Development Management Committee 15th January 2020

Item 4 Report No.PLN 2001 Section C

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	Tara Cowell
Application No.	19/00832/FULPP
Date Valid	20th November 2019
Expiry date of consultations	17th December 2019
Proposal	Raise ridge height to form a first floor and two storey front and side extensions and new boundary fencing
Address	39 Cargate Avenue Aldershot Hampshire GU11 3EW
Ward	Rowhill
Applicant	Mr Assadullah Mir
Agent	Mr Chanto Foo
Recommendation	GRANT

Description & Relevant Planning History

The application relates to a 4-bedroomed detached modern-style bungalow with integral garage built in the mid-1950s. It is located occupying a corner plot at the junction of Cargate Avenue with Church Lane West measuring approximately 0.08 hectares; and with a road frontage of 30 metres onto Cargate Avenue and 25 metres onto Church Lane West. The application site is within the Cargate Avenue Conservation area, which was designated by the Council in the 1980s.

The bungalow is constructed with red/brown bricks and plain clay roof tiles, and has modernstyle uPVC casement windows. The integral garage has a white roller shutter garage door. The bungalow has been extended to the side and rear as a result of a planning permission granted in 1969. The property has an existing vehicular entrance from Cargate Avenue with space to accommodate approximately 3 cars on site. The main garden area of the property is located to the side (south) towards Church Lane West. The site contains a number of trees, which are generally located around the margins of the property. In particular this includes a significant specimen Beech tree within the garden area close to the Church Lane West frontage. None of the trees are subject to a Tree Preservation Order, but are nevertheless subject to some protection by virtue of the site being with a Conservation Area. The property is largely enclosed on the Cargate Avenue frontage by a low brick wall and mixed hedging; and on the Church Road West frontage largely just by a brick wall. The application property is surrounded by existing residential properties. To the east (rear) the site shares a 2-metre high fenced boundary with Abercarne House. To the north is No.37 Cargate Avenue, a two-storey semi-detached Edwardian villa with a loft room, which has a high brick side boundary wall which runs to the rear of, and is attached to, Arbercarne House. To the west on the other side of the road directly opposite are Nos.32A, 34 and 36 Cargate Avenue : Nos.34 and 36 are a semi-detached pair of three-storey Edwardian villas and No.32A a 1960's modern-style detached two-storey house with a tile-hung front wall. Diagonally opposite to the north-east are Nos.32 Cargate Avenue and 'The Hollies, Cargate Grove : these are a pair of semi-detached three-storey Edwardian villas converted into flats. To the south of the application site on the opposite side of Church Lane West is 'Stoneleigh Cottage' (No.41) Church Lane West, a two-storey house. Located immediately behind 'Stoneleigh Cottage' are Nos.33 and 37 Church Lane West, a further pair of Edwardian residential properties. The south-east corner of the application property is located opposite the junction of Church Lane West with Mountview, a modern-style residential cul-de-sac.

The current application seeks planning permission for the substantial extension and alteration of the existing bungalow, including the conversion of the existing integral garage into living accommodation. The proposals would involve the removal of the entire existing bungalow roof and the erection of a first-floor extension and new pitched roof over the ground floor building footprint modified with the addition of a bay window, a corner turret window and an enlarged entrance hallway. The overall result is the creation of a detached two-storey house comprising three reception rooms, hallway, cloakroom, kitchen and a laundry/utility room on the ground floor; and 4 bedrooms (one with an en-suite shower-room) and two bathrooms on the first-floor.

Externally, the proposed extended building is designed, proportioned and detailed to emulate the character and appearance of existing Edwardian villas in the vicinity. In this respect, the current proposals are a re-submission responding to concerns raised in respect of two previous unsuccessful planning applications submitted to the Council:-

- (a) 19/00242/FULPP for "Erection of a first floor and two storey extensions to front and rear elevations" submitted in April 2019, but withdrawn in June 2019; and
- (b) 19/00461/FULPP for "Raise ridge height to form a first floor, erection of front extensions, replacement windows and new railings to existing wall" submitted in July 2019, but withdrawn in October 2019.

Unlike the proposals the subject of the previous withdrawn applications, significant efforts have now been made to design proposals that would be in keeping and sympathetic to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The design also incorporates obscure glazing to some first-floor windows to avoid undue loss of privacy to occupiers of adjoining residential properties.

The area to the front of the extended building is shown to be provided with an expanded permeable hard surface capable of accommodating at least three on-site parking spaces. The existing access onto Cargate Avenue would be retained.

The application is accompanied by a Design & Access Statement, Heritage Statement, and a Development Tree Report.

Consultee Responses

- Aboricultural Officer No objections subject to conditions. This proposal has the potential to threaten a number of amenity trees due to the unavoidable proximity of construction works to surrounding trees. However, the Development Tree Report submitted with the current application adequately addresses all areas of potential conflict in this respect.
- **Conservation Team** No objections subject to conditions. Although the proposals the subject of previous planning applications have given rise to concerns, the current proposals satisfactorily address the various matters raised previously. The proposed elevations are now more balanced and the design incorporates a more traditional and conventional pitched roof. The design now addresses its location as a corner plot. The proposed design incorporates satisfactory architectural detailing, including bay windows, a stone pediment between ground and first-floor elevations, a chimney stack, vertical sliding-sash windows with rubbed-brick window headers and keystones, decorative roof eaves, and traditional rainwater goods. It is proposed that a low brick boundary wall with close-boarded fence inserts be provided on the Cargate Avenue frontage - which is acceptable. Overall, the design of the current proposal takes an architectural lead from the larger detached villas within the Cargate Avenue Conservation Area and, as such, helps link the building back to the traditional buildings in the road.

Neighbours notified

In addition to posting a site notice, 28 individual letters of notification were sent to occupiers of properties in Cargate Avenue, Cargate Grove and Church Lane West, plus Councillors Crawford and Roberts. This notification has incorporated all properties adjacent and opposite the application site and all contributors whom have made representations in respect of the previous withdrawn planning applications.

Neighbour comments

Representations have been made by the occupiers of Abercarne House (twice), No.33 and Stoneleigh Cottage (No.41) Church Lane West; Flat 2 No.32 (twice : two separate people), 34, 35A and 37 Cargate Avenue; and Flat 1 The Hollies, Cargate Grove. The following summary grounds of objection have been raised:-

- 1) The proposals are contrary to adopted local planning policies and objectives;
- 2) The proposals do not address the concerns raised about the previous proposals, namely the scale of the proposals, adverse impacts on neighbours and adverse impact upon the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Indeed, the Council is ignoring previous concerns and/or favours changes to the visual appearance of the proposals over other impacts that remain unresolved;
- 3) The current proposals fail to address to concerns raised in respect of previous proposals for the site by the North East Hampshire Design Review Panel;
- 4) The Cargate Conservation Area would not be conserved by this proposal : the purpose of a Conservation Area is that they should remain undisturbed. There has already been much inappropriate development within the Conservation Area. [Officer Note: Conservation Areas are not designated to prevent development within them, simply that

proposed development is required to preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the area. They are not zones where development is prohibited. Each proposal must be considered on its own relevant planning merits : a developer can only be required to address consequences arising from their own proposal, not to address existing problems.];

- 5) Very little of the original bungalow would remain as a result of the proposals the proposals are, in effect, for a new-build house [Officer Note: planning proposals are considered solely on their own relevant planning merits on the basis of the submitted plans and details of the proposals. Whether the proposals are for an extension or are tantamount to being a complete re- or new-build are not relevant in this context : the proposals are simply considered as what they are.];
- 6) The development is being proposed purely for profit and is unnecessary because new 4-bedroom houses are being built elsewhere in the Borough [*Officer Note: the motives of a developer are not a matter that can be taken into consideration with a planning application. Furthermore, the need for the proposed development in any particular location is equally not a matter relevant to the consideration of a planning application*];
- 7) Overdevelopment : the proposals would be likely to exacerbate existing over-population in the area;
- 8) Visual harm the application property is a prominent corner plot. The proposed house would be too high/tall, with a roof that could accommodate additional rooms. The existing bungalow is discreet and does not impinge visually above the adjoining tree-line;
- 9) Inadequate on-site parking provision, likely to lead to dangerous and/or inconvenient overspill parking outside the proposed development, dangerous reversing manoeuvres out of the site access, and compromised emergency vehicle access along Cargate Avenue;
- 10) Increased traffic congestion and danger at the Cargate Avenue Church Lane West road junction. Increased danger to pedestrians;
- 11) Concern that the extended property could, in the future, be converted into a number of self-contained flats or into an House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) containing bedsits. It is considered that this is the applicant's true plan and that this would, if implemented, cause/exacerbate on-street parking congestion and noise problems. It is not considered likely to become a family home as suggested by the applicants. One contributor requests that a planning condition be imposed to prevent uncontrolled conversion to bedsits of flats. The surrounding area is already a bedsit ghetto. [Officer Note: separate planning permission would be required from the Council to convert the extended property into self-contained dwelling units or an HMO. However a planning condition could be imposed to remove any 'permitted development' rights to convert the property into a Use Class C4 small HMO.];
- 12) Loss of privacy due to overlooking : specifically raised by, and on behalf of, the occupiers of Abercarne House and No.37 Cargate Avenue. The indicated partial obscure-glazing up to 1.7 metres above finished floor level is inadequate to prevent undue overlooking.
- 13) Possible loss of the historic garden wall separating No.37 Cargate Avenue from the application site due to the proposed development [Officer Note: the wall in question is not subject to any statutory protection, the removal of the wall is not subject to planning control; nevertheless the proposals do not include any works to, or the removal of, this boundary wall.];
- 14) Loss of light to neighbours due to the tall roof and over-dominant mass of the proposed development.
- 15) The proposed development is located even closer to Abercarne House than was the case with the previous withdrawn proposals [*Officer Note: this is incorrect, the proposed*

extended building would be sited no closer to Abercarne House than has previously been proposed with withdrawn application 19/00461/FULPP : in fact, the nearest first-floor element has now been set-back 1.6 metres further from the shared boundary than before].

- 16) Infringement of legal rights to light (raised specifically by the occupiers of Abercarne House) [Officer Note: this is a separate private property matter between owners of Abercarne House and the owners of the application site in which the Council cannot be involved; and is not a matter for consideration in the determination of a planning application.]
- 17) Noise, disturbance and inconvenience during the construction period [Officer Note: it is long-standing Government guidance and policy that the effect of construction works to implement a planning permission cannot be taken into account in determining planning applications.];
- 18) Possible disruption of a sewer pipe that runs under the application site [Officer Note: this is not a matter for the consideration of the current planning application.];
- 19) Loss of trees : the existing foundations of the bungalow are considered to be inadequate for the addition of a first-floor and the works to strengthen the foundations would be likely to cause damage to the surrounding trees at the site;
- 20) Loss of property values [Officer Note: this is not a matter that can be taken into account in determining planning applications.]; and
- 21) The Council should not even be considering this application [Officer Note: the Council are obliged to consider and determine all planning applications that are submitted and, as such, cannot refuse to consider planning applications even if there are concerns about the proposals as submitted.].

Policy and determining issues

The site is located within the defined built-up area of Aldershot and within the Cargate Avenue Conservation Area. The site is not adjoined by any Statutory Listed Buildings or non-statutory heritage assets such as 'Buildings of Local Importance' (BOLI). The trees at the site are not subject to a Tree Preservation Order, albeit that trees located in a Conservation Area cannot be removed or subject to significant works without first formally seeking the Council's consent.

Policies SS1 (Presumption in favour of sustainable development), DE1 (Design in the Built Environment), NE3 (Trees and landscaping), HE1 (Heritage), HE3 (Development within/adjoining Conservation Areas) and IN2 (Transport) of the New Rushmoor Local Plan (2014-2032) (adopted February 2019) are relevant. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 'Car and Cycle Parking Standards' (adopted 2017).

The main determining issues are considered to be: the principle of the proposals, the visual impact upon the character and appearance of the Cargate Avenue Conservation Area, impact on trees, impact on neighbours, and highways considerations.

Commentary

1. Principle -

The site is located within the defined built-up area and is an already developed residential plot. Although the site is located within a Conservation Area, this designation does not preclude development from being undertaken. Nor does Conservation Area status exclude proposed development from the overall Government requirement to make better use of

under-used land - such as the application property. Indeed, within reason, the proposals are supported in principle by both Government guidance and Development Plan policies. The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable in principle subject to normal development control criteria being satisfied.

The Council's Cabinet has recently considered the conclusions of a review of the Cargate Avenue Conservation Area. Whilst a number of changes to the Conservation Area boundaries are proposed, these do not affect the current application site.

2. Impact upon the Visual Character and Appearance of the Conservation Area –

Policy HE1 requires that developments within Conservation Areas should conserve and enhance the significance, special interest and character and appearance of the area, reflecting legislative requirements. In terms of impact upon the visual character or appearance of the Conservation Area, the statutory requirement is for development to either preserve or enhance that character and appearance. Policy HE3 states that the Council will "seek to conserve, enhance or better reveal.." aspects of the Conservation Area. The appropriate test for the consideration of impact upon the character and appearance of the area is whether or not the proposed development would cause material harm to the character and appearance of the area *as a whole*.

In this case, the application site is located in a readily visible corner position that is currently occupied by an un-remarkable 1950s bungalow of 'modern' design, appearance and external materials. This must set the 'base-position' for the consideration of impact upon the Conservation Area. The vicinity, and the Conservation Area in general, has an entirely residential character, albeit comprising a range of residential use and occupation ranging from large to small detached, semi-detached and terraced dwellinghouses; blocks of flats created from the conversion of existing large buildings; and also Houses in Multiple occupation (HMOs). Some HMOs in the Cargate Avenue area have existed for so long that they pre-date Conservation Area. There are also some more contemporary buildings and these also contribute, in part, to the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and, indeed, in the main, also existed when the Conservation Area was originally designated. Indeed, the Conservation Area contains a variety of buildings of different types, ages, designs, external materials and extensions and alterations that altogether form part of the established character and appearance of the area.

The proposal has an additional floor resulting in the maximum height of the development being 4 metres higher than the existing bungalow at the roof ridge. In this respect the proposed roof height is slightly taller than that proposed with the previous withdrawn proposals, however by just 200mm (20cm); which is considered to be insignificant. The adjacent existing semi-detached properties in Cargate Avenue (Nos.35 & 37) are approximately 10 metres high at the ridge and the ridge height of the current proposed extended dwelling would be 9.8 metres; and roof eaves height 5.7 metres. As such, the overall height of the proposed building is clearly similar to that already existing in the area.

Whilst concerns have been expressed by objectors about the height of the proposed building, the possible future use/occupation of the roof space and existence of second-floor accommodation, these are characteristics of some existing development in the vicinity. Indeed, the majority of buildings in the Conservation Area are of at least two-storeys. Furthermore, the existence of loft rooms and/or second-floor accommodation is not unusual in the various villa properties present in this vicinity that the current proposals evidently seek

to emulate.

In this overall context, it is considered that the proposed development would fit in well with, and be sympathetic to, the established visual character and appearance of the Conservation Area. In this respect the applicants have responded positively to the concerns expressed about the previous proposals as submitted with planning applications earlier this year. The Council's Conservation Team consider that the current design has made a creditable and successful effort to design and detail an enlarged residential dwelling that satisfactorily emulates the visual character and appearance of some existing similarly-scaled and proportioned buildings in the area. A new boundary wall with fence panel inserts would enclose the Cargate Avenue road frontage of the property. Although there is no statutory protection for the retention of the existing boundary enclosures of the site, the proposals do not indicate the removal or replacement of any of these other existing structures.

It is not considered that the proposals would materially and harmfully alter the visual character and appearance of the area overall. Indeed, having regard to the un-remarkable existing bungalow, it is considered that the current proposals would enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. As such, the proposals are acceptable having regard to statutory requirements and the requirements of New Local Plan Policies HE1, HE3 and DE1.

3. Impact on Trees –

The Council's Arboricultural Officer is satisfied that the existing trees within the site would be adequately protected from harm during the construction period and, as such, raises no objections subject to the imposition of conditions requiring the proposed tree protection measures be implemented in full and retained for the duration of the construction period of the proposed development. The fact that the proposed development is principally contained within the footprint of the existing bungalow assists in this respect.

4. Impact on Neighbours –

It is considered that it is the directly adjoining residential properties at No.37 Cargate Avenue and 'Abercarne House' Church Lane West that are impacted by the proposed development and, as such, require specific consideration of whether or not those impacts are sufficient to justify the refusal of planning permission. Although there are other nearby residential properties, none are considered to be impacted to such an extent that material and undue planning harm would arise. The impacts upon the immediately adjoining neighbouring properties are considered in the following paragraphs:-

<u>Abercarne House</u> : is a detached 2-storey house facing Church Lane West. The main impact of the proposed development would be on the west side of this neighbouring property. Here, there is a small private patio area (comprising part of the garden area of this neighbour) and a conservatory. There are also windows directly facing the application site that principally include those to a bedroom and the kitchen. The shared boundary fencing between the proposed extended building is 5.3 metres from the rear of No. 39 and 4.2 metres away from the main wall of Abercarne House : thereby the overall building-to-building separation at ground level would be 9.5 metres, although the proposed first-floor extension in respect of Bedroom 2 (the closest element of the proposed extensions) would be set back a further 1.6 metres : a total separation of 11.1 metres. It is noted that there are some trees within the application site located close to the shared boundary with Abercarne House. In this context, the relationship with the west side of Abercarne House is not considered to give rise to a harmful impact in planning terms. Although there would be some loss of light, this would be to the west and, as such, be an impact arising principally during summer evenings when the sun is already low towards the horizon and, as such, already likely to be obscured by clouds, and existing trees and buildings. The additional height of the proposed extensions over the height of the roof of the existing bungalow is not considered to be significant in this respect. In terms of outlook, this is already relatively limited due to the existing bungalow at the application property and trees located near the shared boundary, there is no right to an outlook where this arises from over property that is separate ownership. Accordingly it is considered that the resulting separation between the proposed extended building and Abercarne House would be sufficient to provide an acceptable outlook in planning terms.

In terms of privacy issues, there are three proposed rear windows at first-floor level facing Abercarne House. The largest window would be for Bedroom 2, with two smaller windows serving a landing and a bathroom. As there is also a smaller side-facing window serving Bedroom 2, it is considered that all of these proposed first-floor rear windows can be conditioned to be fixed and obscure glazed in their entirety at all times to prevent any potential undue overlooking into the living and social area of Abercarne House, notwithstanding the presence of some existing trees already partially interrupting direct views out of the application site. Similarly, a planning condition can be imposed to preclude the installation of any additional first-floor windows. Such conditions would be enforceable by the Council.

<u>No.37 Cargate Avenue</u> : is a semi-detached two-storey villa with a driveway located between the house and the boundary shared with the application property. It is sited to the north of the application site. The building-to-building distance between the two properties is approximately 10 metres. No.37 has a landing window at first floor, and also has the main entrance door located to the side facing towards the application property. It is considered that the separation is sufficient to provide an acceptable side-to-side relationship. Windows serving the habitable rooms of this neighbouring property do not face towards the application property and, as such, sunlighting/daylighting and outlook would not be materially and harmfully impacted.

The side elevation of No.37 would be presented with the proposed north side elevation of the proposed extended building. This would contain a single first-floor window serving a bathroom. As with the proposed rear elevation first-floor windows, it is considered that suitably-worded planning conditions would ensure no material and harmful overlooking to No.37 would arise.

It is considered that the relationships of the proposed development with all neighbours would be acceptable in planning terms.

5. Highways Considerations -

The proposal makes provision for three on-site road parking spaces, thereby meeting the Council's adopted Parking Standard for a 4-bedroom house in full. The arrangement of the proposed parking spaces on-site is considered acceptable and the existing vehicular access onto Cargate Avenue would be retained. The proposals are considered acceptable in highways terms.

Conclusions -

The proposals are considered to be acceptable in principle and to have acceptable impacts upon the visual character and appearance of the Cargate Avenue Conservation Area, the amenities of neighbours and in highways terms. The proposal are thereby considered acceptable having regard to Policies DE1, NE3, HE1, HE3 and IN2 of the adopted New Rushmoor Local Plan (2014-2032) (February 2019) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Car and Cycle Parking Standards' (2017).

Full Recommendation

It is recommended that planning permission be **GRANTED** subject to the following conditions and informatives:-

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

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

- 2 Construction of the following elements of the development hereby approved shall not start until a schedule and/or samples of the external finishing materials to be used in them have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Those elements of the development shall be carried out using the materials so approved and thereafter retained:-
 - External walls, including all architectural detailing;
 - Roofing materials;
 - Full window details, including design, finishing materials/colour, method of opening, frames and reveals;
 - Rainwater goods

Reason - To ensure satisfactory external appearance.*

3 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England), Order 2015 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order), no development falling within Classes A, B, C and D of Part 1 of Schedule 2 shall be carried out without the prior permission of the Local Planning Authority.

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

4 Notwithstanding the details shown on the submitted plans, the first-floor windows of the development hereby approved annotated 'X' on the plan attached to this decision notice shall be fitted with fixed obscure glass in their entirety and retained in this condition at all times.

Reason - To prevent overlooking and loss of privacy to neighbouring residential properties.

5 The on-site parking spaces shown by the plans hereby approved shall be used only for the parking of private motor vehicles ancillary and incidental to the residential use of the application property (No.39 Cargate Avenue) only. These parking spaces shall be kept available at all times for parking and, for the avoidance of doubt, shall not be used for the storage of caravans, boats or trailers.

Reason - To safeguard residential amenity and ensure the provision and availability of adequate off-street parking.

6 Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order, 1987, (or any other Order revoking or re-enacting that Order) the land and/or building(s) shall be used only for the purpose of a single dwelling house and for no other purpose, including any other purpose within Class C without the prior permission of the Local Planning Authority.

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

7 The permission hereby granted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved drawings C T Foo Associates Drawing numbers: 1/12, 2/12, 3/12, 4/12, 5/12, 6/12, 7/12, 8/12 & 9/12.

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

Informatives

- 1 INFORMATIVE The Local Planning Authority's commitment to working with the applicants in a positive and proactive way is demonstrated by its offer of preapplication 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.
- 2 INFORMATIVE **REASONS FOR APPROVAL** The Council has granted permission because:-

The proposals are considered to be acceptable in principle and to have acceptable impacts upon the visual character and appearance of the Cargate Avenue Conservation Area, the amenities of neighbours and in highways terms. The proposal are thereby considered acceptable having regard to Policies DE1, NE3, HE1, HE3 and IN2 of the adopted New Rushmoor Local Plan (2014-2032) (February 2019) and the Council's adopted Supplementary Planning Document 'Car and Cycle Parking Standards' (2017).

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.

3 INFORMATIVE - Your attention is specifically drawn to the conditions marked *. These condition(s) require either the submission and approval of details, information, drawings etc.by the Local Planning Authority BEFORE WORKS START ON SITE, BEFORE SPECIFIC ELEMENTS OF THE PROPOSAL ARE CARRIED OUT 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.











Ref.	Revision	Date By		No.0122315 (TO Constraints) Project: 39 Cargate Avenue, Aldershot, GU11 3EW - Erection of a first floor and two storey extensions to front and rear elevations	39 Cargate Avenue, Aldershot, GU11 3EW - Erection o and two storey extensions to front and rear elevations	rection of a first floor evations
			ALL DIMENSIONS TO BE CHECKED ON SITE ONLY TO BE SCALED FOR PLANNING AND BUILDING REGULATIONS	Scale: A3 @ 1:100	Date: 25/10/2019	Drawn by: S.K
			Client: MR ASSADULLAH MIR	Job number: 1652	Drawing number: 8/12	Revision:

PROPSAL IN CONTEXT 9m 10m 8 8 ۳ ۲ 6m 4 Q.4 SCALE 1:100 0 1 2 3 4 @ A3 0.5 1.5 2.5 3.5

2H

39 Cargate Avenue



Bricks fence

37 Cargate Avenue

