

**PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS
REGULATORY COMMITTEE**

10.30 A.M.

29TH JUNE 2009

PRESENT: Councillors Keith Budden (Chairman), Joyce Pritchard (Vice-Chairman), Eileen Blamire, Anne Chapman, Susie Charles (substitute for Sylvia Rogerson), Chris Coates, Sheila Denwood, John Gilbert (substitute for John Day), Mike Greenall, Emily Heath (for Minute Nos. 21 to 28 only), Helen Helme, Val Histed, Tony Johnson (substitute for Ken Brown), Geoff Marsland (substitute for Roger Dennison) (for Minute Nos. 21 to 33 (part) only), Robert Redfern, Peter Robinson (for Minute Nos. 21 to 28 only), Bob Roe, Roger Sherlock, Joyce Taylor (for Minute Nos. 21 to 31 only), and Morgwn Trolinger (substitute for Andrew Kay).

Apologies for Absence:

Councillors Ken Brown, John Day, Andrew Kay and Sylvia Rogerson.

Officers in Attendance:

| | |
|-----------------|---|
| Andrew Dobson | Head of Planning Services (for Minute Nos. 21 to 28 only) |
| David Hall | Development Control Manager |
| Andrew Drummond | Senior Planning Officer |
| Martin Culbert | Senior Planning Officer (for Minute Nos. 21 to 27 only) |
| Luke Gorst | Assistant Solicitor |
| Jane Glenton | Democratic Support Officer |

21 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 8th June 2009 were signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

22 SITE VISITS

Site Visits were held in respect of the following applications:

| | | | |
|----|--------------|--|-------------|
| A5 | 09/00158/FUL | Elms Hotel, Elms Road, Morecambe | BARE WARD |
| A6 | 09/00322/FUL | Vacant Workshops, Sand Lane, Warton | WARTON WARD |
| A7 | 09/00247/FUL | The Lilacs, Nether Kellet Road, Over Kellet | KELLET WARD |

The following Members were present at the site visits, which took place on Monday, | 22nd June 2009:

Councillors Keith Budden (Chairman), Joyce Pritchard (Vice-Chairman), Eileen Blamire, Sheila Denwood, John Day, Mike Greenall, Val Histed, Geoff Marsland, Peter Robinson and Bob Roe

Officers in Attendance:

| | | |
|------------------|---|---|
| David Hall | - | Development Control Manager |
| Peter Rivet | - | Senior Planning Officer |
| Daniel Ratcliffe | - | Planning Assistant |
| Martin Brownjohn | - | Environmental Protection District Team Leader |
| Jane Glenton | - | Democratic Support Officer |

23 ITEMS OF URGENT BUSINESS AUTHORISED BY THE CHAIRMAN

There were no items of urgent business.

24 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members were advised of the following declarations of interest:

Councillor Helme declared a personal interest in A9 09/00527/OUT – Ellel Institute, Stoney Lane, Galgate – being a member of Ellel Parish Council.

Councillor Pritchard declared a personal and prejudicial interest in A10 09/00401/FUL – 5 Manor Court, Brookhouse, Lancaster and A11 09/00402/LB – 5 Manor Court, Brookhouse, Lancaster – having registered to speak as Ward Councillor in favour of the applications.

Councillor Blamire declared a personal and prejudicial interest in A13 09/00330/DPA – Land for Proposed Bailrigg Business Park, Bailrigg Lane, Lancaster – being a Cabinet Member and the matter having been considered previously by Cabinet.

Councillor Charles declared a personal and prejudicial interest in A13 09/00330/DPA – Land for Proposed Bailrigg Business Park, Bailrigg Lane, Lancaster – being a Cabinet Member and the matter having been considered previously by Cabinet.

Councillor Gilbert declared a personal and prejudicial interest in A13 09/00330/DPA – Land for Proposed Bailrigg Business Park, Bailrigg Lane, Lancaster – being a Cabinet Member and the matter having been considered previously by Cabinet.

Councillor Coates declared a personal and prejudicial interest in A13 09/00330/DPA – Land for Proposed Bailrigg Business Park, Bailrigg Lane, Lancaster – having objected to the previous application.

Councillor Heath declared a personal and prejudicial interest in A13 09/00330/DPA – Land for Proposed Bailrigg Business Park, Bailrigg Lane, Lancaster – having objected to the previous application.

25 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Head of Planning Services submitted a Schedule of Planning Applications and his recommendations thereon.

Resolved:

- (1) That the applications be determined as indicated below (the numbers denote the schedule numbers of the applications).
 - (2) That, except where stated below, the applications be subject to the relevant conditions and advice notes, as outlined in the Schedule.
 - (3) That, except where stated below, the reasons for refusal be those as outlined in the Schedule.
- (a) NOTE
- | | | |
|--------|---|--|
| A | - | Approved |
| R | - | Refused |
| D | - | Deferred |
| A(C) | - | Approved with additional conditions |
| A(P) | - | Approved in principle |
| A(106) | - | Approved following completion of a Section 106 Agreement |
| W | - | Withdrawn |
| NO | - | No objections |
| O | - | Objections |

APPLICATIONS SUBJECT TO PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

CATEGORY A APPLICATIONS

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

It was noted that Councillor Pritchard had previously declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the following item, having registered to speak as Ward Councillor and supporter of the application. Councillor Pritchard spoke on the item, left the meeting whilst the application was being considered and did not vote on the matter.

26 5 MANOR COURT, BROOKHOUSE, LANCASTER

(Under the Scheme of Public Participation, Councillor Pritchard spoke to the Committee as Ward Councillor and in support of applications A10 and A11.)

A10 09/00401/FUL Erection of a lean-to extension LOWER LUNE R
to the side for Mr. Kevin VALLEY WARD
Murphy

Councillor Pritchard addressed the Committee in support of the application and advised that the applicant's initial application for Planning and Listed Building Consent for the erection of a timber framed conservatory had been refused, as it had been deemed unsuitable, and the applicant had appealed. However, other developments had been permitted locally, such as a garage extension, which had been built next to a listed farmhouse, and there was another barn conversion locally, which had an extension visible from the road. The applicant had subsequently been advised that a small lean-to

extension using traditional materials might be considered more favourably, and the applicant had accepted this. The applicant had employed specialist architects, and had entered into dialogue with Planning Services, and planning officers had visited the site. The applicant had submitted further proposals in line with advice from Planning Services, but these had been turned down. The applicant felt that his submission was in keeping with the area and that he had done what had been asked of him by Planning Services. No objections to the proposal had been received from the Parish Council. Members were asked to consider the application favourably.

Members considered the application.

It was proposed by Councillor Sherlock and seconded by Councillor Denwood:

“That Planning Permission be refused.”

Upon being put to the vote, 12 Members voted in favour of the proposition and 7 against, whereupon the Chairman declared the proposal to be carried.

Resolved:

That Planning Permission be refused for the following reasons, as set out in the report:

1. Although of an appropriate architectural style and materials, the proposed development would represent a substantial extension to the exposed side of this converted barn, which at the present time still retains its original simple agricultural form. The addition of the proposed extension in the centre of this elevation of the building would result in the loss of that traditional architectural character and simplicity which is fundamental to the character and appearance of the group as a whole. The proposed development would therefore conflict with the requirement of saved policy E20 (The Re-use of Buildings in the Countryside).
2. The proposed development is in a prominent location, which would dominate this side of the building and detract from the shape, character, appearance and historic integrity of the barn. Because of its visual prominence at the focal point of the vista through the group, it would also dominate and detract from the character, appearance and historic integrity of the group as a whole. The proposed development would, in consequence, therefore, seriously detract from the character, appearance and historic integrity of the setting of the listed building and its former curtilage structures and would conflict with the requirements of Core Strategy policy E1 (Environmental Capital) and saved policy E33 (Alterations or Extensions to Historic Buildings).
3. The development of the site in the manner proposed would detract from the distinctive characteristics, appearance and landscape quality of this particular settlement and its surrounding countryside and have a detrimental effect on the environmental quality and public amenity of the locality. The proposed development would therefore detract from the wider rural landscape of national importance within which it is located and be contrary to the aims and objectives of the Forest of Bowland AONB. In this respect, therefore, the proposed development would conflict with the requirements of Core Strategy policies SC3 (Rural Communities) and E1 (Environmental Capital) and saved policies E3

(Development affecting Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the Yorkshire Dales National Park) and E20 (The Re-use of Buildings in the Countryside).

4. In terms of providing sufficient accommodation to create a reasonably workable residential unit, the proposed development cannot be justified in terms of need, and in these circumstances, would conflict with the provisions of saved policy E20 (The Re-use of Buildings in the Countryside) which seeks to contain barn conversions within the original traditional structures.
5. The proposed development would set a strong precedent for further similar unnecessary extensions elsewhere within this group, which would become difficult to resist, thereby prejudicing the Council's policy in seeking well planned development.

27 5 MANOR COURT, BROOKHOUSE, LANCASTER

A11 09/00402/LB Listed Building application for LOWER LUNE R
the erection of a lean-to VALLEY WARD
extension to the side for Mr.
Kevin Murphy

It was proposed by Councillor Sherlock and seconded by Councillor Denwood:

"That Listed Building Consent be refused."

Upon being put to the vote, 12 Members voted in favour of the proposition and 7 against, whereupon the Chairman declared the proposal to be carried.

Resolved:

That Listed Building Consent be refused for the following reasons, as set out in the report:

1. Although of an appropriate architectural style and materials, the proposed development would represent a substantial extension to the exposed side of this converted barn, which at the present time still retains its original simple agricultural form. The addition of the proposed extension in the centre of this elevation of the building would result in the loss of that traditional architectural character and simplicity which is fundamental to the character and appearance of the group as a whole. The proposed development would therefore conflict with the requirements of Core Strategy Policy E1 (Environmental Capital) and Saved Policies E33 (Alterations or Extensions to Historic Buildings) and E20 (The Re-use of Buildings in the Countryside).
2. The proposed development is in a prominent location, which would dominate this side of the building and detract from the shape, character, appearance and historic integrity of the barn. Because of its visual prominence at the focal point of the vista through the group, it would also dominate and detract from the character, appearance and historic integrity of the group as a whole. The proposed development would, in consequence, therefore, seriously detract from the character, appearance and historic integrity of the setting of the listed building and its former curtilage structures and would conflict with the requirements of Core

Strategy Policy E1 (Environmental Capital) and Saved Policy E33 (Alterations or Extensions to Historic Buildings).

3. The proposed development would set a strong precedent for further similar unnecessary extensions elsewhere within this group, which would become difficult to resist, therefore prejudicing the Council's policy in seeking to conserve the historic environment.

CATEGORY D APPLICATION

Application for development by a District Council

It was noted that Councillor Blamire had previously declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the following item, being a Cabinet Member and the matter having been considered previously by Cabinet, left the room during its consideration and did not vote on the item.

It was noted that Councillor Charles had previously declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the following item, being a Cabinet Member and the matter having been considered previously by Cabinet, left the room during its consideration and did not vote on the item.

It was noted that Councillor Gilbert had previously declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the following item, being a Cabinet Member and the matter having been considered previously by Cabinet, left the room during its consideration and did not vote on the item.

It was noted that Councillor Coates had previously declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the following item, having objected to the previous application, left the room during its consideration and did not vote on the item.

It was noted that Councillor Heath had previously declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the following item, having objected to the previous application, left the room during its consideration and did not vote on the item.

28 LAND FOR PROPOSED BAILRIGG BUSINESS PARK, BAILRIGG LANE, LANCASTER

*(Under the Scheme of Public Participation, Roberta Kerr, Vice-Chairman of Scotforth Parish Council, spoke in opposition to the application.
Kathryn Donnelly of WYG Planning and Design spoke in support of the application.)*

A13 09/00330/DPA Outline application for a ELLEL WARD A
Science Park (approximately
34,000 sq. m of B1 use
floorspace) and full application
for a new access off the A6,
construction of an internal
spine road and provision of
landscaping for Lancaster City
Council

Roberta Kerr, Vice-Chairman of Scotforth Parish Council, addressed the Committee and advised Members that she was responding on behalf of Bailrigg Village. Residents strongly opposed the application and one-third had made their views known. Traffic was a contentious issue. County Highways had concerns and there was capacity already on the A6. An independent survey had ranked the site 22nd out of 25 regional sites, scoring less than 45% on sustainability and compliance with regional policy. Paragraph 7.2.5 of the officer's report was uncompromising in that traffic was the most contentious issue associated with the scheme. The accuracy of the transport assessment was questionable. It was unclear how the 860 car parking spaces in the submission would be significantly reduced to 600 and how the move away from car usage would be sustainable. The flooding of Ou Beck and the potential for overflow into residents' septic tanks was of concern. The Flood Risk Assessment had predicted that during 1 in 100 year flood events, flood levels would overtop Ou Beck channel banks. Climate change meant that measures were needed to address such events, as was a catchment study to demonstrate the effect of proposed discharges. The proximity of the end of the spine road to Bailrigg village would result in a lack of space for adequate screening. If approved, the application should be conditioned, and workable measures introduced to control car usage.

Kathryn Donnelly of WYG Planning and Design addressed the Committee and advised Members that the traffic problems related had been comprehensively addressed through consultation with the County Council and Highway Authority, and a Travel Plan would be introduced. Landscaping and screening would be incorporated at Bailrigg and the biodiversity of the area enhanced. Flood risk had been seriously addressed and risk assessed, showing that the development would have no impact on dwellings. Regional investment and contribution to the economy would result in a higher ranking of the site. The benchmark figure had been set at 40% and the site had passed the sustainability test by scoring an overall average of 47%. The focus of the Science Park was to retain the qualified workforce, and complied with the Regional Spatial Strategy. The principle of the Science Park had been accepted in the Core Strategy and Regional Development Plans. The development would represent a building of high design and would increase employment in the district.

It was proposed by Councillor Sherlock and seconded by Councillor Redfern:

- “(1) That Outline Planning Permission for a Science Park be granted.
- (2) That Planning Permission for a new access off the A6, construction of an internal spine road and provision of landscaping be granted.”

Upon being put to the vote, 11 Members voted in favour of the proposition and 4 against, whereupon the Chairman declared the proposal to be carried.

Resolved:

- (1) That Outline Permission for a Science Park be granted, subject to the following conditions, as set out in the report:
 - 1. 5 years consent.
 - 2. Outline permission – Reserved Matters required (except access).
 - 3. Illustrative drawings only.
 - 4. Limitation of Use Class B1 only, in association with the provisions of the entry criteria to be submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Local Planning Authority.

5. Phasing plan to be submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. Phase 1 to be developed south of the spine road.
6. Submission and implementation of a Renewable Energy Strategy prior to approval of the reserved matters. Minimum of 10% of the development's predicted energy requirement sourced from on site renewable energy production.
7. All buildings to achieve a BREEAM rating of excellent, or equivalent.
8. Submission of a Car Parking Management Strategy.
9. Car Parking – details required (including mobility spaces). The development shall not exceed the maximum parking levels permitted by RT2 of the Regional Spatial Strategy.
10. Provision of motorcycle and bicycle storage to be agreed (bicycle parking provision to be provided at a ratio of 1 space per 10 employees). All buildings to be provided with showers and changing facilities.
11. Travel Plan condition. Prior to commencement of the development, any revisions to the submitted Framework Travel Plan shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Local Planning Authority, Highway Authority and the Secretary of State for Transport. Any revisions shall be implemented and monitored in accordance with the revised Travel Plan. As a minimum, the Travel Plan shall incorporate details of the development phasing and measures to reduce the reliance on single occupancy vehicle trips throughout each development phase. The development shall proceed wholly in accordance with the Framework Travel Plan.
12. Off-site highway improvements to be provided by way of a S278 agreement to include:
 - a) the provision of a bus lay-by on the northbound side of the A6 just north of Galgate junction;
 - b) the provision of parking bays along the southbound side of the A6 to the north of Galgate junction;
 - c) the installation of MOVA technology to Galgate traffic lights;
 - d) the provision of 2 Quality Bus Stops (one on either side of the A6 in the vicinity of the site access);
 - e) the provision of cycle paths along the A6 in either direction of the access junction, totalling up to 950 m;
 - f) the provision of a foot/cycle path link from the site's southern boundary to the University's cycle infrastructure in the vicinity of Lake Carter; and
 - g) the provision of up to 2.65 km of further off-site designated foot/cycle paths (locations to be agreed with the Local Planning Authority in conjunction with the Highway Authority).
13. Off-site highway improvements 'd', 'e' and 'f' listed in Condition 14 shall be constructed and available for use prior to the occupation of any building on site. No more than 11,000 sq. m gross internal area (GIA) of development shall be occupied until up to 1.35 km of off-site designated foot/cycle paths has been provided. Up to 1.3 km further off-site designated foot/cycle paths shall be constructed prior to the occupation of more than 23,000 sq. m (GIA) of development.
14. Two internal cycle paths (one running north-south across the site and the other attached to the south side of the spine road) shall be constructed and available for use prior to the occupation of any building on site.
15. No development shall be commenced in excess of 11,000 sq. m (GIA) until full design details of the required improvements to Galgate junction and the northbound bus lay-by have been submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Local Planning Authority, Highway Authority and the Secretary of State for Transport.

16. No more than 11,000 sq. m (GIA) of development shall be occupied until the agreed measures in Condition 15 have been fully implemented to the satisfaction of the Highway Authority in liaison with the Highway Agency.
17. No development shall be occupied until full details of an automated system to monitor vehicle movements to and from the site have been submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Local Planning Authority, Highway Authority and the Secretary of State for Transport. The agreed system to be fully implemented and operational prior to occupation.
18. No development shall be occupied until details of a Bailrigg Transportation Steering Group have been submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the Local Planning Authority, Highway Authority and the Secretary of State for Transport. The purpose of the Steering Group is to monitor data supplied pursuant to Condition 17, in association with the agreed Framework Travel Plan, and consider overall travel behaviour at the site. It will be convened in accordance with the agreed details.
19. No more than 23,000 sq. m (GIA) of the development shall be occupied if monitoring in accordance with the requirements of Condition 17 shows that traffic entering the application site morning peak hour (defined as the 60 minute period between 0700 and 1000 hours) exceeds 240 vehicles in total (40% maximum from the south) on five or more occasions within any three month period or until a scheme of traffic management measures and/or highway improvements that mitigates the excess has been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority, Highway Authority and the Secretary of State for Transport. Any approved scheme shall be implemented in full prior to any further development exceeding 23,000 sq. m is occupied.
20. No development exceeding 23,000 sq. m (GIA) shall commence until a full detailed assessment of potential impacts from Phase 3 and its associated floorspace has been undertaken and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, Highway Authority and the Secretary of State for Transport.
21. No development exceeding the allowable floorspace levels shall commence until any identified scheme of traffic management measures and/or highway improvements resulting from the assessment undertaken in Condition 20, have been submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority, Highway Authority and the Secretary of State for Transport. Any approved scheme shall be implemented in full prior to any further development exceeding 23,000 sq. m is occupied.
22. If monitoring in accordance with the requirements of Condition 17 shows that traffic entering the application site in the morning peak hour (defined as the 60 minute period between 0700 and 1000 hours) has exceeded the pro rata trip rates for the allowable floorspace in Condition 20 (40% maximum allowable floorspace shall be occupied until the highway improvements specified in Condition 21 have been constructed and completed to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority, Highway Authority and the Secretary of State for Transport.
23. Prior to the construction of each phase of the overall development commencing, the applicant shall submit full details, including the cumulative gross floor area total, proposals to occupy all buildings and any associated car parking. The details submitted shall be sufficient for the Local Planning Authority (in consultation with the Highways Agency) to approve what stage the building(s) (or component parts of any buildings) is/are being brought into their intended use for the purposes of discharging Conditions 19 and 21.

24. Submission of a Surface Water Drainage Strategy (including attenuation surface discharges from the development to existing 'greenfield rates' of 10 litres per second per hectare). The approved strategy to be fully implemented.
 25. Separate drainage system.
 26. Provision of inceptors – car parks.
 27. Refuse storage details.
 28. Provision of CCTV.
 29. Light pollution – external lighting details.
- (2) That Planning Permission for a new access off the A6, construction of an internal spine road and provision of landscaping be granted, subject to the following conditions, as set out in the report:
1. Standard 3 year consent.
 2. Development as per approved plans.
 3. Submission and implementation of a detailed Landscaping Scheme (including an initial 10 year maintenance programme) prior to approval of reserved matters.
 4. Submission and implementation of a Habitat Management and Creation Plan, prior to approval of reserved matters (to include the provision of an 8 metre wide vegetated buffer zone to either side of Ou Beck).
 5. Submission and implementation of a Construction Environmental Management Plan.
 6. Full implementation of bat, water vole and badger mitigation proposals.
 7. Scheme for the Protection of Trees (during building operations).
 8. Retention of existing trees/hedgerow (unless agreed in writing in advance with Local Planning Authority).
 9. A detailed Method Statement is submitted and agreed in writing for all works in proximity to trees.
 10. All tree works as detailed within Arboriculture Implications Assessment are undertaken in compliance with this document and BS3998 (1989) Tree Work and undertaken by a trained and experienced arborist.
 11. No cement washout areas within 20 metres of any trees, vegetation or Ou Beck.
 12. Submission of a Surface Water Drainage Strategy (including attenuation surface discharges from the development to existing 'greenfield rates' of 10 litres per second per hectare). The approved strategy to be fully implemented.
 13. Separate drainage system.
 14. Construction hours (0800 – 1800 hours, Monday to Friday, 0800 – 1400 Saturday).
 15. Construction noise and vibration.
 16. Scheme for dust control.
 17. Contaminated land condition.
 18. Contaminated land – importation of soil, materials and hardcore.
 19. Contaminated land – prevention of new contamination.
 20. Bunding of tanks.
 21. Wheel cleaning facilities – during construction.
 22. Archaeological survey.
 23. Adoptable highway details required.
 24. On-site highway works to be constructed and adopted by way of a S38 agreement include:
 - the site access;
 - the internal spine road; and
 - the provision of toucan crossing facilities at the access junction.Each relevant phase shall be accessible by adopted roads prior to occupation of any building within that phase.

Councillors Robinson and Heath left the meeting at this point.

APPLICATIONS NOT SUBJECT TO PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

CATEGORY A APPLICATIONS

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

29 ELMS HOTEL, ELMS ROAD, MORECAMBE

| | | | | |
|----|--------------|---|-----------|-------|
| A5 | 09/00158/FUL | Demolition of existing building and erection of new single building to house 44 no. 2 bedroom and 4 no. 1 bedroom assisted living apartments, 2 nurses studios, an undercroft parking area and an undercroft storage facility for use of the apartments for Hay Carr Estates/Mitchells of Lancaster | BARE WARD | A (C) |
|----|--------------|---|-----------|-------|

It was proposed by Councillor Blamire and seconded by Councillor Taylor:

“That, subject to Legal Services’ confirmation that the Unilateral Undertaking is satisfactory, Planning Permission be granted.”

Upon being put to the vote, 16 Member voted in favour of the proposition and 1 against, with 1 abstention, whereupon the Chairman declared the proposal to be carried.

Resolved:

That, subject to Legal Services’ confirmation that the Unilateral Undertaking is satisfactory, the application be approved, subject to the following conditions, as set out in the report:

1. Standard three year condition.
2. Amended plans 21st May 2009, showing alterations to car park and ramped access to garden.
3. Development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
4. No development to take place until developers agree programme of public transport and pedestrian access improvements.
5. No development to take place until developers have agreed provision of affordable housing.
6. Samples of materials to be agreed.
7. Scheme for microgeneration to be agreed.
8. Landscaping scheme to be agreed and implemented.
9. Trees to be protected from damage during construction.
10. Accommodation to be occupied by people over 55 only.
11. Construction and demolition to take place only between 0800 – 1800 hours, Mondays to Fridays – no work on Sundays or officially recognised public holidays.

12. Details of ventilation from car park to be agreed.
13. Separated drainage system to be provided.

and to the following additional condition (suitably worded):

14. Details of any pile driving to be agreed.

30 VACANT WORKSHOPS, SAND LANE, WARTON

| | | | | |
|----|--------------|-----------|----------------|---|
| A6 | 09/00322/FUL | WITHDRAWN | WARTON WARD | W |
|----|--------------|-----------|----------------|---|

31 THE LILACS, NETHER KELLET ROAD, OVER KELLET

| | | | | |
|----|--------------|---|-------------|-------|
| A7 | 09/00247/FUL | Erection of extensions and alterations for Mr. Paul Jackson | KELLET WARD | A (C) |
|----|--------------|---|-------------|-------|

It was proposed by Councillor Helme and seconded by Councillor Johnson:

“That Planning Permission be granted.”

Upon being put to the vote, 17 Members voted in favour of the proposition and 1 against, whereupon the Chairman declared the proposal to be carried.

Resolved:

That Planning Permission be granted, subject to the following conditions, as set out in the report:

1. Standard 3 year time limit.
2. Development in accordance with approved plans.
3. The front elevation shall be finished in traditional stone, details to be agreed.
4. Details of stone heads, reveals, sills, drip mouldings and verge copings to be agreed.
5. Details of the roof eaves, ridges and verges to be agreed.
6. Colour of render to be agreed.
7. Use of a late roof details to be agreed.
8. Finishes of external woodwork to be agreed.
9. Windows on the first floor of the east elevation to be fitted with obscure glazing only.
10. Limitation to Use Class C3 (Dwelling House).

and to the following additional condition (suitably worded):

11. Precise method of opening to the new bathroom windows to be agreed.

The meeting was adjourned at 1.30 p.m. for lunch.

The meeting was reconvened at 1.55 p.m.

Councillor Taylor left the meeting at this point.

32 BLACKTHORNE COTTAGE, BORWICK ROAD, CAPERNWRAY

A8 09/00373/VCN Variation of condition no. 3 of KELLETT WARD A (C)
planning consent
02/001203/REM to vary the
condition from the agricultural
occupancy condition to an
occupancy condition in
association with the equestrian
enterprise at the site for Mr. J.
McCarthy

It was proposed by Councillor Greenall and seconded by Councillor Helme:

“That Planning Permission be granted.”

Upon being put to the vote, Members voted unanimously in favour of the proposition, whereby the Chairman declared the proposal to be carried.

Resolved:

That Planning Permission be granted, subject to the following amended condition:

1. Dwelling to be occupied by person or persons involved in the adjoining equestrian business or agricultural use in the future.

It was noted that Councillor Helme had previously declared a personal interest in the following item, being a member of Ellel Parish Council.

Councillor Marsland left mid-way through the following item.

33 ELLEL INSTITUTE, STONEY LANE, GALGATE

A9 09/00527/OUT Demolition of existing institute ELLEL WARD A(P)(C)
building and erection of 2
semi-detached dwellings for
Mrs. Kath Coleman

It was proposed by Councillor Sherlock and seconded by Councillor Roe:

“That, subject to the concerns of the Highway Authority and Environment Agency being satisfactorily addressed, Outline Planning Permission be granted.”

Upon being put to the vote, 15 Members voted in favour of the proposition, with 1 abstention, whereupon the Chairman declared the proposal to be carried.

Resolved:

That, subject to the concerns of the Highway Authority and Environment Agency being satisfactorily addressed, Outline Planning Permission be granted, subject to the following conditions, as set out in the report:

1. Standard time limit.
2. Outline permission – full details to be submitted.
3. Development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
4. Off street parking to be provided and retained at all times thereafter.
5. The footway to be provided and retained at all times thereafter.
6. All existing stone and architectural features, including existing stone plaques, to be carefully removed and stored securely for re-use on the proposed development.
7. Removal of permitted development rights.

and to the following additional conditions (suitably worded):

8. Hours of construction.
9. Recording of existing building.
10. Land contamination study.

CATEGORY C APPLICATION

Application for development by a District Council

34 LUNE VALLEY CYCLE PATH, CATON, LANCASTER

A12 090/00463/CCC Extension of Lune Valley foot and cycle path by approximately 120 metres due east from Bull Beck picnic site for Lancashire County Council LOWER LUNE VALLEY WARD NO (C)

It was proposed by Councillor Blamire and seconded by Councillor Chapman:

“That the County Council be advised that the City Council approves the proposal in principle, subject to

- (1) The County Council providing compensatory tree planting for those removed
- (2) The County Council giving consideration to improving access across the busy A583 to Bull Beck picnic area.”

Upon being put to the vote, 15 Members voted in favour of the proposition, with 1 abstention, whereupon the Chairman declared the proposal to be carried.

Resolved:

That the County Council be advised that the City Council approves the proposal in principle, subject to

- (1) The County Council providing (1) compensatory tree planting for those removed
- (2) The County Council giving consideration to improving access across the busy A583 to Bull Beck picnic area.

35 DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

The Head of Planning Services submitted a Schedule of Planning Applications dealt with under the Scheme of Delegation of Planning Functions to Officers.

Resolved:

That the report be noted.

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 2.20 p.m.)

**Any queries regarding these Minutes, please contact
Jane Glenton, Democratic Services - telephone (01524) 582068 or email
jglenton@lancaster.gov.uk**