

COMMITTEE REPORT

ITEM NUMBER: 7

APPLICATION NO.	23/02411/HOU
LOCATION	92 Connaught Road, Fleet, GU51 3LP
PROPOSAL	Erection of a two storey front extension, creation of first floor, demolition of existing conservatory and alterations to fenestration
APPLICANT	Mr & Mrs F Saunders
CONSULTATIONS EXPIRY	01 December 2023
APPLICATION EXPIRY	16 March 2024
WARD	Fleet Central
RECOMMENDATION	Grant



Reproduced from the Ordnance Survey map with the permission of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown Copyright 2000. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown Copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. **Please Note: Map is not to scale**

BACKGROUND

This application has been reported to the Planning Committee at the discretion of the Executive Director - Place, in line with the Council's Constitution, as this application raises issues relating Policy 11 of the made Fleet Neighbourhood Plan and the material considerations from the fallback position. The Executive Director considered that consideration by Planning Committee of this application would help to inform other similar planning applications.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE

The application site consists of a modest bungalow located on the northwest side of Connaught Road. The dwelling has an external appearance of concrete tiles and white render. There is a conservatory and patio to the rear. The rear garden slopes upwards towards the rear. The dwelling to the southwest is two-storeys. The plot to the northeast is the garden of a block of flats. Fleet Baptist Church is located to the rear. The front garden has a low brick wall and is laid to lawn. Car parking is located on a drive to the side of the dwelling with on road parking for permit holders and short-term visitors.

SITE/SURROUNDING DESIGNATIONS

- The site falls within the settlement boundary of Fleet.
- The site falls within Flood Zone 1 and in a causal area for flooding.

PROPOSAL

Permission is sought for the erection of a two-storey front extension, creation of a first floor and demolition of the existing conservatory and alterations to fenestration. The overall dwelling height would be 7.65 metres, with a subservient ridge height of 6.4 metres. There would be first floor windows on each elevation. The external materials would consist of dark brown concrete plain tiles, grey fascias and soffits, grey window frames and white render, and red face brickwork with contrast red brick to corner returns.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

24/00086/GPDBUH, Construction of an additional storey within the limitations of Part 1 Class AA of the consolidated General Permitted Development Order, Prior Approval Granted 19 February 2024.

23/02684/GPDBUH, Construction of additional storey within the limitations of Part 1 Class AA of the consolidated General Permitted Development Order, withdrawn, 08/01/2024.

23/01311/HOU, Erection of a two-storey front extension, creation of first floor, demolition of existing conservatory and alterations to fenestration, Refuse Permission, 17 July 2023.

RELEVANT PLANNING POLICY

Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) requires applications for planning permission to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

The relevant Development Plan policies for this proposal include the Hart Local Plan (Strategy & Sites) 2032 (HLP32), the saved policies of the Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996- 2006

(HLP06), and the Fleet Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2032 (FNP32) adopted November 2019.

All of these adopted and saved policies within these documents are consistent with the December 2023 version of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

The Development Plan locates the application site within the settlement policy boundary of Fleet.

The relevant policies are:

Hart Local Plan (Strategy & Sites) 2032 (HLP32):

Policy SD1 Sustainable Development

Policy NBE4 Biodiversity

Policy NBE5 Managing Flood Risk

Policy NBE9 Design

Policy INF3 Transport

Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006 'saved' policies (HLP06):

Policy GEN1 - General Policy for Development

Fleet Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2032

- Policy 10 - General Design Management policy
- Policy 11- Safeguarding Bungalow Stock
- Policy 15 - Residential Gardens
- Policy 19 – Residential Parking

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2023

Section 2 (Achieving sustainable development)

Section 4 (Decision-making)

Section 9 (Promoting sustainable transport)

Section 12 (Achieving well-designed and beautiful places)

Section 15 (Conserving and enhancing the natural environment)

Other material documents

The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as amended).

Appeal decisions

Planning Practice Guidance (PPG)

National Design Guidance (NDG)

Supplementary Planning Document: Cycle and Car Parking in New Development (2023)

BRE Report - Site layout planning for daylight and sunlight: a guide to good practice (2022)

Hart's Climate Change Action Plan

CONSULTEES RESPONSES

Fleet Town Council

Objection with comments:

- This is the redevelopment of a 3 bedroom bungalow (building with no stairs) to a potentially 4-6 bedroom house.
- There is extensive development of 3 and 4 bedroom houses and even more 1 and 2 bedroom apartments, but there has been only 1 bungalow developed in the last 10 years and before the introduction of the Neighbourhood Plan there had been erosion of bungalow stock generally bought up for the development of 4 and 5 bedroom houses.
- It has to be determined if this a 4 bedroom house or potentially a 6 bedroom property. The latter would require 4 parking spaces dimensioned as 2.5 x 5.0m (under Hart's TAN) and the proposed layout would conflict with Policy 15, to retain 50% of the front garden to soft landscaping - this has negative impacts on carbon capture and biodiversity. If it is determined this is a 4 bedroom house the applicants noted they could amend the parking plan to conform with Policy 15 of the FNP and retain soft landscaping to the front garden.
- The argument for permitted development of the addition of floor to an existing building requires the extension to 'sit' on the footprint of the existing building and match the style and finishes of the host building. It would not produce the applied for property
- The applicant has proposed to mitigate the breach of FNP Policy 11 by the addition of an accessible ramp to the front door, a downstairs wet room and potentially 2 downstairs bedrooms to retain single level living downstairs.

The proposal is in breach of Neighbourhood Plan, Policy 11.1

It is noted that mitigation has been proposed to accommodate accessible living at the ground floor, and suitable for multi-generational living but the end result remains a large two storey family home unsuitable for older persons to down size to (paragraph 3.4 FNP)

Ecology Consult (Internal)

No objection: The property appears to be of a modern (post-1960s) development, located in a suburban setting, and I have no records of protected species relevant to this application. The proposals are unlikely to impact on bats and on this basis, I have no objection to this application. If permission is granted and a bat is subsequently discovered, works should stop immediately, and Natural England should be contacted. Further survey and / or licensing may then be required for the works to proceed.

Building Control (Hart and Rushmoor Building Control Partnership):

A full structural survey carried out by a qualified surveyor would confirm the condition of the walls but in general there is no reason why they could not support a first-floor extension. I note that the walls are to be underpinned suggesting that the developers have taken into consideration the existing structure and additional loadings to be imposed.

It would also be possible to build the first floor without any loading on the existing walls.

NEIGHBOUR COMMENTS

Four comments of support:

- In-keeping with other properties on the road, and would bring a young family into the community.
- Renovation required to existing building.
- Not suitable for a person with disabilities or additional needs.
- Plans allow the property to be a family home, and also fully suitable for an older person or someone with mobility issues.
- Better than flats or multiple houses.
- Provision of adequate parking spaces required.
- Permeable parking spaces required.

ASSESSMENT

Principle of Development

The application site is situated within the settlement of Fleet where there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development provided that the proposal is in compliance with development plan policies and that no unacceptable harm to the street scene, residential amenity, the environment, highway safety or any other material planning considerations arise. These considerations are set out below.

Application background

The application before Member's is the same as 23/01311/HOU which was refused for being contrary to the Fleet Neighbourhood Plan Policy 11. This application is the same in terms of the design, car parking and amenity matters, which were not objected to previously. Although repeated in this report, they do not form part of the key considerations of this application. The key changes between 23/01311/HOU and this application are as follows:

- additional justification relating to Policy 11 of FNP, the internal layout of the dwelling;
- granting of a Class AA Prior Approval (permitted development), for the enlargement of a dwellinghouse by construction of additional storeys.

There does not appear to have been any material changes to site circumstances since the previously refused application.

There have been material changes in planning policy through the adoption of the NPPF (December 2023) and the Council's Parking SPD rather than TAN. These policy amendments are substantially the same with respect to this application.

Key considerations

The key planning consideration is the reason for refusal on the aforementioned case and if this has been overcome, or if material considerations outweigh the relevant part of the Development Plan. The reason for refusal is set out in full below:

"The proposed development would result in the conversion and loss of a single-level bungalow suitable to occupation by older people. The proposed development is therefore contrary to Policy 11 of the Fleet Neighbourhood Plan 2018 - 2032 which seeks to safeguard building stock for people of limited mobility including people with disabilities and older residents."

Background to the Neighbourhood Plan policy

The Fleet Neighbourhood Plan (FNP) was made in November 2019. The Policy wording of Policy 11 is:

Policy 11 - Safeguarding building stock for people of limited mobility including people with disabilities and older residents.

1. Proposals for the conversion of bungalows (a bungalow is a house which has only one level, and no stairs) to a house comprising two or more storeys that will result in the loss of local homes especially suited to occupation by older people will not be supported.
2. Proposals for the modification of bungalows to adaptable standards to support independent living will be supported.
3. Proposals that result in the loss of homes especially suited to occupation by older people and/or people with limited mobility will not be supported.

Subject to compliance with Policy 10 the development of new bungalows will be supported.

Following the making of the FNP, amendments were made to the General Permitted Development Order 2015 (as amended) (GPDO) on 31st August 2020, through the introduction of Class AA permitted development rights for the enlargement of a dwellinghouse by construction of additional storeys.

The Neighbourhood Plan policy therefore pre-dates the changes to the permitted development order and Class AA is a more up to date and should be given weight in the determination of this application.

Application of this Policy to this application

Policy 11 has been upheld at appeal in at least 3 instances:- 20/00884/HOU, 22/00798/HOU, 22/00402/HOU. Pertinent key points of these appeals are detailed below on why they were dismissed.

20/00884/HOU

- That there is little substantive evidence before the inspector to show how the proposal would secure the retention of accommodation that Policy 11 seeks to retain.
- Does not include details on how the family member (elderly and disabled), would be accommodated within the proposed accommodation and would live independently within the property.
- The Planning Practice Guidance confirms that, in general, planning is concerned with land use in the public interest. It is probable that the scheme would remain long after personal circumstances of the appellant cease to be material. The benefits of family-supported living for elderly residents are acknowledged, but this does not outweigh the harm arising from the loss of independent accommodation which Policy 11 seeks to retain.
- Whilst “the appellant has referred to permitted development rights in respect of alterations to provide first floor accommodation as a potential fall-back position. However, no evidence has been provided to demonstrate how such accommodation could be satisfactorily provided (note: in this case with Class B – alterations to the roof) with the

existing hipped roof, nor that the appellant would genuinely pursue this option if the appeal failed”.

22/00798/HOU

- I acknowledge that the proposed dwelling would incorporate a downstairs bedroom with ensuite and other provisions to aid access and adaptation. It thereby could provide accommodation for those with restricted mobility including older people. However, this does not necessarily make it more suited, and the policy does not specifically seek levels of accessibility. As the supporting text explains there are several reasons why the retention of bungalows is sought including: supporting downsizing, providing an alternative to small apartments, and supporting independent living, along with the issues of a limited stock and an increasing older population.
- In this case I accept that there is a fallback to utilise the loft space for bedrooms through the utilisation of Permitted Development Rights which is supported by a Lawful Development Certificate (Council reference 22/01415/LDC - Class B).
- This would create first floor accommodation and there is nothing before me to suggest this could not be implemented. However, it would not fundamentally alter the scale of the property, and the bedroom space would be restricted by the roof slope. This would be significantly different to the proposed 5-bedroom family sized house, and which is a revised proposal following an earlier larger scheme with accommodation over three floors (Council reference 21/02989/HOU). As such, I find that the proposal offers something very different to the existing property, even with the utilisation of the roof space, and compared to the type of accommodation the policy seeks to maintain for older people to live independently.

22/00402/HOU

- With the proposal the property would be changed to a four-bedroom family dwelling with no bathrooms on the ground floor. Thus, it would not be suitable for those wanting to downsize to one/two bedroom homes or those seeking lifetime homes, with all facilities accessible and at ground level.
- I acknowledge that the loft of the existing dwelling could potentially be converted to provide additional living space at first floor level. However, the resultant first floor living space would be limited and the dwelling would remain comparatively modest in size.

The existing dwelling

The existing dwelling is a relatively modest bungalow located within the Settlement of Fleet. The Planning Consultant outlines the existing dwelling is not suited to accommodation for lifetime standards or those with any significant degree of mobility impairment (paragraph 4.5 of the Planning Statement). The application is also accompanied by a letter from the vendor, setting out one “elderly lady” viewed the property, but decided there was too much renovation required. Further that over 20 viewings and only offers from speculators were received and they planned to redevelop the property and did not provide satisfactory offers. The dwelling was sent to auction and no reasonable offers were made.

Notwithstanding the facts of the existing dwelling, which would make it challenging for some older people to occupy the building, with the correct renovations to the bungalow, many of which would

be required to up-date the dwelling, there is nothing to say that it could not facilitate the occupation of the dwelling by an older person or those with a disability. Further, although there is some evidence that the dwelling struggled to sell, there is limited information provided on how it was marketed.

Secondly, the Planning Consultant sets out the proposed resultant dwelling would provide parking spaces in close proximity to the main entrance of the dwelling, hard surface for wheelchair/elderly persons, a ramped entrance to the front door, accessible thresholds and turning spaces for a wheelchair. Internally, the dwelling would be fitted out to comply with Part M of building regulations, staircase designed to enable a chair lift, and a ground floor bedroom and wet room and switches and sockets at a suitable height from the floor.

A Planning Inspector in one of the above-mentioned appeals discounted the personal circumstances of the applicant, particularly as the scheme would likely remain long after personal circumstances of the appellant ceased to be material. In this case, the proposed alterations and accessible arrangements are commendable. Some of the details would be secured through the plans, and Building Regulations and could therefore be considered sufficiently 'secured'. However, Policy 11 of the FNP does not specifically seek levels of accessibility. As the supporting text explains there are several reasons why the retention of bungalows is sought including: supporting downsizing, providing an alternative to small apartments, and supporting independent living, along with the issues of a limited stock and an increasing older population. These works alone would not satisfy the requirements of Policy 11 of the FNP. Additionally, some of the works would not be development, and entirely internal, that it would not be possible to reasonably condition these, due to not according with the 6 tests of Paragraph 55 of the NPPF for conditions.

Further, the Planning Inspector was clear that although an extended property may be utilised by, or partially by older occupants or, accessibility arrangements are put in place, planning is concerned with the public interest in the long term, and not just the present occupiers.

Lastly, this application puts forward a fallback position. Planning Inspectors have been clear that it needs to be demonstrated how such accommodation could be satisfactorily provided. Further that where there is a fallback, there has to be a reasonable likelihood of the development being carried out if the application were refused, otherwise the fallback would not outweigh Policy 11 of the FNP.

In the case at 92 Connaught Road, the applicant has submitted a Class AA Prior Approval application to set out the development which could be carried out, were this application not permitted.

A fallback does exist.

In comparing the fallback position and this application, the development would result in the same level of bedroom accommodation, and living space, albeit the application before Members, would result in more overall floorspace.

Relevance of the fallback position

The fallback position with respect to this application relates to Class AA, of the GPDO. This permits the applicant to extend the bungalow into a two-storey dwelling within 3 years of the date

of granting Prior Approval in accordance with the submitted plans. This differs from the fallback in one of the above-mentioned appeal decisions where the proposal only sought to utilise and extend the existing roofspace.

The approval granted under reference 24/00086/GPDBUH (the class AA application) would result in the conversion of the bungalow to a two-storey dwelling.

The key similarities and differences between the Class AA application and this application are as follows:

- both developments would result in a two-storey dwelling.
- The height of the resultant dwelling under Class AA would be 8 metres (as scaled from the plans). The height of the householder application is 7.65 metres in height.
- The two-storey front extension would come 1.6 metres forward of the forward most part of the existing property. The Class AA application would be on the same footprint.
- The Class AA application would result in 151 square metres of floorspace. This application would result in 189 square metres of floorspace.
- Number of bedrooms – 5 bedrooms on the fallback application. This application proposes 5 bedrooms. No requirements for car parking to be considered in the Class AA application. 3 allocated car parking spaces required, with 1 car parking space unallocated. Provision of four car parking spaces is shown on the site in this application.
- The extent / labelled roof requirements are the same, i.e. each application show very similar ground floor requirements.
- Class AA – matching materials required. Planning application – render with concrete tiles, with brick quoining and detailing around windows, grey windows.
- First floor side windows would be implemented in this application, none proposed under the Class AA application.

Therefore, the fallback position would result in a substantial sized dwellinghouse with accommodation at first floor level, resulting in the loss of a bungalow contrary to Policy 11 within the Fleet Neighbourhood Plan 2018 - 2032.

Notwithstanding this, Officers consider the fallback position can be given significant weight, as there is a real prospect of the fallback development being carried out if the current application is refused. The proposed development under this application would not, in Officer's view result in any greater harm to the character of the area, street scene or neighbours than the fallback position. It would also provide a similar level of accommodation to this application. In this case it is considered that, the Prior Approval (Class AA) application can be given significant such weight in the determination of this application that it would outweigh Policy 11 of the FNP17.

Design and character of the area

The Neighbourhood Plan states that the height of new buildings shall be in keeping with neighbouring properties and roofscapes shall be well articulated to avoid bulky, featureless appearance. Proposals shall respect neighbouring buildings and demonstrate how heights of development will not be over-bearing or dominant in the existing street scene.

Policy NBE9 of the Hart Local Plan 2032 also states that design should promote, reflects, and incorporates the distinctive qualities of its surroundings in terms of the proposed scale, density, mass and height of development and choice of building materials. This policy goes on to state that innovative building designs will be supported provided that they are sensitive to their surroundings and would help to improve the quality of the townscape or landscape.

The immediate area is characterised by a mixture of dwellings such as bungalows and two storey dwellings of varying scale and design. In visual and character respects, the proposal would integrate into the established character and appearance of the immediate surroundings and whilst the development would result in a visual change to the street scene, it would not amount to visual harm. The proposed scale of the dwelling and the stated materials are acceptable for the locality.

The proposal is therefore acceptable in design and appearance respects, and complies with Policy GEN1 of the HDP06, Policy NBE9 of the HLP32, Policy 10 of the Fleet Neighbourhood Plan and Section 12 of the NPPF 2023.

Biodiversity

Local Plan Policy NBE4 states that all developments should protect and enhance biodiversity. The Local Planning Authority has a duty under the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 to have full regard to the purpose of conserving biodiversity, which extends to being mindful of the legislation that considers protected species and their habitats and to the impact of the development upon sites designated for their ecological interest.

The property is a modern dwelling in a suburban location. Considering the building type, its location and the proposed works the property does not appear to meet the 'Trigger list for bat surveys', Therefore, a formal bat survey is not required in this instance. However, should permission be granted, and a bat subsequently found during construction then work should cease immediately, and Natural England be contacted. A license may then be required for the work to continue. An informative will be added to the decision notice to that effect.

The proposal is therefore acceptable in parking and highway safety respects and complies with Policy GEN1 of the HDP06, Policy NBE4 of the HLP32, Policy 10 of the Fleet Neighbourhood Plan and Section 15 of the NPPF 2023.

Climate Change

Hart has announced a climate change emergency and is committed to reducing carbon emissions. By virtue of the scale of the development, the proposal would not be anticipated to have a significant impact on Climate Change issues.

Residential Amenity

Policy GEN1 emphasises that sustainable development should be permitted provided that the proposal does not result in any material loss of amenity to adjoining neighbours, among other considerations.

Whilst the proposed development would inevitably result in a visual change and change in relationship, it is not considered to result in significant impacts by way of overbearing and overshadowing impacts. The increase in built form to the neighbouring property is not considered to result in significant detrimental harm to the occupiers through loss of light given the first-floor side window serves a non-habitable room, and the resultant property would not extend past the rear elevation of the neighbouring dwelling.

No overlooking or overbearing impacts to the property to the rear of the proposed site is anticipated, by virtue of the separation distances involved. Views from the first-floor openings on

the rear elevation would look straight down the application sites rear garden and there would be oblique views into the neighbouring properties rear gardens.

The proposal is therefore acceptable in amenity respects and complies with Policy GEN1 of the HDP06.

Parking

Local Plan Policies GEN1, INF3 and NBE9 state that all developments should provide appropriate parking provision in accordance with the Council's parking standards. The Council has recently adopted the Parking SPD which replaces the Technical Advice Note. This requires a 4/5 bedroomed property to have 3 allocated parking spaces and 1 unallocated parking space. The site plan for the dwelling identifies two sets of tandem parking. Whilst the marked-out areas on the plans do not accord with the space standards within the SPD, there would be sufficient space for an 11 metres by 2.5 metre expanse to be provided at the front and side of the dwelling and if necessary, permit parking is provided along the roadside.

The proposed garage is not of sufficient size to accommodate a vehicle and therefore is likely to be used for storage purposes. It is noted that Policy 15 of the Fleet Neighbourhood Plan seeks to retain at least 50% of original garden as soft landscaping, however hard surfaces fall under permitted development subject to them being constructed of porous materials. If recommended for permission, a suitably worded condition will be imposed to secure the parking arrangements and that they are of porous materials. Further, taking account of the fallback position, which has no requirement for car parking to be assessed, the extent of car parking should be considered against the fallback scheme, in this instance.

The proposal is not considered to give rise to any detrimental implications on highway safety and is compliant with HLP32 Policy INF3 and Saved Policy GEN1 of the HLP06 in this regard.

Other Matters

Equality Issues: The proposal raises no concerns in respect of equality issues.

Queries were raised to the Planning Agent through the application to establish the development would be an extension to the existing dwelling, rather than a replacement of the existing dwelling. Building Control were consulted on the application and have no objections that the development could be provided as an extension to the existing.

PLANNING BALANCE

The principle of a dwelling of this design and external form and parking has already been accepted under the previous application ref. 23/01311/HOU as not justifying refusal. Although the proposed development would conflict with the requirements of Policy 11 of the Fleet Neighbourhood Plan 2019, through the loss of a bungalow which could feasibly be renovated to be occupied by people of limited mobility including people with disabilities and older residents, there is a clear fallback position, under Class AA. This has been confirmed by the Prior Approval process and would result in the loss of a bungalow that is especially suitable for elderly or disabled persons. Given the issues pertaining to the design and residential amenity are accepted, and it has been proven there is a genuine fallback position, that is in Officer's views materially similar in scope and form to this application, and would reasonably be carried out; the fallback position can be given significant weight. It is recommended the Council could not reasonably resist this application for the construction of a first floor, roof and two storey front extension to 92 Connaught Road, on this

basis.

CONCLUSION

The application is recommended for approval subject to conditions.

RECOMMENDATION - Grant

CONDITIONS

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

Reason

To comply with Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

- 2 The development hereby permitted shall be carried in accordance with the following approved plans:

2023-Saunders-03 Rev A (Proposed elevations), 2023-Saunders-04 (Floor Joist Layout Roof Trusses Layout), 2023-Saunders-05 (Car Parking Layout External Accessibility Layout), 2023-Saunders-02 Rev B (Proposed Floor Plans), Site Boundary Measurements Rev A.

Reason:

To ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the approved details.

- 3 The dwelling shall not be occupied until space has been laid out in the site in accordance with drawing number 2023-Saunders-05 for four cars to be parked in the application site. The spaces shall be retained free from any impediment to its intended use for the life of the development.

Reason:

To ensure a satisfactory development, with appropriate on-site car parking facilities, in accordance with 'saved' policy GEN1 of the Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006. In the interests of highways safety in accordance with Policy INF3 of the Hart Local Plan Strategy and Sites 2032 and Policy 19 of the Fleet Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2032 (2019).

- 4 The additional parking area to be created shall be constructed from permeable/porous materials, to prevent additional surface water flooding. Installation of the parking area shall ensure that any loose surface material is prevented from migrating onto the public highway.

Reason:

In the interest of preventing surface water flooding in accordance with Policy NBE5 of the Hart Local Plan (Strategy & Sites) 2032 and Section 9 of the NPPF 2023 and Policy 15 of the Fleet Neighbourhood Plan.

- 5 The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development

hereby permitted shall be as described in the proposed elevation plans, unless otherwise agreed in writing by Hart District Council.

Reason: To ensure a satisfactory visual relationship of the new development with the existing building and surroundings; and in accordance with Policy GEN1 of the Hart District Local Plan (Replacement) 1996-2006 Saved Policies and Policy NBE9 of the Hart Local Plan (Strategy & Sites) 2032 and Policy 10 of the Fleet Neighbourhood Plan 2018-2032 (2019).

INFORMATIVES

- 1 The Council works positively and proactively on development proposals to deliver sustainable development in accordance with the NPPF. In this instance: The applicant was advised of the necessary information needed to process the application and, once received, the application was acceptable and no further engagement with the applicant was required.
- 2 You may require Building Regulations Consent and we advise that you should contact Building Control on 01252 398715.
- 3 The applicant is advised to make sure that the works hereby approved are carried out with due care and consideration to the amenities of adjacent properties and users of any nearby public highway or other rights of way. It is good practice to ensure that works audible at the boundary of the site are limited to be carried out between 8am and 6pm Monday to Friday, 8am and 12 noon on Saturdays with no working on Sunday and Bank Holidays. The storage of materials and parking of operatives vehicles should be normally arranged on site.
- 4 Hart District Council has declared a Climate Emergency. This recognises the need to take urgent action to reduce both the emissions of the Council's own activities as a service provider but also those of the wider district. The applicant is encouraged to explore all opportunities for implementing the development approved by this permission in a way that minimises impact on climate change.
- 5 The applicant is advised that under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017, bats are a protected species and it is illegal to intentionally or recklessly damage, disturb or destroy a bat or its habitat. If any evidence of bats is found on site, Natural England must be informed and a licence for development obtained from them prior to works continuing. For further information go to www.naturalengland.org.uk or contact Natural England (S.E. regional office) on 0238 028 6410.