



Committee: PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS REGULATORY COMMITTEE

Date: MONDAY, 9TH FEBRUARY 2009

Venue: LANCASTER TOWN HALL

Time: 10.30 A.M.

A G E N D A

- 1 Apologies for Absence
- 2 Minutes of the Meeting held on 12th January 2009 (previously circulated)
- 3 Items of Urgent Business authorised by the Chairman
- 4 Declarations of Interest

Planning Applications for Decision

Community Safety Implications

In preparing the reports for this Agenda, regard has been paid to the implications of the proposed developments on Community Safety issues. Where it is considered the proposed development has particular implications for Community Safety, this issue is fully considered within the main body of the report on that specific application.

Category A Applications

Applications to be dealt with by the District Council without formal consultation with the County Council.

- | | | | | |
|----------|------------------------|---|---------------------------------|----------------------|
| 5 | A5 08/01246/RCN | Millennium Heights, Lune Street,
Lancaster | Skerton
East Ward | (Pages 1 - 3) |
| | | Application to remove affordable housing condition from remaining flats for Mr S Kay | | |
| 6 | A6 08/01371/FUL | 87 Crag Bank Road, Carnforth | Bolton-le-Sands
Ward | (Pages 4 - 6) |
| | | Retrospective application for the retention of a ramp to provide disabled access to garden for Mr Paul O'Sullivan | | |

- | | | | | |
|----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| 7 | A7 08/01301/FUL | Borwick Fishery, Kellet Lane, Warton Warton | Warton Ward | (Pages 7 - 10) |
| | | Erection of two 10 metre high domestic scale wind turbines and plant room building for Borwick Development Solutions | | |
| 8 | A8 08/01404/CU | PLANNING APPLICATION WITHDRAWN | | |
| 9 | A9 09/00002/FUL | Grosvenor Road Garage, Heysham Road, Heysham | Heysham Central Ward | (Pages 11 - 14) |
| | | Redevelopment of Bay View Cars site for 9 flats for Bay View Cars | | |

Category D Application

Proposals for development by a District Council

- | | | | | |
|-----------|-------------------------|---|--------------------|------------------------|
| 10 | A10 08/01333/DPA | 40 Sycamore Grove, Lancaster | Castle Ward | (Pages 15 - 17) |
| | | Erection of extension to rear/side to provide disabled facilities comprising of bedroom and bathroom and the creation of off street parking to the front for Lancaster City Council | | |

11 Delegated Planning Decisions (Pages 18 - 23)

ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

(i) Membership

Councillors Roger Dennison (Chairman), Eileen Blamire (Vice-Chairman), Ken Brown, Abbott Bryning, Keith Budden, Anne Chapman, John Day, Sheila Denwood, Mike Greenall, Emily Heath, Helen Helme, Val Histed, Andrew Kay, Joyce Pritchard, Peter Robinson, Bob Roe, Sylvia Rogerson, Roger Sherlock, Catriona Stamp and Joyce Taylor

(ii) Substitute Membership

Councillors June Ashworth, Chris Coates, John Gilbert, Tony Johnson, Karen Leytham, Ian McCulloch, Geoff Marsland, Robert Redfern, Keith Sowden, Malcolm Thomas and Paul Woodruff

(iii) Queries regarding this Agenda

Please contact Jane Glenton, Democratic Services - telephone (01524) 582068 or email jglenton@lancaster.gov.uk.

(iv) Changes to Membership, substitutions or apologies

Please contact Members' Secretary, telephone 582170, or alternatively email memberservices@lancaster.gov.uk.

MARK CULLINAN,
CHIEF EXECUTIVE,
TOWN HALL,
DALTON SQUARE,
LANCASTER LA1 1PJ

Published Wednesday, 28th January 2009

DECISION DATE 18 December 2008	APPLICATION NO. 08/01246/RCN A5	PLANNING COMMITTEE: 9 February 2009
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED APPLICATION TO REMOVE AFFORDABLE HOUSING CONDITION FROM REMAINING FLATS		SITE ADDRESS MILLENNIUM HEIGHTS LUNE STREET LANCASTER LANCASHIRE LA1 2AT
APPLICANT: Mr S Kay Flat 1 14 Millenium Heights Lune Street Lancaster		AGENT:

REASON FOR DELAY

Awaiting assessment of current housing market conditions.

PARISH NOTIFICATION

N/A.

LAND USE ALLOCATION/DEPARTURE

There are no 'saved policies' relating to this site.

STATUTORY CONSULTATIONS

Strategic Housing

OTHER OBSERVATIONS RECEIVED

None

REPORT

This application relates to a development of residential flats for which planning permission was granted (04/00426/FUL) on 28th June 2004. The site was occupied by the former Red Cross Hotel and is situated in a prominent gateway location to the City alongside the A6.

At the time the planning application was considered there had been put in place a restraint on housing growth in Lancaster District resulting from the approval of the first Regional Planning Guidance for the North West. There was, at that time, sufficient provision in existing planning permissions for housing completions to meet the Lancashire Structure Plan targets which were surprisingly reduced in the

Regional Planning Guidance by the Secretary of State. In response the City Council produced Supplementary Planning Guidance which barred new permissions being granted apart from in exceptional circumstances which enhanced regeneration priorities in the District. The 'exceptions' policy to normal restraint was extremely successful over the subsequent five year period in steering the pent up demand for housing development to lower demand areas and unpopular regeneration sites. The formal period of restraint has now been lifted, though regeneration priorities still play a part in steering new housing to appropriate locations.

The planning permission granted for the Millennium Heights development was justified as an exception to the restraint policy on two grounds. The first was that it secured the redevelopment of a run down premises in a key gateway location and within a ward which suffered from significant economic and social deprivation. To help regenerate this area the scheme was designed to particularly encourage first time buyers from the upwardly mobile private housing market to relocate in this less popular location. The design of the building was contemporary and refreshing and would make a considerable aesthetic contribution to the appearance of this key gateway site into Lancaster.

In addition to the regeneration benefits the scheme was also intended to provide low cost housing for first time buyers in the form of market discounted housing restricted in accordance with the Supplementary planning guidance under the former Local Plan. That not only required a continuing reduction to the open market value on first and subsequent sales, but also restricted accessibility to those discounts to eligible persons as specified by the Council. This means people with restricted income levels and prevents speculators purchasing discount schemes. In the original permission the developers offered to provide all 22 flats at an affordable discount.

After prices were originally set at It became apparent that the developers were struggling to find sufficient 'eligible persons' to comply and that their original intention to provide 100% affordable housing was somewhat unrealistic. By a further application 05/00947/FUL they asked that the affordable housing restriction be removed from 50% of the units. Consent was granted on 17th October 2005 as it was accepted that (a) The primary reason for granting the exception to housing restraint was the physical regeneration of the site; and (b) the building was still providing a level of affordable housing beyond the normal 30% provision which was being negotiated on other schemes at that time.

An unfortunate side effect of the relaxation was a complaint to the Local Ombudsman by owners of the remaining affordable units that their homes were becoming unsellable because the remaining flats, now unrestricted and available on the open market, were competing to be sold at the same price as they had paid for their own discounted properties. The complainants found it difficult to accept that their own discounted homes had reduced in value to either because the original scheme was over valued in a competitive market, and by that time market values for flats were also beginning to reduce due to a level of over provision. The ombudsman did not find maladministration as a result of the Council's decision, but did comment that the existing property owners who had already purchased flats should have been consulted before the decision was made.

This application has now been made by the complainant on behalf of the remaining 11 owners to remove the affordable housing restriction from their properties. It has been submitted with letters from four mortgage lenders explaining that because of the restrictions on the re-sales of the properties they were not prepared to provide mortgages for them.

In current unprecedented market conditions issues relating to slow sales and reluctance of lenders to provide mortgages cannot be used as reasons alone to remove occupancy conditions. If there is a strong and reasonable reason for restrictions then they should stay in place. Even before the current credit crunch however, the use of restricted market discounts as a means of providing affordable housing in the District had been abandoned. Following the introduction of Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) 16 'The Phasing of New Residential Development' in the Summer of 2003, and certainly by 2005, the City Council had recognised that ever increasing house prices had meant that even properties with 20% market discount were beyond the reach of 'eligible' purchasers. Schemes for affordable housing were only being negotiated on the basis of social rent or equity share managed by Registered Social Landlords.

Current falls in market values should in theory bring properties with restricted market discounts back within the reach of 'eligible persons'. However one has to balance this against the near collapse of the traditional mortgage market and recognise that future lending trends seems to be showing a reluctance to lend against properties with restrained equity. New forms of affordable housing are already emerging as concepts and there is likely to a greater involvement by Housing Associations in equity share and first time buyer initiatives than ever before.

In this context it is considered that whilst there was a laudable objective in securing the original Section 106 Agreement securing affordable housing in this scheme, it was not the primary objective justifying the exception to the restraint policy. In addition that restraint on housing growth has now been eased and the evidence shows that discounted open market pricing is unlikely to continue to make a realistic contribution to assisting new first time buyers on the housing market after the credit crunch. In this Ward the maintenance of quality market housing and the prevention of properties becoming empty and unused should also a priority. In the event of repossessions (if any property owners found themselves in this unfortunate position) it is clear that it would be difficult to find new buyers or finance to support their purchase. This would not be in the public interest.

For this reason it is concluded that the affordable housing restrictions on the remaining properties should be removed.

HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS

This application has to be considered in relation to the provisions of the Human Rights Act, in particular Article 8 (privacy/family life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property). Having regard to the principles of proportionality, it has been concluded that there are no issues arising from the proposal which appear to override the responsibility of the City Council to regulate land use for the benefit of the community as a whole, in accordance with national law.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That **PERMISSION BE GRANTED** for the removal of the restrictions in the Principle and Variation Agreements under Section 106 and 106A of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 relating to Millennium Heights.

<p>DECISION DATE</p> <p>3 February 2009</p>	<p>APPLICATION NO.</p> <p>08/01371/FUL A6</p>	<p>PLANNING COMMITTEE:</p> <p>9 February 2008</p>
<p>DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED</p> <p>RETROSPECTIVE APPLICATION FOR THE RETENTION OF A RAMP TO PROVIDE DISABLED ACCESS TO GARDEN</p>		<p>SITE ADDRESS</p> <p>87 CRAG BANK ROAD CARNFORTH LANCASHIRE LA5 9JB</p>
<p>APPLICANT:</p> <p>Mr Paul O'Sullivan 11 Shakespeare Road Lancaster LA1 2JR</p>		<p>AGENT:</p> <p>Mr Robert Partington</p>

REASON FOR DELAY

Referral to Planning Committee.

PARISH NOTIFICATION

Carnforth Town Council - No objections, approve in principle.

LAND USE ALLOCATION/DEPARTURE

Lancaster District Local Plan - No specific proposals.

Lancaster Core Strategy - No specific proposals.

STATUTORY CONSULTATIONS

None.

OTHER OBSERVATIONS RECEIVED

Access Officer - This application meets the requirements of Lancaster District Local Plan Policy R21 and supports the continued occupancy and access to the amenities of the house by the resident.

Two letters have been received from neighbouring residential occupiers. Both letters do wish to raise objection to the principle of a ramped access to the garden area but raise concerns over the development of this ramped access; the main areas of concern relate to loss of privacy/intrusion and new flooding problems which until construction of the ramp and platform had not previously occurred.

REPORT

Site and its Surroundings

The application site is located to the northern end of Crag Bank Road close to its junction with The Drive, Carnforth. The property is one of a number of small two-storey stone-built cottages running along the southern side of Crag Bank Road. The cottage has a side open access to its western gable leading to a long narrow rear garden.

The property enjoys a rear flat-roof single-storey extension to form a kitchen, a detail replicated in many of the neighbouring dwellings including the adjoining one. The land immediately to the rear of the extension is maintained at the same level of the ground floor of the property, to create a small private patio area, again a detail replicated at the neighbouring properties. The remaining garden area drops down approximately 1.3m and falls gently to the south.

The rear boundaries adjacent to the higher level patio comprise 1.6/1.8m fencing to either side. The boundary at the lower level is a 1.0m high fence to both garden boundaries.

The Proposal

The development is a retrospective one for the construction of a stone ramp which provides disabled access to a level-raised flagged garden area to the southern end of the original garden, some 25 metres from the rear of the patio area. The ramp is 1.2m wide and approximately 800mm above ground level as it leaves the patio. Due to changes in the ground level the ramp is approximately 1.1m above ground level at its highest point, falling to 200mm above the new garden level when it joins the new level flagged area.

The development of the ramped garden access is part of an overall scheme to upgrade the house and adapt it for occupancy by a wheelchair-bound resident.

Planning History

The site has no related planning history.

Planning Policy

In considering the application saved Policy H19 and Supplementary Planning Guidance Note (SPG) 12 ('The Residential Design Guide') of the Lancaster District Local Plan needs to be considered. Policy H19 seeks to ensure that new residential development would not have an adverse effect upon the amenities of nearby residents. These aims are again reflected in the design guidance contained within SPG 12.

Comments

As indicated earlier in the report, the application is a retrospective one and as a consequence, this allows the development to be fully assessed. At present, the construction is not wholly completed as it would involve the mounting of edge restraints to prevent a wheelchair from running off the side of the ramp. However, it is sufficiently complete to assess its impact upon the amenity of neighbouring residents as required by saved Policy H19.

It is clear from the boundary treatments currently on site and the level of patio areas that a section of higher level garden area remains private immediately to the rear of the house at the application site and neighbouring dwellings. The residents of this length of housing currently choose to have low level boundaries between each property at their lower level which allows overlooking of these garden areas. The development of a raised ramp 1.0m above garden level allows overlooking not only of the lower garden area but also of the more private garden areas immediately to the rear of the houses by anyone utilising the ramped access. It is considered that this relationship is one which should not be encouraged in principle.

A general approach when assessing development which introduces overlooking issues would be whether new or enhanced boundary treatments, or other measures, could be developed which would mitigate the impact of the proposal. As indicated, the current boundaries are only 1m high alongside the lower level. This is obviously the choice of the current occupiers of the houses but increased privacy could be developed by the construction of a higher fence of 1.6/1.8m height. However, in this case a tall boundary treatment would need to be introduced (at least 2.5m in height from the lower garden level) to develop/maintain adequate levels of privacy. This scale of boundary would be unduly dominant and overbearing in relation to the neighbouring residential occupier.

The agents have responded to the concerns of the neighbouring residents/owners indicating that the historical layout of the gardens has always allowed overlooking of the rear patios. The design of the ramp has been laid out not only to satisfy the physical needs of the applicant but also to allow planting to be developed in the open, curved areas. It is anticipated that the planting will mature over time to aid screening of the neighbouring gardens but no details have been provided. The agent acknowledges that the ramp does enable overlooking but consider that it is only likely to occur when the applicant is being pushed back up the ramp towards the house.

The issue of recent flooding has also been raised by the neighbours. The agents have indicated that this area has always been low-lying and subject to occasional flooding. The agent further indicates that the design of the ramp incorporates cross drainage to enable surface water to move naturally across the site.

Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above, it is considered that despite the obvious needs of the applicant, the approach taken to develop disabled access into the garden area is unduly detrimental to the amenity and privacy of neighbouring residential occupiers. Reluctantly, as a consequence, a recommendation for refusal has been reached. It is considered that a more appropriate method which enables level change needs should be developed that will enable the applicant to have access to the garden area but without undue impact upon the neighbouring properties. Of course, the local planning authority will continue to liaise with all parties in an attempt to find an appropriate solution.

HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS

The applicant's right to use and develop their property has to be balanced against the rights of neighbouring residents, namely, their right to respect for their private lives and homes. As set out above, the impact of the proposed development on neighbouring properties is considered unacceptable and, therefore, it is considered necessary and proportionate to refuse this application.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That **PERMISSION BE REFUSED** for the following reasons: -

1. In the opinion of the local planning authority the access ramp, by reason of its design and height is unduly detrimental to the amenity and privacy of neighbouring residential occupiers. As such the development is considered to be contrary to saved Policy H19 and the aims and objectives contained within Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 12 (The Residential Design Guide) of the Lancaster District Local Plan.

DECISION DATE 14 January 2009	APPLICATION NO. 08/01301/FUL A7	PLANNING COMMITTEE: 9 February 2009
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED ERECTION OF TWO 10 METRE HIGH DOMESTIC SCALE WIND TURBINES AND PLANT ROOM BUILDING		SITE ADDRESS BORWICK FISHERY KELLET LANE WARTON LANCASHIRE
APPLICANT: Borwick Development Solutions C/O The Old Railway Yard Middleton Via Carnforth Lancashire LA6 2NE		AGENT: The Wright Design Partnership

REASON FOR DELAY

Decision deferred by Committee at January 2009 meeting.

PARISH NOTIFICATION

This site is in Warton Parish, but as it is close to the junction of three parishes. All three Parish Councils have been notified of the application.

Warton Parish Council - Object, because of the possible detrimental impact of the development on the flight patterns of birds and bats.

Borwick Parish Meeting - Object to the proposal, on the basis that the siting of the turbines takes no account of the visual impact of the development. Point out the contrast with the fishery on the other side of Kellet Lane which is very well hidden.

Over Kellet Parish Council - No observations received.

LAND USE ALLOCATION/DEPARTURE

Countryside area as defined by the Lancaster District Local Plan.

STATUTORY CONSULTATIONS

County Council Highways - No objections.

Lancashire County Council Ecology - share the concern of the North Lancashire bat group (see below) and support their suggestion that an assessment of the impact of the scheme should be provided, with a monitoring programme.

OTHER OBSERVATIONS RECEIVED

A resident of Bridge House, Borwick objects on the basis that the site boundary should be landscaped and planted, rather than used to site wind turbines.

A further seven letters and emails have been received objecting to the proposal on the following grounds:

- The turbines are too close to the road, and would be better sited near the M6 motorway
- Noise from the turbines will reduce the quality of life in the area
- The appearance of the turbines will be detrimental to the surrounding countryside
- There is no need to have two turbines.

North Lancashire Bat Group support the development of energy from sustainable sources but are concerned about the possible harmful effects of the turbines on bats and other wildlife. They would like to see an impact assessment carried out, or failing that a requirement that the developer should monitor the installation.

REPORT

The Site and its Surroundings

The site lies to the east of the M6 motorway, with an access off Kellet Lane which runs from Over Kellet to Tewitfield. The land has been worked for sand and gravel and the reclamation scheme has resulted in the creation of a group of lakes, which are now used for fishing.

Approval has already been granted for a shelter and a small café serving the fishery. The site owners wish to provide the site with its own energy source. Their proposal is to install two wind turbines which would recharge a battery based electricity supply. This would be housed in a small building of traditional design, with stone faced walls and a slated roof.

Update from Previous Planning Committee - 12 January 2009

This application was considered by Committee at its meeting on 12 January 2009. A decision was deferred, to allow more information to be obtained about the proposal.

Members indicated that they wished to have a response to the following questions:

- What are the intended electricity supply arrangements for the site?
- Whether solar panels have been considered as an alternative? And,
- How the landscaping along the site boundary would be affected by the development?

In respect of the first question, the applicants' architect advises that it is intended that the site should as far as possible be self sufficient in electricity. It will be necessary to have a mains supply to cover periods when insufficient wind is available but it is expected that much of the time the turbines will feed a surplus into the national grid.

With regards to the second question, the working drawings for the building under construction already show solar panels on the roof (it is anticipated that these will be available in time for the committee meeting).

In respect of the third question, so far as the landscaping scheme for the site boundary is concerned, details of this have already been agreed and it will not be affected by the wind turbines. As the submitted plans indicate, they will be sited behind it, not (as some of the objectors appear to believe) immediately adjoining Kellet Lane.

Original Material Considerations

The columns supporting the wind turbines would be 10m high and the turbines would have a wing diameter of 2.8 metres. It should be stressed that this is not a large scale development on the lines of Caton Moor Wind Farm. The two masts would be comparable in height to a pair of main road lighting columns so the impact on the surrounding landscape would be relatively small. According to the information on the manufacturer's web site this type of equipment has been installed and operated successfully in remote locations as far apart as Greece, Australia and Columbia.

The proposal has to be assessed in relation to Policy SC1 of the Core Strategy which states that in order to ensure that development proposals are as sustainable as possible; the Council will require new development to use energy efficient design and orientation, energy efficiency and renewable energy technologies. The site is within an area identified as Countryside so policy E4 of the Lancaster District Local Plan is also relevant. This requires that new development should be in scale and keeping with the character and natural beauty of the landscape, appropriate to its surroundings, should not result in a significant adverse effect on nature conservation interests.

The site is within the parish of Warton but because of its location on the east side of the M6 motorway it is more immediate interest to residents of Borwick. Borwick Parish Meeting object to the proposal, and a site meeting with the case officer took place on 6 January. At this a number of concerns were expressed by local people, particularly in relation to the impact of the turbines on the landscape, and their proximity to the road.

The concerns of the North Lancashire Bat Group will be noted. However for a small scale scheme of this kind, requiring the developer to employ an outside consultant either to prepare an environmental statement or to monitor the installation for bat and bird strikes would be an onerous requirement, disproportionate to the size of the scheme. The comments of the County Council's ecology service suggest that the number of bats on the site will increase as the landscaping on the site boundary matures. It can be argued from this that in effect the developers would be penalised for providing a habitat favourable to bats.

Central government advice as set out in PPS9 (Biodiversity) has to be balanced against the objectives of PPS22 (Renewable Energy). Paragraph 18 is particularly relevant:

"Local planning authorities and developers should consider the opportunity for incorporating renewable energy projects in all new developments. Small scale renewable energy schemes utilising technologies such as solar panels, biomass heating, small scale wind turbines, photovoltaic cells and combined heat and power schemes can be incorporated both into new developments and some existing buildings. local planning authorities should specifically encourage schemes through positively expressed policies in local development documents."

This is followed by paragraph 20:

"Of all renewable technologies, wind turbines are likely to have the greatest visual and landscape effects. However, in assessing planning applications, local authorities should recognise that the impact of turbines on the landscape will vary according to the size and number of turbines and the type of landscape involved, and these impacts may be temporary if conditions are attached to planning permissions which require the future decommissioning of turbines."

Imposing a monitoring condition on the lines suggested by the Bat Group would be quite onerous, in that it would necessitate the use of somebody with a certain amount of specialist knowledge. This could be a significant disincentive to the use of innovative technology. Consequently it is not considered appropriate or reasonable to ask the site owners to run a monitoring programme.

Conclusion

It is anticipated that the information received has answered the questions posed by Committee Members. Amended plans showing the position of solar panels should be available for display prior to the February meeting. Overall, the local planning authority maintains the view that the proposal is to be welcomed as a useful micro generation initiative.

HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS

This application has to be considered in relation to two sections of the Human Rights Act: Article 8 (privacy/family life), and Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property). There are no issues arising from the proposal which appear to override the responsibility of the City Council to regulate land use for the benefit of the community as a whole, in accordance with national law.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That **PERMISSION BE GRANTED** subject to conditions as follows:

1. Standard three year condition.
2. Development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
3. If no longer being required for the purposes of electricity generation, turbines to be removed within three months and the land reinstated to the satisfaction of the local planning authority.

DECISION DATE 27 February 2009	APPLICATION NO. 09/00002/FUL A09	PLANNING COMMITTEE: 9 February 2009
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED REDEVELOPMENT OF BAY VIEW CARS SITE FOR 9 FLATS		SITE ADDRESS GROSVENOR ROAD GARAGE HEYSHAM ROAD HEYSHAM LANCASHIRE
APPLICANT: Bay View Cars Grosvenor Road Morecambe Lancashire LA3 1DS		AGENT: JMP Architects Ltd

REASON FOR DELAY

None.

PARISH NOTIFICATION

Heysham Neighbourhood Council - Views not received at the time of compiling this report. Any views will be verbally reported to Members.

LAND USE ALLOCATION/DEPARTURE

Within the Urban Area defined in the Lancaster District Local Plan - no specific proposals affecting the site.

STATUTORY CONSULTATIONS

County Highways – The proposal raises some concerns over the level of off-street parking provision associated with the proposal (100% parking proposed). The neighbouring West One development provided for 116%. The development will lead to additional on-street parking in the area. This is however mitigated by the closure of the garage business and the problematical on-street parking associated with the use.

The boundary wall to Heysham Road and part of Grosvenor Road acts as a retaining wall to the highway. The reconstruction of this wall will require the approval of the County Bridges Section prior to any works being commenced. The resulting wall shall be kept below 1.0m in height on the Grosvenor Road frontage to ensure visibility is maintained.

Environmental Health Officer - Views not received at the time of compiling this report. Any views will be verbally reported to Members.

Housing Policy Officer - Views not received at the time of compiling this report. Any views will be verbally reported to Members.

United Utilities - Views not received at the time of compiling this report. Any views will be verbally reported to Members.

OTHER OBSERVATIONS RECEIVED

To date a single letter has been received from a near neighbour on Heysham Road. The letter expresses concerns over the development of the site from a loss of view, limited parking in the area and questions the need for this form of development given the lack of sales in the adjacent West One development. Suggest smaller scale housing would be more appropriate and in keeping with the area.

REPORT

Site and its Surroundings

The application site is located at the junction of Heysham Road with Grosvenor Road. The adjoining land uses are all residential with a mixture of two-storey and two/three-storey terraced properties in addition to a small number of two-storey semi-detached properties. The closest properties are those of Rydal Road and Rydal Grove, which are two-storey stone built terraced houses. The roofs to the Rydal Grove dwelling closest to the site area have full width dormer windows facing the site and are effectively three storey in terms of accommodation. A car parking area serving a recently completed six-storey block of flats lies immediately to the west of the application site.

The site currently comprises a large single-storey commercial car showroom (currently operating as Bay View Garages) with an open forecourt/parking area to the north. The floor level of the building is set below that of the adjoining Heysham Road and Rydal Grove. The rear wall of the showroom forms the rear boundary to properties on Rydal Road. The wall height is approximately 2.2m above the garden levels with the roof of the car showroom rising away from these residential properties another 3.5/4.0m.

The Proposal

The application seeks to develop a single building comprising of nine units of accommodation. Internally, the development provides for 2 one-bedded flats, 5 two-bedded flats, 1 two-bedded maisonette and 1 three-bedded maisonette. The accommodation is contained within a building rising three and a half storeys in height with additional roof space accommodation for the maisonettes. The lower level beneath the residential units allows for car parking to a semi-basement level.

Externally, the site utilises the existing vehicle access leading down to the basement parking area, which will provide parking for nine cars and some secure cycle storage. Gardens areas are to be developed to the corners of the site for the sole use of the ground floor flats. In addition an area is to be provided at street level for additional cycle and refuse storage. The main pedestrian entrance to the building is also to be found on the Heysham Road frontage of the development.

The building as a whole rises 12.5m from Heysham Road to its ridge (14m from the lower ground level within the site). The external walls of the building are a mixture of a natural stone plinth (up to 2.0m high), two and a half storeys of white render, with timber cladding to the eaves and verge. The roof introduces simple gable forms with natural slate coverings. Windows, doors and rainwater goods are to be grey powder-coated aluminium.

The footprint of the building is broadly 'T' shaped with the longest frontage facing Heysham Road. A large open glazed stair well rising the full height of the building develops the main entrance facing Heysham Road.

Planning History

The site has been the subject of an earlier application (Ref: 05/00150/OUT) in early 2005. This application sought consent for the development of 3 houses and 7 flats on the same site. The houses were to be over three storeys and located to the south end of the site fronting Heysham Road and the flats over four storeys at the northern end of the site at the junction of Heysham Road with Grosvenor

Road. Although the application was submitted in outline, the application provided illustrative plans to consider location and massing. The application was subsequently refused on three grounds, namely; (i) oversupply of housing (SPG 16), (ii) impact upon neighbouring dwellings; and (iii) lack of parking provision.

The houses were to be built tight to the southern boundary of the site and fronting Heysham Road with gardens to the rear. The overall height of these buildings was approximately 9.5m above Heysham Road. The relationship to the properties on Rydal Road was considered unacceptable because they had rear-facing windows and a distance of only 7m to the large gable of the house. At the time it was acknowledged that the current car showroom has an impact upon the houses, but this is only from a wall approximately 2.2m high and from a further steel clad roof rising away from the houses.

The application was the subject of appeal and was dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate. The issues of housing supply and neighbour impact were acknowledged and accepted by the Planning Inspectorate, but parking provision was considered acceptable given the presence of on street parking on the adjacent Grosvenor Road.

Planning Policy

The application should be considered in respect of the saved policies of the Lancaster District Local Plan and the Lancaster Core Strategy.

Saved Policies **H12** and **H19** of the Lancaster District Local Plan are considered appropriate and seeks to ensure that development of small sites within the main urban core are only permitted where they do not result in the loss of green space, would not have significant adverse effects upon the amenities of nearby residents, achieve a high standard of design, are satisfactorily serviced and makes arrangements for access, servicing and cycle/car parking.

Following publication of the revised Regional Spatial Strategy, Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) 16 - The Phasing of New Residential Development - of the Lancaster District Local Plan is no longer relevant.

Policies **SC1** - Sustainable Development, **SC2** - Urban Concentration and **SC5** - Standards for Housing of the Lancaster Core Strategy are considered appropriate and also need to be considered as part of the application submission. These are best summarised as follows:

SC1 - Seeks to ensure that new development proposals are as sustainable as possible. The policy needs to consider both the location and design of the development. In respect of location, the proposal should be convenient for local services, use previously developed land, alleviate adverse environmental conditions, not have significant impact on conservation, archaeology or built heritage and be compatible with the surrounding landscape. In respect of design, the layout should be convenient to walk or cycle around, reuse buildings, use local material and minimise construction waste, clean up environmental problems use energy efficient design and renewables and sustainable drainage.

SC2 - Seeks to build healthy and sustainable communities by focusing development where it will support the vitality of existing settlement, regenerate area and reduce the need to travel. As such the policy seeks to direct 90% of all new dwelling within the existing urban area of Morecambe, Heysham, Lancaster and Carnforth.

SC5 - seeks to ensure that development proposal achieve a high standard of design, maintaining and improving the quality of development in the main urban area in addition to other sensitive areas.

Comments

It is considered that the location of the development for residential use is one which could be supported in principle as it is located within the main urban area in a sustainable location, well served by public transport and is close to other services such as shops, schools etc. Whilst the broad principle is acceptable, it is however the case that the matters of detail are unacceptable.

The application as submitted does not fully justify and set out the benefits that are to be brought to the community by this form of residential development. It is understood that the agent is to provide a Statement of Community Benefit in time for the planning committee for consideration but the proposal can be seen to help to regenerate the area, remove a non-compliant employment use and develop a well designed building within the locality. In addition to these suggested benefits the scheme does not address the issues of energy conservation/efficiencies or energy generation. The agent is again to address these issues and provide a detailed sustainability analysis (including energy conservation/generation) in time for the committee meeting.

The general design of the building is considered to be appropriate to the area, the simple gable forms and proposed materials reflect those of the neighbouring properties, although the building clearly has a contemporary element with the introduction of large scale window openings and to the communal areas and some of the living rooms.

However, one of the critical issues during the last application and appeal, and during this application, is the impact of the development upon neighbouring residential amenity. The original submission in 2005 sought to develop a three-storey building close to the houses of Rydal Road and Rydal Grove. This relationship was considered unacceptable by both the local planning authority and the Planning Inspectorate. The new scheme has attempted to address some of the concerns of the previous scheme by setting the building further away from Rydal Grove. The distance has increased from 7m to between 12m and 16m from the rear of the properties. However, the building is to be approx 3m higher, much deeper and it is also proposed to introduce windows to the lounge and both bedrooms of the flats facing Rydal Road. It is considered that the scheme has not adequately dealt with the concerns identified as part of the earlier appeal and as submitted the relationship of the new building to the dwellings on Rydal Road is overbearing and will introduce an unacceptable degree of overlooking.

In addition, the new proposal now seeks to develop a three storey high structure rather than developing rear gardens to the site close to properties on Rydal Grove as per the early scheme. This end of the building is blank but is very close to existing dwellings (less than 4.0m at its closest) and is considered unacceptable regardless of the presence of a 2.2m high wall and sloping roof to the original car showroom.

Overall, it is considered that the agent will provide sufficient information and minor revisions to the scheme to adequately demonstrate that proposal has benefits to the wider community and can create sustainable lifetime homes.

However, it is considered that the scale of the building, its footprint and massing and window orientation will combine to create an unduly detrimental impact upon the amenities of neighbouring residents. As such the development is considered to be contrary to saved Policy H19 of the Lancaster District Local Plan and Policies SC1 and SC5 of the Lancaster Core Strategy.

It is recommended that permission should be refused

HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS

The applicant's right to use and develop their property has to be balanced against the rights of neighbouring residents, namely, their right to respect for their private lives and homes. As set out above, the impact of the proposed development on neighbouring properties is considered unacceptable and, therefore, it is considered necessary and proportionate to refuse this application.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That **PERMISSION BE REFUSED** for the following reasons: -

1. Contrary to saved Policy H19 and SC1 and SC5 - adverse effect on the amenities of the adjoining houses be reason of massing and loss of privacy.

DECISION DATE 2 March 2009	APPLICATION NO. 08/01333/DPA A10	PLANNING COMMITTEE: 9 February 2009
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED ERECTION OF EXTENSION TO REAR/SIDE TO PROVIDE DISABLED FACILITIES COMPRISING OF BEDROOM AND BATHROOM AND THE CREATION OF OFF STREET PARKING TO THE FRONT		SITE ADDRESS 40 SYCAMORE GROVE LANCASTER LANCASHIRE LA1 5RS
APPLICANT: Lancaster City Council Town Hall Dalton Square Lancaster LA1 1PJ		AGENT: Lancaster City Council

REASON FOR DELAY

None.

PARISH NOTIFICATION

None.

LAND USE ALLOCATION/DEPARTURE

The property is unallocated with in the Lancaster District Local Plan 1996 - 2006

STATUTORY CONSULTATIONS**Access Officer**- No comments received at time of writing the report, comments will be reported verbally.**Lancashire County Highways** - No objections.**Tree Protection Officer** – Has expressed the importance of the group of 4 mature trees located within the grass verge fronting the application site. It has been recommended that to prevent any detrimental harm or any risk of damage as a result from the proposed development, specific conditions related to the protection of these trees are recommended.**OTHER OBSERVATIONS RECEIVED**

None.

REPORT

The application has been brought before Committee Members as the subject property is in City Council ownership.

The Site and its Surroundings

The property which forms the subject of this application is a two storey semi detached dwelling made up of pebble dash rendered brick under a pitched concrete tiled roof. The application site is located to the west of Lancaster City Centre on the eastern side of Sycamore Grove within the Marsh Estate.

Relevant Planning Policy

Lancaster District Local Plan (Saved Policy) **R21** – Requires development to provide suitable access provision for people with disabilities;

Core Strategy - Policy **SC5** – General requirement to maintain and improve the quality of development in the district.

Assessment

The proposed single storey extension to the side/rear of the property is required to incorporate disable access and much needed facilities for day to day use. The proposal also includes off street parking to the front to provide improved access to the dwelling house.

The boundary treatment to the property consists of approximately a 1-metre high picket fence to the north, east and southern boundaries. This was not seen to be suitably sufficient on the northern boundary, so to resolve the issue of potential detrimental impact caused in terms of overlooking and loss of privacy to the nearby neighbouring properties, amended plans have been received showing a 1.8 metre high close-boarded timber fence to be installed along the full length of this boundary prior to any development taking place.

The proposed extension is to be 3.2 metres high at the ridge line and 6.2 metres in length, contained under a lean-to roof to the side and pitched at the rear. The design and materials are seen to be acceptable and in keeping with the existing dwelling and the surrounding residential properties.

To provide off street parking the applicant will need to extend the hardstanding towards the highway which already benefits from a dropped kerb to accommodate this access. However, within close proximity on the grass verge are 4 mature trees which will need to be protected during the construction of the development, and this will be provided and agreed by means of a Method Statement and a Tree Protection Plan as required by imposition of a planning condition.

Conclusion

Members are advised that the development can be supported as the amended plans indicate that the proposal will not adversely affect residential amenity, nor will it cause any other detrimental impacts on the nearby neighbouring properties.

HUMAN RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS

This application has to be considered in relation to the provisions of the Human Rights Act, in particular Article 8 (privacy/family life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property). Having regard to the principles of proportionality, it has been concluded that there are no issues arising from the proposal which appear to override the responsibility of the City Council to regulate land use for the benefit of the community as a whole, in accordance with national law.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That **PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED** subject to the following conditions;

1. Standard planning building time limit
2. Development as per approved plans
3. Amended plan condition (20th January 2009)
4. Close boarded timber fence to be installed prior to development, at dimensions stipulated on the amended plans.
5. No commencement until submission and agreement of a detailed Method Statement and a Tree Protection Plan for all works within 7m of all on and off site trees

LANCASTER CITY COUNCIL

APPLICATION NO	DETAILS	DECISION
07/01679/FUL	3 Berwyn Avenue, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of a first floor extension for Mr D Bulman (Bare Ward)	Application Refused
08/00994/FUL	Straights Head, Aughton Road, Gressingham Erection of a replacement dwelling for Mr And Mrs Longton (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01012/LB	Thurnham Hall, Lancaster Road, Thurnham Listed building application for re-roofing including installation of replacement rooflights and the insertion of a roof access hatch, and other works including stone repairs and repointing for Diamond Resorts (Ellel Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01078/AD	Heversham House Farm, Starbank, Ellel Erection of a Dutch barn for Mr J Gardner (Ellel Ward)	Prior Approval Not Required (AD/PA)
08/01105/FUL	Halton Green House, Green Lane, Halton Erection of single storey side extension to form sun lounge and double garage with roof terrace above and Juliet balcony to south west elevation for Mr Alan Sellers (Halton With Aughton Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01125/FUL	Lancaster Royal Grammar School, East Road, Lancaster Retrospective application for the retention of 2 covered cycle stands at Lee House for The Governors, Lancaster Royal Grammar School (Bulk Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01148/CU	19 Marine Road West, Morecambe, Lancashire Change of use of property to a cafe/coffee shop (class A3) for Mr David Crompton (Heysham North Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01182/FUL	304 Oxcliffe Road, Heaton With Oxcliffe, Morecambe Erection of a detached garage with office over situated to the rear right side of garden for Mr T Hill (Westgate Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01194/FUL	Hope Cottage, Long Lane, Tatham Erection of a garden store, carport and veranda for Mr And Mrs Sutton (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01203/ADV	14 - 16 Cheapside, Lancaster, Lancashire Retrospective application for the retention of a non-illuminated fascia sign and an illuminated projecting sign with overhead trough lights for Specsavers (Dukes Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01209/FUL	Volker Stevin Ltd, Whitegate, Morecambe Construction of a new steel portal framed building between the existing workshop and storage building and new office and ancillary accommodation within the current workshop for Mr Andy Barker (Westgate Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

08/01221/CU	Deys Farm, Quernmore Road, Quernmore Change of use from redundant barn to two live-work units for Mr D Coward (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Application Refused
08/01224/FUL	Victoria Institute, Brookhouse Road, Caton Erection of a rear extension and installation of solar panels for Victoria Institute (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01231/CU	Higher Broadwood Farm, Cragg Road, Wray Proposed barn conversion to be used as residential extension to existing farmhouse and conversion of adjacent agricultural unit to workshop including roof lift and erection of an extension for D. Condor And Son (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01243/CU	8 Cavendish Road, Heysham, Morecambe Retrospective application for the retention of use of the ground floor shop as residential accommodation and application for external alterations for Mr B O'Farrell (Heysham North Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01250/ADV	Unit 1B, 1 Lancaster Gate, Lancaster Erection of conservation style projecting sign with exterior slimline trough lighting for Orange (Dukes Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01255/FUL	John Wilding Approved Cars, Northgate, Morecambe Siting of a temporary office for Mr J. Wilding (Westgate Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01258/FUL	36 Victoria Parade, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of a two storey rear extension and single storey side extension for Mr Stephen Rawse (Poulton Ward)	Application Refused
08/01259/CU	2 Victoria Terrace, Glasson Dock, Lancaster Change of use from retail (A1) with living accommodation above to dwellinghouse (C3) for Mr James Eastham (Ellel Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01274/FUL	2 Wilson Grove, Heysham, Morecambe Erection of a two storey extension for Mr And Mrs Smith (Heysham South Ward)	Application Refused
08/01276/FUL	3 Brantwood Drive, Lancaster, Lancashire Amendments to previously approved application no. 07/01716/FUL for Mr And Mrs Ratcliffe (Scotforth East Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01281/FUL	Thorneycroft, Kirkby Lonsdale Road, Arkholme Alterations to raise the level part of existing roof, single storey extension to front and alterations to fenestration for Mr Waddington (Kellet Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01282/FUL	North Barn, 8 Slyne Hall Heights, Slyne Erection of a single storey extension to accommodate new swimming pool for Mr I Rawlins (Slyne With Hest Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

08/01286/FUL	Walter Lyon House (formerly Highfield House), Quernmore Road, Lancaster Erection of a single storey rear extension (Phase 1) and a first floor rear extension including external staircase (Phase 2) for Inward House Projects (John O'Gaunt Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01295/FUL	Morecambe Delivery Office, Market Street, Morecambe Repositioning of staff entrance and installation of a larger public callers hatch and shutter for Royal Mail PLC (Poulton Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01296/RENU	Green Hill, Borwick Lane, Borwick Renewal of application no. 03/01035/CU to extend the time for commencement of development by a further 3 years for Mr And Mrs D Greenwood (Kellet Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01293/FUL	5 Manor Court, Brookhouse, Lancaster Erection of a lean-to extension to create new snug/living space for Mr Kevin Murphy (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Application Withdrawn
08/01294/LB	5 Manor Court, Brookhouse, Lancaster Listed Building application for the erection of a lean-to extension to create new snug/living space for Mr Kevin Murphy (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Application Withdrawn
08/01297/FUL	Railway Cottage, Corricks Lane, Conder Green Amendments to application No. 08/00542/CU for change of use of domestic garage to tea room for Mr David Sharratt (Ellel Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01302/CU	2 Stevant Way, Morecambe, Lancashire Change of use of land for siting of a mobile catering trailer for Mr P West (Westgate Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01304/FUL	Coulterthwaite, Coulter Beck Lane, Leck Erection of raised decking to the rear for Mr And Mrs Kelly (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01313/LB	3 Silverdale Road, Yealand Redmayne, Carnforth Listed building application for the erection of a two storey extension to the rear for Mr A Burn (Silverdale Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01314/FUL	One Tree Hill, Aldcliffe Hall Drive, Lancaster Erection of a two storey gable and a single storey extension to rear for Hans Gellerson (Castle Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01319/FUL	6 Townley Street, Morecambe, Lancashire Demolition of 2 storey rear annex and erection of a kitchen extension for Mr Malcolm Hamer (Poulton Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01320/CON	6 Townley Street, Morecambe, Lancashire Conservation area consent to demolish two storey rear annex for Mr Malcolm Hamer (Poulton Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01322/FUL	Hall Bank, Cantsfield Road, Cantsfield Erection of two storey extension to the north side elevation, two storey extension to the east and west elevations and erection of a replacement garage with attached shed and greenhouse for Mr Simon and Victoria Reed (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Application Withdrawn

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

08/01323/FUL	7 Slyne Hall Heights, Slyne, Lancaster Installation of velux windows to front and rear for Mr & Mrs Ruscoe (Slyne With Hest Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01327/CU	Castle View Caravan Park, Hobsons Lane, Capernwray Change of use from 19 touring caravan pitches to 17 static caravans for John McCarthy (Kellet Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01328/LB	Higher Moor Head Farmhouse, Rakehouse Brow, Quernmore Listed building application for render and tanking coat to western gable for Mr Jonathan Backhouse (Ellel Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01329/FUL	11 Lowther Avenue, Morecambe, Lancashire Demolition of existing garage and erection of two storey extension to side for Mrs D Baker (Torrisholme Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01330/FUL	8 Westbourne Place, Lancaster, LA1 5DY Erection of a single storey extension to side/rear for Mr Jack Emmott (Castle Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01331/FUL	40 Gressingham Drive, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a two storey side extension for Mr I Wright (Scotforth East Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01332/FUL	10 Crag Bank Road, Carnforth, Lancashire Construction of dormer to both sides of roof for Mr And Mrs A Lane (Bolton Le Sands Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01337/VCN	Axa Direct, Northgate, Morecambe Variation of condition 1 of planning permission 06/00772/FUL to allow an extension of the time limit for Axa Insurance UK PLC (Westgate Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01338/FUL	Old Crow Trees, Lodge Lane, Melling Demolition of existing flat roofed structures and erection of single storey extension to rear for Mr And Mrs Hodgson (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01339/LB	Old Crow Trees, Lodge Lane, Melling Listed Building application for demolition of existing flat roofed structures and erection of single storey extension to rear to include internal alterations and replacement windows for Mr And Mrs Hodgson (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01340/FUL	Spar Supermarket, Willow Lane, Lancaster Relocation of compressor units and erection of metal enclosure for James Hall And Co (Properties) (Castle Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01334/ADV	15-17 Penny Street, Lancaster, LA1 1UA Erection of 3no. fascia signs and 1no. hanging sign for Vision Express Ltd (Dukes Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01342/OUT	4A Byron Avenue, Bolton Le Sands, Lancashire Outline application for the erection of a detached two storey dwelling with associated parking for Mr John Lamoury (Bolton Le Sands Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

08/01343/FUL	Leighton Moss, Storrs Lane, Silverdale Erection of extension to provide new boiler house and underground storage bunker for RSPB Fairburn Ings (Silverdale Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01348/LB	Woodbine Cottage, Upphall Lane, Priest Hutton Listed building application for demolition of porch, erection of replacement single storey garden room and internal alterations for Mr And Mrs Horsfield (Kellet Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01349/FUL	Woodbine Cottage, Upphall Lane, Priest Hutton Demolition of existing rear porch and erection of single storey garden room for Mrs And Mrs Horsfield (Kellet Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01353/ELDC	44 Ullswater Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Lawful development certificate for en-suite bathroom extension to the first floor for Mr Ahmed Patel (Bulk Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
08/01359/FUL	39 Dunkeld Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a two storey extension to the rear for Mr J Moss (John O'Gaunt Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01360/FUL	Brantholme, Hasty Brow Road, Slyne Erection of a replacement garage for Mr P Rogerson (Slyne With Hest Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01364/FUL	The Smithy, Lodge Lane, Wennington Permanent permission to use building for complementary therapies with existing uses as office and domestic storage (temporary permission app. No. 05/01262/FUL) for Mrs Sarah Rycroft (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01361/FUL	Sellerley Farm, Conder Green Road, Galgate Erection of a free range chicken building for Mr E Newsham (Ellel Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01363/FUL	50 Tranmere Crescent, Heysham, Morecambe Erection of two storey extension to rear for Mr J Miller (Heysham Central Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01369/FUL	28 Stankelt Road, Silverdale, Carnforth Proposed construction of a detached two car garage and store with a paved terrace over. for Mr Paul Holgate (Silverdale Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01372/LB	24 - 26 Main Street, Heysham, Morecambe Listed building consent for use of part of adjoining dwelling to form extension to Visitor Centre for Heritage Trust For The North West (Heysham South Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01373/CU	24 - 26 Main Street, Heysham, Morecambe Change of use of part of adjoining dwelling to form extension to existing Visitor Centre for Heritage Trust For The North West (Heysham South Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01374/FUL	35A Princes Crescent, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of second storey extension to rear for Mr Gareth Evans (Bare Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

08/01376/RENT	Pre School Centre, University Of Cumbria, Bowerham Road Renewal of temporary planning permission no. 06/00179/FUL for the siting of pre-school unit for Mr N Harris (John O'Gaunt Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01377/FUL	Woodgate Park, Newgate, Morecambe Erection of an industrial unit (Unit 9) for Promotional Printing Machinery (Westgate Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01397/FUL	37 Princes Crescent, Morecambe, Lancashire Retrospective application for a detached timber framed office and timber palisade boundary fence to rear for G F Property Sales (Bare Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01383/FUL	2 Reedmace Walk, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of a conservatory and storage shed for Mr D. Shackleton (Westgate Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01396/FUL	10 Main Road, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Erection of a side extension to detached garage for Mr C Malin (Bolton Le Sands Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01400/FUL	20 - 22 Victoria Street, Morecambe, Lancashire Change of use from residential (Class C3) to office use (Class A2) and minor alterations to rear elevations for Mr Neil Anderton (Poulton Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01402/AD	Lower Highfield Farm, Aughton, Halton-with-Aughton Erection of an agricultural storage building for Mr J M Sanderson (Halton With Aughton Ward)	Prior Approval Granted
08/01405/FUL	15 Ellwood Court, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of a conservatory to the side for Rev R Gill (Westgate Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01409/CU	166 Lancaster Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Change of use of ground floor from residential flat (class C3) to extension of laundrette (Sui generis) for Mr D Wilcock (Poulton Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01418/FUL	8 Broadlands Drive, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Erection of two storey extension to side and conservatory to rear for Mr P. Bracewell (Slyne With Hest Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01441/PLDC	4 The Cliffs, Heysham, Morecambe Certificate of Lawfulness for conversion of garage to granny flat with connecting conservatory for Mr J Keogh (Heysham Central Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00009/AD	East View, Old Moor Road, Wennington Agricultural Determination for the erection of a storage building for Mr And Mrs Woods (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Prior Approval Not Required (AD/PA)