farnborough Hampshire GU14 7EZ**

---

---

Application No 18/00270/FULPP Ward: Rowhill  
Applicant: Chris Pedoe  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 10 May 2018  
Proposal: Erection of porches to front  
Address **18 - 20 Pavilion Road Aldershot Hampshire**

---

---

Application No 18/00272/SCREEN Ward: St Mark's

Applicant: Royal London Mutual Insurance Society L

Decision: **Environmental Assessment Not Required**

Decision Date: 09 May 2018

Proposal: SCREENING OPINION in respect of the change of use of existing ground floor undercroft warehouse area to B1a office, installation of first floor mezzanine to provide additional floorspace for B1b/B1c/B2/B8 use and ancillary B1a office use, alterations to elevations to include revised/new fenestration, the installation of louvres and the erection of an external staircase, alterations to service area to provide additional car parking and creation of new condensor and bin store enclosures, extension to existing condensor enclosure, provision of additional cycle parking, , extension to existing car parking area to provide 4 additional spaces, provision of motorcycle parking, alterations to the roof to include the installation of an antenna (2.8 metres high) and solar photovoltaic panels, removal of HGV parking spaces with associated alterations.

Address **1 Voyager Park Dingley Way Farnborough Hampshire GU14 6FF**

---

---

Application No 18/00273/FUL Ward: Cove And Southwood

Applicant: Mrs M Laverick

Decision: **Permission Granted**

Decision Date: 02 May 2018

Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension

Address **9 McNaughton Close Farnborough Hampshire GU14 0PX**

---

---

Application No 18/00274/REXPD Ward: St Mark's

Applicant: Mr S Toshev

Decision: **Prior approval is NOT required**

Decision Date: 10 May 2018

Proposal: rection of a single storey rear extension measuring 6 metres deep from the original rear wall of the property x 2.8 metres high to the eaves x 3 metres overall height

Address **6 South Street Farnborough Hampshire GU14 6LN**

---

---

Application No 18/00275/PDCPP Ward: Aldershot Park  
Applicant: Mr Tris Stover  
Decision: **Development is Lawful**  
Decision Date: 10 May 2018  
Proposal: Hip to gable roof extension, formation of a dormer window to the rear and roof lights to front to facilitate a loft conversion  
Address **9 Orchard Way Aldershot Hampshire GU12 4HW**

---

---

Application No 18/00277/NMA Ward: North Town  
Applicant: Vivid Build Ltd  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 02 May 2018  
Proposal: Non material amendment to planning permission 13/00081/FULPP dated 28 November 2014 for the demolition of 132 flats and erection of 34 one-bed dwellings, 131 two-bed dwellings, 59 3-bed dwellings and 2 4-bed dwellings (226 in total) with associated highway works, parking , landscaping and amenity areas to allow for the replacement of single doors with double doors on the communal cycle/bin storage stores and alterations to the external finish on blocks 27 (plots 484-499), 31 (plots 537-556), 34 (plots 584-599 and 616-631), 35, (plots 640-648) and 37 (plots 682-697)  
Address **North Town Redevelopment Site - Stage 2 - Land Bounded By Eastern Road And Denmark Square Pegasus Avenue Aldershot Hampshire**

---

---

Application No 18/00278/FUL Ward: Fernhill  
Applicant: Mr G Tomlinson  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 02 May 2018  
Proposal: Erection of a front porch  
Address **6 Goddards Close Farnborough Hampshire GU14 9GU**

---

---

Application No 18/00279/REXPD Ward: Empress  
Applicant: Mr J Hull  
Decision: **Prior approval is NOT required**  
Decision Date: 30 April 2018  
Proposal: Erection of a single storey rear extension measuring 4.5 metres deep from the original rear wall of the property, 2.7 metres high to the eaves and 4 metres in overall height  
Address **120 Ship Lane Farnborough Hampshire GU14 8BJ**

---

---

Application No 18/00281/FUL Ward: Fernhill  
Applicant: Mr G Tomlinson  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 10 May 2018  
Proposal: Formation of 3 dormer windows to side elevation  
Address **6 Goddards Close Farnborough Hampshire GU14 9GU**

---

---

Application No 18/00282/NMAPP Ward: Empress  
Applicant: Mr W Cole  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 18 April 2018  
Proposal: Non material amendment of planning application 16/00468/FUL dated 4th July 2016 for change in design of windows and the re-positioning of windows and skylights  
Address **The Larches 29 Napoleon Avenue Farnborough Hampshire GU14 8LZ**

---

---

Application No 18/00288/PDCPP Ward: Manor Park  
Applicant: Mr FARRAR  
Decision: **Development is Lawful**  
Decision Date: 10 May 2018  
Proposal: Demolition of conservatory and erection of a single storey rear extension  
Address **8 Highfield Avenue Aldershot Hampshire GU11 3BY**

---



---

Application No 18/00295/FULPP Ward: St Mark's

Applicant: Mr & Mrs Green

Decision: **Permission Granted**

Decision Date: 11 May 2018

Proposal: Erection of a first floor rear extension

Address **30 South Street Farnborough Hampshire GU14 6LN**

---

Application No 18/00300/REXPD Ward: Rowhill

Applicant: Mrs C Russell

Decision: **Prior approval is NOT required**

Decision Date: 10 May 2018

Proposal: Erection of a single storey extension measuring 3.65 metres from the original rear wall of the property x 2.3 metres to the eaves x 3.53 metres overall height

Address **45 Kingsway Aldershot Hampshire GU11 3PE**

---

Application No 18/00301/TPOPP Ward: Knellwood

Applicant: Mr Lewis Field

Decision: **Permission Granted**

Decision Date: 11 May 2018

Proposal: One Oak (T67 of TPO 429A) crown reduce height by no more than 3 metres to suitable growth points, reduce lateral spread by no more than 2 metres to suitable growth points and crown thin by no more than 10%

Address **46 Salisbury Road Farnborough Hampshire GU14 7AL**

---

Application No 18/00306/TPO Ward: St John's

Applicant: Mr Simon Allaway

Decision: **Permission Granted**

Decision Date: 11 May 2018

Proposal: Remove four Alder trees (part of group G5 of TPO 408A) as per submitted photograph

Address **Land Affected By TPO 408- At Trunk Road, Broadhurst, Sorrel Close And Thyme Court Farnborough Hampshire**

---

---

Application No 18/00326/NMA Ward: Knellwood  
Applicant: Mr S Marjaria  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 26 April 2018  
Proposal: Non Material Amendment to planning application 15/00509/FULPP dated 6th August 2015 to allow the change in materials to the outbuilding from facing brickwork to reinforced glass render and to change the doors from timber to double glazing with white uvpc frames  
Address **23 Cambridge Road West Farnborough Hampshire GU14 6RW**

---

---

Application No 18/00348/NMA Ward: St John's  
Applicant: Mr B Earnshaw  
Decision: **Permission Granted**  
Decision Date: 03 May 2018  
Proposal: Non material amendment to planning application 16/00747/FUL dated 10th October 2016 to allow a change in materials  
Address **Modbury 155 Fleet Road Farnborough Hampshire GU14 9SL**

---

---

Application No 18/00360/COND Ward: Wellington  
Applicant: Group Properties Limited  
Decision: **Conditions complied with**  
Decision Date: 09 May 2018  
Proposal: Request for confirmation of compliance with the conditions imposed by planning permission 16/00672/FULPP dated 2 November 2016  
Address **1 Sherlow House Nelson Street Aldershot Hampshire GU11 1HB**

---

---

Application No 18/00378/COND

Ward: St Mark's

Applicant: Gwyn Hughes

Decision: **Conditions complied with**

Decision Date: 11 May 2018

Proposal: Confirmation that condition 1 attached to planning permission 17/00029/FULPP dated 19 April 2017, in respect of the erection of a part three storey, part second floor front extension, a three storey side extension and enclosure/reroof of existing atrium, has been complied with

Address **Warwick House 1 Aerospace Boulevard Farnborough Hampshire GU14 6XW**

---

---

Application No 18/00379/COND

Ward: St Mark's

Applicant: Gwyn Hughes

Decision: **Conditions complied with**

Decision Date: 11 May 2018

Proposal: Confirmation that condition 1 attached to planning permission 17/00028/FULPP dated 15 March 2017 in respect of the erection of a part three storey, part second floor front extensions, two second floor rear extensions, a single storey rear extension and installation of glazing to rear elevation, has been complied with

Address **York House Lakeside Road Farnborough Hampshire GU14 6XP**

---

This page is intentionally left blank