



Committee: PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS REGULATORY COMMITTEE

Date: MONDAY, 4 JUNE 2018

Venue: LANCASTER TOWN HALL

Time: 10.30 A.M.

A G E N D A

Officers have prepared a report for each of the planning or related applications listed on this Agenda. Copies of all application literature and any representations received are available for viewing at the City Council's Public Access website <http://www.lancaster.gov.uk/publicaccess> by searching for the relevant applicant number.

1 Apologies for Absence

2 Appointment of Vice-Chairman

To appoint a Vice-Chairman for the duration of the 2018/19 municipal year.

3 Minutes

Minutes of meeting held on 9th May, 2018 (previously circulated).

4 Items of Urgent Business authorised by the Chairman

5 Declarations of Interest

To receive declarations by Members of interests in respect of items on this Agenda.

Members are reminded that, in accordance with the Localism Act 2011, they are required to declare any disclosable pecuniary interests which have not already been declared in the Council's Register of Interests. (It is a criminal offence not to declare a disclosable pecuniary interest either in the Register or at the meeting).

Whilst not a legal requirement, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 9 and in the interests of clarity and transparency, Members should declare any disclosable pecuniary interests which they have already declared in the Register, at this point in the meeting.

In accordance with Part B Section 2 of the Code Of Conduct, Members are required to declare the existence and nature of any other interests as defined in paragraphs 8(1) or 9(2) of the Code of Conduct.

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 that the proposed development has particular implications for community safety, the issue is fully considered within the main body of the individual planning application report. The weight attributed to this is a matter for the decision-taker.

Local Finance Considerations

Section 143 of the Localism Act requires the local planning authority to have regard to local finance considerations when determining planning applications. Local finance considerations are defined as a grant or other financial assistance that has been provided; will be provided; or could be provided to a relevant authority by a Minister of the Crown (such as New Homes Bonus payments), or sums that a relevant authority has, will or could receive in payment of the Community Infrastructure Levy. Whether a local finance consideration is material to the planning decision will depend upon whether it could help to make development acceptable in planning terms, and where necessary these issues are fully considered within the main body of the individual planning application report. The weight attributed to this is a matter for the decision-taker.

Human Rights Act

Planning application recommendations have been reached after consideration of The Human Rights Act. Unless otherwise explicitly stated in the report, the issues arising do not appear to be of such magnitude 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.

6	A5 18/00095/FUL	Land north of 1 Sunny Hill, Westbourne Road, Lancaster	Marsh Ward	(Pages 1 - 10)
		Erection of a three storey building comprising of 6 two-bed apartments (C3) with associated parking, landscaping and creation of a pedestrian access		
7	A6 18/00421/VLA	Land Off Sycamore Road, Brookhouse	Lower Lune Valley Ward	(Pages 11 - 13)
		Variation of legal agreement attached to planning permission 14/00270/OUT to alter the affordable housing provisions		

8	A7 18/00406/FUL	8 Levens Close, Lancaster	Marsh Ward	(Pages 14 - 17)
		Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of two storey rear extension		
9	A8 18/00308/FUL	1 Downham Cottages, Chapel Lane, Galgate	Ellel Ward	(Pages 18 - 21)
		Erection of a two storey side extension		
10	A9 18/00468/FUL	61 Gloucester Avenue, Lancaster	Scotforth East Ward	(Pages 22 - 24)
		Erection of a single storey side and rear extension		
11	A10 18/00484/FUL	Salt Ayre Sports Centre, Dors Henderson Way, Heaton With Oxcliffe	Skerton West Ward	(Pages 25 - 29)
		Erection of a single storey extension and bin store and creation of a seated area and children's playground/outdoor activity area to the front		
12	Quarterly Reports (Pages 30 - 37)			
13	Delegated Planning List (Pages 38 - 46)			

ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

(i) Membership

Councillors Carla Brayshaw (Chairman), June Ashworth, Jon Barry, Stuart Bateson, Alan Biddulph, Eileen Blamire, Dave Brookes, Abbott Bryning, Ian Clift, Helen Helme, Jane Parkinson, Jean Parr, Robert Redfern, Sylvia Rogerson and Susan Sykes

(ii) Substitute Membership

Councillors Claire Cozler (Substitute), Sheila Denwood (Substitute), Mel Guilding (Substitute), Tim Hamilton-Cox (Substitute), Andrew Kay (Substitute), Geoff Knight (Substitute) and Malcolm Thomas (Substitute)

(iii) Queries regarding this Agenda

Please contact Tessa Mott, Democratic Services: telephone (01524) 582074 or email tmott@lancaster.gov.uk.

(iv) Changes to Membership, substitutions or apologies

Please contact Democratic Support, telephone 582170, or alternatively email democraticsupport@lancaster.gov.uk.

SUSAN PARSONAGE,
CHIEF EXECUTIVE,
TOWN HALL,
DALTON SQUARE,
LANCASTER, LA1 1PJ

Published on Monday 21st May 2018.

Agenda Item A5	Committee Date 4 June 2018	Application Number 18/00095/FUL
Application Site Land North of 1 Sunny Hill Westbourne Road Lancaster Lancashire	Proposal Erection of a three storey building comprising of 6 two-bed apartments (C3) with associated parking, landscaping and creation of a pedestrian access	
Name of Applicant Mr Howard	Name of Agent Mr David Howard	
Decision Target Date 24 April 2018	Reason For Delay	
Case Officer	Ms Charlotte Seward	
Departure	No	
Summary of Recommendation	Refusal	

1.0 The Site and its Surroundings

- 1.1 The proposal site is a walled garden to the north of semi-detached properties 1 and 2 Sunny Hill. Within the site there is a disused garage and a number of trees, including two Yew trees protected by a TPO and a group of trees that are protected as a group. The site is accessed off Westbourne Road and is located within the Cannon Hill Conservation Area. To the east of the site lies the Grade II Listed residential property known as The Knoll. There is an area of surface water drainage 1:1000 risk at the access point to the site.

2.0 The Proposal

- 2.1 The scheme has been revised on 5 separate occasions in response to consultation responses, comments from the public and the Planning Officer. The proposal, as it stands at the point of writing this report, seeks permission for a three storey building comprising of 6 2-bed flats. The proposal includes 6 parking spaces and 1 visitor space, and 6 cycle spaces. The site is proposed to be landscaped to include retaining walls, stone paving, 6 Holly trees and 3 Oak trees. Bin storage is proposed to the side of the building. Vehicular access is proposed via the existing, unaltered access point but a new pedestrian access with opaque gates is proposed in the existing wall onto Westbourne Road.

3.0 Site History

- 3.1 Outline planning permission was granted in 2010 (10/00731/OUT) for a detached single dwelling house on the proposal site. This application was never implemented and has lapsed. On land adjacent to 2 Sunny Hill planning permission was granted in 2010 (10/00542/FUL) for a five bed dwelling house and the formation of a new improved access. This permission has been materially commenced and is considered extant.

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
10/00731/OUT	Outline application for the erection of a detached single dwelling house	Permitted

10/00542/FUL	Erection of a five bed dwelling house and the formation of a new improved access	Permitted
09/01168/OUT	Outline application for the erection of a five bed private dwelling, associated landscaping and alterations to the access and junction with Westbourne Road	Permitted
09/00010/REF	Outline application for the erection of a five bed private dwelling and associated landscape works	Appeal dismissed
09/00196/OUT	Outline application for the erection of a single five bed roomed private dwelling and associated landscape works	Refused

4.0 Consultation Responses

4.1 The following responses have been received from statutory and non-statutory consultees:

Consultee	Response
County Highways	Where approval is granted it should be subject to conditions relating to: implementation of the parking scheme prior to first occupation; construction traffic management statement; off-site highways improvement scheme for the provision of a bus stop, flag pole and timetable to be implemented prior to first occupation.
Tree Protection Officer	Objects: Removing all of the trees as proposed will have a long and lasting adverse impact upon the existing character and appearance of the local Conservation Area, a designated area that is recognised for its "wooded character".
Conservation Officer	Objects: The proposed new development would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of the Cannon Hill Conservation Area as it would erode the wooded and spacious plot character of the area.
Lancaster Civic Society	Objects: This development is inappropriate for a prominent site in a Conservation Area and would recommend that planning permission be refused.
Environmental Health	Objects: The proposal does not include any mitigation for the impact of the increased traffic on air quality.
United Utilities	Comments: Foul and surface water shall be drained on separate systems. A surface water drainage scheme that accords with the sustainable drainage hierarchy and includes adequate proposals for maintenance and management of the surface water drainage system shall be required.

5.0 Neighbour Representations

5.1 56 letters of objection were received to the original proposal, and 39 further representations in objection have been made to the 4 sets of amended proposals that have been submitted. The material planning considerations raised are summarised below:

- Overdevelopment of the site that conflicts with the character of the Conservation Area - density of development on sites in this area are considered to be 10-20% of the total garden area whilst this proposal would exceed this at 25-30%;
- Size/scale/height/footprint/design/set back from the boundary is inappropriate for the site and the character of the Conservation Area;
- The site is suitable only for 1 dwelling – previous proposal could be considered reasonable for plot size and character of the area;
- Unacceptable impact on protected trees and the impact on amenity and biodiversity of the area, and the character of the Conservation Area and lack of adequate replanting to mitigate this impact;
- Adverse impact on residential amenity of The Knoll and Sunny Hill;
- Proposed parking not in accordance with policy standards – insufficient parking could result in potential overspill onto the public highway creating a hazard. Parking incidents resulting in obstruction resulted in call outs from the police 9 times in 2015, 10 times in 2016 and 6 times in 2017;
- Increased traffic generation on narrow Westbourne Road resulting in hazard;
- Increased use of narrow pavement;
- Lack of bicycle storage;

- Lack of garden space;
- Increase use of constrained access and potential conflict with pedestrians and cyclists;
- Impact on setting of the adjacent Listed building, The Knoll;
- Lack of a surface water run-off scheme - the removal of trees and creation of hard surfacing will increase potential for flooding of Westwood and Westlands;
- Deeds for Sunny Hill restrict development on this plot to a private dwelling house;
- The plans showing the 2010 development permitted on land adjacent to 2 Sunny Hill are misleading;
- Overlooking of Westbourne Road properties; and
- Lack of emergency vehicle access.

6.0 Principal National and Development Plan Policies

6.1 National Planning Policy Framework

- Paragraphs 7, 14 and 17 – Sustainable Development and Core Principles
- Paragraph 32 – Access and Transport
- Paragraphs 49 and 50 – Delivering Housing
- Paragraphs 56, 58, 64 – Requiring Good Design
- Paragraph 80 – Sustainable Drainage
- Paragraph 133 – Heritage Assets

6.2 Local Planning Policy Overview – Current Position

At the 20 December 2017 meeting of its Full Council, the local authority resolved to publish the following 2 Development Plan Documents (DPD) for submission to the Planning Inspectorate:

- (i) The Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD; and,
- (ii) A Review of the Development Management DPD.

This enables progress to be made on the preparation of a Local Plan for the Lancaster District. The DPDs were published on the 9 February for an 8 week consultation in preparation for submission to the Planning Inspectorate for independent Examination. If an Inspector finds that the submitted DPDs have been soundly prepared they may be adopted by the Council, potentially in late 2018.

The **Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD** will replace the remaining policies of the Lancaster District Core Strategy (2008) and the residual 'saved' land allocation policies from the 2004 District Local Plan. Following the Council resolution in December 2017, it is considered that the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD is a material consideration in decision-making, although with limited weight. The weight attributed to this DPD will increase as the plan's preparation progresses through the stages described above.

The **Review of the Development Management DPD** updates the policies that are contained within the current document, which was adopted in December 2014. As it is part of the development plan the current document is already material in terms of decision-making. Where any policies in the draft 'Review' document are different from those adopted in 2014, and those policies materially affect the consideration of the planning application, then these will be taken into account during decision-making, although again with limited weight. The weight attributed to the revised policies in the 'Review' will increase as the plan's preparation progresses through the stages described above.

6.3 Lancaster District Core Strategy (adopted July 2008)

- SC1: Sustainable Development
- SC2: Urban Concentration
- SC4: Meeting the District's Housing Requirement
- SC5: Quality in Design

6.4 Development Management Development Plan Document (DPD)

- NPPF1: Presumption in favour of sustainable development

- DM20: Enhancing Accessibility and Transport Linkages
- DM22: Vehicle Parking Provision
- DM27: The Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity
- DM29: Protection of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland
- DM31: Development affect Conservation Areas
- DM32: Setting of Designated Heritage Assets
- DM35: Key Design Principles
- DM39: Surface Water Run Off and Sustainable Drainage
- DM41: New Residential Development

7.0 Comment and Analysis

7.1 The main issues are:

- Principle of development
- Housing land supply
- Housing mix
- Highways safety
- Trees and impact on Conservation Area
- Residential amenity
- Scale and design, and impact on Conservation Area
- Air quality
- Surface water and foul drainage

7.2 Principle of Development

7.2.1 The site is located within the urban area of Lancaster, which in addition to the existing urban areas of Morecambe, Heysham and Carnforth, is where Policy SC2 seeks to direct 90% of all new dwellings within the District. Policy requires that development proposals are directed to where sustainable travel patterns can be achieved, should minimise the need to travel by private car and maximise opportunity for walking, cycling and public transport. This site can be considered to be sustainable in relation to transport and access to services.

7.2.2 Given the location of this development within the urban area, within an established residential area, within reasonable walking distance to services and open space, and having access to sustainable forms of transport, the development of this site for housing is supported in principle, subject to detailed matters being acceptable.

7.3 Housing Land Supply

7.3.1 Paragraph 14 of the NPPF sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Where the development plan is out of date, or the local planning authority does not have a 5 year housing land supply, permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole or specific policies in the NPPF indicate development should be restricted.

7.3.2 In October 2017 Lancaster City Council published a 5 year housing land supply position. Based on the adopted housing requirement of 400 dwellings per annum the housing land supply is 4 years. As a consequence there is a clear expectation that unless material considerations imply otherwise, sites that offer the opportunity for housing delivery should be considered favourably.

7.4 Housing Mix

7.4.1 Policy DM41 of the Development Management DPD requires that new residential development must provide an appropriate dwelling mix in accordance with the Lancaster District Housing Needs Survey or other robust evidence of local housing need. The proposed development is for 6 2-bed flats. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (Part II) published in February 2018 identified for Lancaster South a need of 1600 dwellings, 33% of which is identified for the house type "flats", and majority of the general need is identified to be for 1/2 bed dwellings. As such the delivery of 6 2-bed flats would still assist in delivering a balanced housing market.

7.5 Highways safety

7.5.1 Policy DM35 requires that developments incorporate suitable and safe access to the existing highway network, provide for parking in accordance with Policy DM22 and Appendix D, and design

schemes that reduce the negative impacts of cars. The proposal seeks to utilise the existing vehicular access and create a new pedestrian access.

- 7.5.2 Public objection to the proposal has raised concern of adverse highways impacts arising from the insufficient parking provision, resulting in the potential for overspill parking off-site. Furthermore concerns have been raised about the use of the existing access and potential conflict of pedestrians/cyclists/vehicles on the narrow Westbourne Road.
- 7.5.3 The case officer raised concerns with County Highways in relation to the intensification of use of the existing access as a result of the development. From the site visit it was considered that the visibility was constrained in both directions by the existing boundary walls. When measuring 2.4m back from the carriageway, visibility appeared to be significantly impaired.
- 7.5.4 Following further consideration, County Highways has advised that "*The existing access complies with the requisite design guide standards such as to accommodate an increased frequency of vehicles movements from the adjacent public highways onto Sunny Hill Lane*" and that the visibility splays are in excess of 43m. Therefore, notwithstanding the concerns raised by the public objectors and by the case officer, County Highways does not have any objection to the increased use of this access making it difficult to substantiate a reason for refusal on highway grounds. Due to the attractive character of the boundary walls and the walls to the right being outside of the control of the applicant, it is not possible to improve the sight lines to increase visibility.
- 7.5.5 Appendix B of the Development Management DPD sets out the maximum car parking standards. For 2-bed dwellings the standard is a maximum of 2 car parking spaces. The amended proposal provides for 6 parking spaces and 1 visitor space. Previous plans considered have shown a higher and lower provision number of parking spaces. The amendments as they relate to parking provision have sought to address both the highway safety issues. It is considered that a reduced provision can be accepted in this location due to the proximity of the site to the city centre (0.75km) and the railway station (c0.5km). County Highways considered the parking level to be adequate for this location where a condition requiring agreement to an off-site highways improvement scheme for the provision of a bus stop is made. However, the number 11 bus that serves the residential areas to the west of the city centre from the bus station only has 2 bus stops on Westbourne Road, according to County's transport maps, and the application site sits virtually half way between them (350m and 365m to the west and east respectively). Therefore not only is their request disproportionate for the size of the amended proposal, but the bus stops relate poorly to the application site.
- 7.5.6 The cycle storage standards require a maximum of 12 bicycle spaces and 6 communal spaces. The proposal includes the provision of 6 spaces to be wall mounted on the elevation facing Westbourne Road. The provision is less than half the required standards and given the reduced number of parking spaces this provision should be higher. However, the size of the development plot and the requirement to provide adequate bin storage means that it is difficult to provide additional storage. The original proposal showed 16 spaces, and the subsequently revised scheme showed 12. The scheme was further reduced to provide for a bin store adjacent to the building rather than sited adjacent to the access where its positioning was undesirable in relation to traffic flow and amenity of the lane. It is considered that it is difficult with the current building footprint and parking requirements to provide any additional cycle parking spaces. It is considered that the proposal is therefore contrary to requirements for cycle storage and that this has an adverse impact on the sustainability of the scheme. It is also considered that a more secure solution would be preferable, especially with the introduction of the pedestrian access.
- 7.5.7 The amended scheme shows a pedestrian access within the existing boundary wall onto Westbourne Road. This is in response to objections relating to the conflict of pedestrians and vehicles at the access. County Highways has not provided comment on this pedestrian access. Whilst it is considered that the location of this access is less than ideal as it would lead to the bins and the cycle storage area, it is considered that this addition to the scheme has helped to increase pedestrian safety.
- 7.5.8 County Highways has requested a number of other conditions. This includes a condition to implement the agreed parking layout. Such a condition would meet the tests of the NPPF (paragraph 206) as the parking is essential to the acceptability of the scheme. The condition relating to construction traffic management is dealt with through separate legislation and therefore would not meet the test of the NPPF.

7.5.9 County Highways position makes it difficult to substantiate a reason for refusal on the basis of the intensification of the existing access. A reduced number of car parking spaces can be accepted given its sustainable location. Likewise, whilst more cycle storage would be preferable, the scale of the development and the limitation of the site does not allow for the provision of more spaces.

7.6 **Trees and Impact on Conservation Area**

7.6.1 The site falls within the Conservation Area which is in part characterised for its wooded character. There are several Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) that affect trees within the site. T1 and T14 are protected by TPOs nos. 376 (2005) and 118 (1987). Trees within the site are now subject to a group TPO (no. 648 (2018)), which includes the group of 7 trees around the garage, a group 3 trees adjacent to T1, a group of 3 in the south west corner of the site and 2 trees which fall with the garden of The Knoll on the boundary. In addition any trees over 75mm in diameter (as measured 1.3m above ground level) are protected as they are in a Conservation Area. The designation of these trees means that they are considered to have an amenity value that is worth protecting.

7.6.2 It should be noted that in 2010 a refusal of a Tree Works application was partly allowed and partly dismissed at appeal. Appeal decision APP/TPO/A2335/911 allowed for the felling of 6 trees but required the retention of T14. The felling of the 6 trees was allowed subject to a requirement to replant 3 oak and 3 holly trees in specified locations. The trees have been felled but the replacement planting has not occurred.

7.6.3 Policy DM29 supports the protection of trees which positively contribute, as individuals or groups, to the amenity and/or environmental value of the area. Development should positively incorporate existing trees within the new development. Where this cannot be achieved the loss must be adequately justified and any loss replaced at a ratio of 3 new trees for each 1 lost.

7.6.4 Objections have been received from the Tree Protection Officer, the Conservation Officer and from the public in relation to the loss of the protected trees and the lack of substantial replanting. Concern from the public has been raised to the biodiversity losses that would result from their removal.

7.6.5 This proposal seeks to remove all of the trees from the site. The submitted AIA concludes that the trees are either category C or U and that their removal to accommodate the development can be accepted on this basis. The assessment also states that visual appeal of the T1 and long term coexistence in its location means that its TPO is not defensible. A further separate statement from another Tree Consultant advises that in their opinion T1 has limited public amenity due to it being viewed only from a short section of road and states that the proposed development would mean that the tree cannot be preserved. The AIA does not make assessment of the impact of the revised parking on T14, and fails to consider the protected status of the trees in the assessment, and also fails to include the required replanting of 3 holly trees from the 2010 appeal. A number of statements have been submitted by the agent in relation to the trees which set out a position that challenges whether the trees on the site are worthy of the TPO status and questions the amenity value of the trees and their contribution to the area.

7.6.6 The Tree Protection Officer has submitted an objection to the proposed removal of all of the trees, and has recently refused a Tree Works Application for the site which resulted in the creation and designation of the most recent TPO. It is the Tree Protection Officer's view that the trees have an amenity level that merits TPO designation and the loss of the trees would be harmful to the appearance and character of the Conservation Area. Furthermore, the proposed replacement planting scheme, taking into account the replanting required as part of APP/TPO/A2335/911, is considered not to meet the terms of the appeal decision and would only result in 2 additional trees and a hedgerow, falling significantly short of the required replacement ratio of 3:1.

7.6.7 Having considered the information submitted by the agent, the two tree consultants employed by the agent, and the Tree Protection Officer's comments, and having carried out a site visit, it is considered that the existing trees have a high level of amenity value that contributes to the appearance and character of the Conservation Area, and to the identified characteristic of the area of large properties in mature landscaped plots. The proposed development does include planting but this would not meet in full the requirements of the terms of the 2010 appeal and would fall well short of the required planting of 33 trees. In addition any future trees would be under future pressure as they would overshadow the principle rooms of the flats.

7.6.8 Amended plans have been submitted, but none of these plans, have sought to reduce the tree losses or retain the protected Yew Tree. The degree of loss of existing trees is considered to be unacceptable, and the degree of replacement planting insufficient to overcome it. Whilst the level of replanting at 1:3 at this site may be difficult to achieve with any proposal, it is possible to develop the site whilst retaining trees within this site, and providing more substantial replanting. However, this would require a much reduced proposal in terms of number of dwellings, footprint and scale. Overall the proposal would lead to unjustified loss of protected trees, resulting in less than substantial harm to the Cannon Hill Conservation Area.

7.7 Residential Amenity

7.7.1 Policy DM35 sets out the key design principles which new development should address. The following assessment addresses the amenity of the proposed units, and the impact on neighbouring properties.

7.7.2 Currently there are no standards for new flat accommodation in the Development Plan. At a national level there are the "Technical housing standards – Nationally described space standard". It is proposed that these will be adopted as part of the emerging plan. For 2 bed homes with 3 bed spaces the minimum gross internal floor area (GIA) is 61sqm with 2sqm of built in storage. 4 flats are 62sqm and 2 flats are 61sqm so just meeting the overall GIA requirement. The internal built in storage for each of the units is 1sqm and therefore does not meet the required 2sqm. The width and total floor area of the single and double bedrooms just meet requirements. Overall the scheme just meets the required specifications but fails to meet the internal storage requirements. An additional 1sqm could be provided within the double bedrooms or hallway to meet this requirements. It is considered that this could be dealt with through an amendment to the plans. A verbal update will be provided to Committee should amended plans be submitted.

7.7.3 Concern was raised about the level of outlook and overshadowing of the bedrooms on the ground floor. The levels of the site mean that these bedrooms would look out onto a 3.5m high retaining wall. Generally an acceptable distance to a blank elevation is 10m. The scheme has been amended to try and address these issues by including pulling the building back from the retaining wall to increase the distance by 1.2m, but angling the windows and by including an area of planting in the retaining wall to soften the views. Despite these amendments the degree of overshadowing and overbearingness on the ground floor bedrooms is significantly adverse that it can be considered unacceptable.

7.7.4 In relation to the neighbouring properties, the original proposal was considered to have an unacceptable impact on the amenity of The Knoll from overlooking. The proposal included 8 windows and 13 roof lights looking towards the garden of the property within close proximity of the boundary. The amended scheme has sought to address this by reducing the numbers of windows, altering the internal floor levels relative to the height of the Velux rooflights and angling windows to prevent direct looking. It is considered that these amendments have reduced the impact on The Knoll to a degree that can be considered acceptable.

7.7.5 The close proximity of the development to 1 Sunny Hill means that there is a potential impact from overlooking. The Sunny Hill elevation shows 3 bathroom windows facing directly towards the neighbouring residential property. This impact could be mitigated by a condition to require that windows are fixed and obscure glazed. The impact of the front elevation windows is more difficult to overcome. The first and second floor windows would afford views into the garden of Sunny Hill. This garden is already overlooked by the neighbouring 2 Sunny Hill, but this proposal would increase the degree of overlooking and further reduce the remaining privacy of the garden.

7.7.6 There are no specific standards relating to external amenity for flats. However, as a general rule 9sqm for external amenity/drying area is required for flat conversions. For dwelling houses this is 50sqm. Policy DM35 relating to design requires that proposals should have regard to local distinctiveness in siting and layout and create appropriate outdoor spaces for proposed occupiers. The proposals have been amended to increase the external amenity area by reducing the level of parking and hard surfacing to account for this, which has improved the scheme. However, overall the level of external amenity space does not reflect the density of development in the area which is for single dwelling houses in large soft landscaped plots.

- 7.7.7 The positioning, distance and orientation of the proposal to the neighbouring Westwood and Westlands would mean that there would be no harm to residential amenity as a result of the proposal.
- 7.7.8 In summary, the residential amenity of the ground floor flats is unacceptable and the proposal would result in overlooking of Sunny Hill garden that cannot be mitigated by the proposed holly trees. Further mature planting could overcome this but would not be possible on the current layout and would have additional impacts of further overshadowing the proposed flats.
- 7.8 **Scale and design, and impact on Conservation Area**
- 7.8.1 Policy DM35 requires that new development should make a positive contribution to the surrounding landscape. Policy DM31 permits only development that preserves or enhances the character of the Conservation Area. This reflects the provision of the Town and Country Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act. A key characteristic of the Cannon Hill Conservation Area is its fortuitous aesthetic of dwellings situated within large landscaped plots and its wooded character. Policy DM32 requires that the setting of designated heritage assets is preserved and enhanced.
- 7.8.2 The original scheme was identified to be unacceptable in scale and design. Whilst the proposal sought to use high quality materials the height, footprint, proximity to the boundary, loss of trees and green space, fenestration and lack of design details would have resulted in a proposal that would result in less than substantial harm to the Conservation Area.
- 7.8.3 The proposal has been amended to reduce the number of flats from 8 to 6, to reduce the number of parking spaces from 9 to 7, to increase the amenity space within the site and space for planting. The height of the building has been reduced by 0.75m and the building has been moved from the rear retaining wall by 1.2m. However, the overall footprint has been retained. The design of the scheme has also been altered to break down the elevation into two sections, include a peaked gable and reduced the number of windows and rooflights.
- 7.8.4 The scheme is certainly an improvement on the original proposal, but the overall scale and footprint of the dwelling would still result in the overdevelopment of the site. The design of the scheme uses high quality materials but would still be of a design which is not reflective of the character of the area, particularly in relation to the amount and design of the fenestration, including the projecting rear windows and the central glazing element and porch, and the split roof form. Policy requires that development in a Conservation Area should be of a high standard to ensure the preservation and enhancement of the Conservation Area, particularly in a prominent road side location. The proposal would result in less than substantial harm to the Conservation Area that could be avoided by a much reduced scheme.
- 7.9 **Air quality**
- 7.9.1 Policy DM35 requires that proposals minimise the impacts on air quality. The Council's Low Emission and Air Quality Planning Advisory Note (PAN) sets out mitigation required for certain types of proposals. This site is located within close proximity to the Lancaster Air Quality Management Area (AQMA), and any traffic entering and exiting the site would need to travel through the AQMA.
- 7.9.2 The size of the scheme means that it falls below the threshold requirement for an Air Quality Assessment, but the location of the scheme means in relation to the highway network will mean that the proposal will have a potential to increase the levels of pollution in the AQMA.
- 7.9.3 The PAN requires for sites which are below the threshold but will affect the AQMA to mitigate their air quality impacts, including the control of construction emissions. Environmental Health has objected on the grounds that no scheme for mitigation has been submitted with the application.
- 7.9.4 In discussion with the Environmental Health Officer it was identified that the provision of 2 electric vehicle charging points and a method statement for construction dust control would overcome the objection. Subject to an appropriate condition to require the submission and agreement of details of the former prior to the commencement of development, the proposal would be considered acceptable in relation to air quality. The latter requirement is covered by other legislation.
- 7.10 **Surface water and foul drainage**
- 7.10.1 Policy DM39 requires that new development should seek to demonstrate that there is no increase in on and off site surface water run-off. The sustainable drainage hierarchy as set out in Paragraph

80 of the NPPF requires that surface water is drained in the most sustainable way and must demonstrate why more sustainable methods are not feasible. The most sustainable way is to a watercourse, then infiltration, then to a surface water drain and lastly where no other option are possible connection into the public sewer.

- 7.10.2 United Utilities has commented that conditions should be applied to any permission to require that foul and surface water are drained on separate systems, and that a surface water drainage scheme accords with the sustainable drainage hierarchy. Details must include adequate proposals for maintenance and management of the proposed surface water drainage system.
- 7.10.3 In relation to surface water drainage, no information has been submitted to demonstrate why the only option at this site is to drain into the public sewer, and no detailed drainage plans have been provided to show how this will drain on a separate system for the whole site or ensure that the rate of run off is limited to 5 litres per second into the public sewer. It is considered that this could be adequately dealt with a pre-commencement condition requiring the submission of a detailed surface water drainage scheme (which is separate from the foul drainage) and scheme for the management/maintenance of the agreed system.
- 7.10.4 In relation to foul drainage the application states that foul and surface water will drain into a private system and then connect into the public sewer. Indicative plans have been provided of this which show both the foul and surface water in the same system. Subject to a condition requiring the final details of a separate foul drainage system on site, the proposal can be considered acceptable in relation to foul drainage.

8.0 Planning Obligations

- 8.1 There are no planning obligations to consider as part of this application.

9.0 Conclusions

- 9.1 This proposal would deliver 6 homes within a part of the urban area of Lancaster that would reduce the need to travel and help to meet the outstanding housing needs of the District. The type and size of homes would meet the identified need for the Lancaster South area and the location can be considered to be sustainable.
- 9.2 National and local planning policy applies a presumption in favour of sustainable housing development in location where there the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply. Planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the requirements of the NPPF taken as a whole.
- 9.3 In this case it is considered that the proposal represents unacceptable overdevelopment of the site. The scale of the proposal in terms of massing, footprint and the number of dwellings proposed relative to the size of the site results in the unjustified loss of trees and inadequate re-planting, unacceptable levels of amenity for the two ground floor bedrooms, and a disproportionate retained area of soft landscaping in comparison to neighbouring residential plots. In addition the design of the proposal would detract from the appearance and character of the Conservation Area. Cumulatively the scale of the development would result in less than substantial harm to the Conservation Area which could not be justified, and unacceptable levels of amenity for the ground floor flats. It is considered that these impacts are significantly adverse that it cannot be outweighed by the benefits of delivering 6 homes on this site.

Recommendation

That Planning Permission **BE REFUSED** for the following reason:

1. The siting, scale and design of the proposed building and parking area results in the unjustified loss of trees and inadequate re-planting, unacceptable levels of amenity for the two ground floor flat bedrooms, and a disproportionate retained area of soft landscaping in comparison to neighbouring residential plots that results in harmful overdevelopment of the site that fails to preserve and enhance the Cannon Hill Conservation Area and results in less than substantial harm that is not outweighed by the benefits of the provision of housing. The proposal is therefore considered to be

contrary to National Planning Policy Framework Paragraphs 14, 49, 64 and 133, and Development Management Development Plan Document Policies DM29, DM31 and DM35.

Article 35. Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015

In accordance with the above legislation, the City Council can confirm the following:

Lancaster City Council takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals, in the interests of delivering sustainable development. As part of this approach the Council offers a pre-application service, aimed at positively influencing development proposals. Regrettably the applicant has failed to take advantage of this service and the resulting proposal is unacceptable for the reasons prescribed in the Notice. The applicant is encouraged to utilise the pre-application service prior to the submission of any future planning applications, in order to engage with the local planning authority to attempt to resolve the reasons for refusal.

Background Papers

None.

Agenda Item A6	Committee Date 4 June 2018	Application Number 18/00421//VLA
Application Site Land Off Sycamore Road Brookhouse Lancashire	Proposal Variation of legal agreement attached to planning permission 14/00270/OUT to alter the affordable housing provisions	
Name of Applicant Oakmere Homes	Name of Agent Mr Daniel Hughes	
Decision Target Date 19 May 2018	Reason For Delay Committee cycle	
Case Officer	Mrs Jennifer Rehman	
Departure	N/A	
Summary of Recommendation	Approve	

1.0 The Site and its Surroundings

1.1 The site that is the subject of this application relates to a previously existing property (47 Sycamore Road – since demolished) and the adjoining field to the west. The site is accessed via Sycamore Road within the village of Brookhouse located in the Forest of Bowland AONB and the District's Countryside Area. The site is surrounding by existing residential development to the east and south and open agricultural land to the north and partly to the west where land is also used for equestrian purposes. The development has commenced on site.

2.0 The Proposal

2.1 This is an application made under s106A(1)(a) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to modify terms of the original planning obligation. The applicant is seeking to insert an additional clause (relating to the affordable housing provision) within the original obligation associated with planning permission 14/00270/OUT.

2.2 The additional clause allows the Council and developer/owner to agree a revised alternative affordable housing scheme in the event a registered provider cannot be secured to deliver the agreed affordable housing units.

3.0 Site History

3.1 The relevant planning history is set out below:

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
14/00270/OUT	Outline application for the demolition of existing bungalow and erection of up to 31 dwellings	Approved
17/00730/REM	Reserved Matters application for the erection of 22 dwellings	Approved

17/00925/RCN	Application to removal condition 4 of 14/00270/OUT relating to off-site highway works.	Approved
17/00924/VLA	Variation of legal agreement attached to planning permission 14/00270/OUT to remove the obligation relating to the allotment contribution.	Approved

4.0 Consultation Responses

4.1 The Council's Strategic Housing Officer has raised no objections during pre-application discussion and in relation to the draft Deed of Variation which will be required if this proposal is approved.

5.0 Neighbour Representations

5.1 Not applicable.

6.0 Principal National and Development Plan Policies

6.1 National Planning Policy Framework
Paragraph 50 – Wide choice of high quality homes
Paragraphs 203 – 206 Planning conditions and obligations

Development Management DPD
DM41 – New Residential Development
DM48 – Community Infrastructure

Other Considerations
National Planning Practice Guidance
Meeting Housing Needs Supplementary Planning Document (2013)

7.0 Comment and Analysis

7.1 An application under s106A(1)(a) provides for a discharge or modification of a planning obligation by agreement with the Local Planning Authority and the person or persons against whom the obligation is enforceable. There is no specific time period under section 106 A (1)(a), so this can be done at any time with agreement but must be executed as a formal deed (i.e. by legal agreement).

7.2 The applicant had agreed an affordable housing scheme pursuant to the terms of the original obligation. Specifically, this required the owner (applicant) to provide up to 40% affordable housing units unless at reserved matters stage it becomes apparent to the owner that the abnormal costs of developing the site prohibit the delivery of a viable form of development.

7.3 A viability case has previously been advanced by the applicant and at the reserved matters stage an affordable housing provision equivalent to 18% was accepted by the Council. This was confirmed to Members in our recommendation for the reserved matters application, which was reported to Planning Committee on 21 August 2017. The agreed affordable housing scheme comprises 2 1-bed affordable rented units, 1 2-bed shared ownership unit and 1 3-bed shared ownership unit.

7.4 Following the approval of the reserved matters application and agreement of the above affordable housing provision, the applicant later contacted the local planning authority to inform Officers that they were having difficulties attracting a registered provider (RP) to purchase and deliver the affordable rented units. Officers advised the applicant that there were no provisions within the existing obligation to amend the previously agreed affordable housing scheme after the point of approval of reserved matters.

7.5 At the pre-application stage, the applicant produced evidence to demonstrate the lack of RP interest for the rented units. This information comprised private communication between a number of RPs and the applicant. The evidence indicates that the main reasons for the lack of interest related to the fact it is only two rented units on offer; a preference for different house types/sizes from those identified as the affordable units, and; that some of the RPs did not have capacity to bid for future s106 proposals. These reasons are not a surprise to Officers. We know through past experience

that RPs all have their own criteria for assessing proposals, that some are not keen on delivering mixed tenure schemes and the larger RPs are unlikely to take on a small number of units because of management costs and general economies of scale involved.

- 7.6 The submitted application is supported by the same evidence and is considered sufficient to warrant consideration to the inclusion of a new clause within the planning obligation to allow the developer and Council to renegotiate a further revised alternative affordable housing scheme. Officers are of the opinion that the main consideration here is that the obligation still serves a useful planning purpose and that any agreed affordable housing is actually deliverable. There is little use in having provisions within a planning obligation that cannot be met resulting in affordable homes being undeliverable. On this basis, Officers support the applicant's proposed modifications to the obligation to allow for the insertion of an additional clause to allow renegotiations to the affordable housing scheme in the event an RP cannot be secured. This additional clause is not intended to provide opportunities to open further viability negotiations for the developer to reduce the overall provision of affordable units on the site (18%). The affordable housing scheme can only be renegotiated on the grounds that an RP cannot be secured.
- 7.7 In light of the evidence presented, it is apparent that if the applicant cannot attract an RP for the rented units that the likely outcome of a revised affordable housing scheme would be for all four units to be delivered as intermediate homes (shared ownership). This has already been a scenario presented at the pre-application stage and again as part of this submission. Subsequently, at the pre-application stage the impacts of this change on development viability were also assessed. The application has been supported with a viability appraisal assuming four intermediate units. This sufficiently evidences that the development could not viably support an increase in the overall number of affordable homes from four units to five units in light of adjustments to the assumed values of the amended affordable units.

8.0 Planning Obligations

- 8.1 A formal deed is required to insert an additional clause into Paragraph 1) a) of the Third Schedule to enable the owner and the Council to agree a revised alternative affordable housing scheme in the event a registered provider cannot be found to purchase the agreed affordable housing scheme.

9.0 Conclusion and Recommendation.

- 9.1 An application to modify the obligation under s106A 1(a) can only be done by agreement between the authority whom the obligation is enforced and the person or persons against whom the obligation is enforceable. If Members did not allow the modification for the insertion of the proposed clause, the obligation cannot be varied. However, for the reasons set out above, Members are recommended to accept the proposed modifications to the obligation in the interests of creating optimal conditions to secure a deliverable affordable housing scheme.

Article 35. Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015

In accordance with the above legislation, the City Council can confirm the following:

Officers have made this recommendation in a positive and proactive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development, working proactively with the applicant to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. The recommendation has been taken having had regard to the impact of development, and in particular to the relevant policies contained in the Development Plan, as presented in the officer report, and to all relevant material planning considerations, including the National Planning Policy Framework, National Planning Practice Guidance and relevant Supplementary Planning Documents/ Guidance.

Background Papers

None

Agenda Item A7	Committee Date 4 June 2018	Application Number 18/00406/FUL
Application Site 8 Levens Close Lancaster Lancashire LA1 5UL	Proposal Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of two storey rear extension	
Name of Applicant Mr & Mrs Machell	Name of Agent Mr Sam Edge	
Decision Target Date 24 May 2018	Reason For Delay Committee Cycle	
Case Officer	Mr Robert Clarke	
Departure	No	
Summary of Recommendation	Approval	

Procedural Matters

The proposed development would normally fall within the scheme of delegation. However, Councillor Jon Barry has requested that the application be reported to the Planning Committee on grounds of the development’s impacts upon residential amenity.

1.0 The Site and its Surroundings

- 1.1 The application site is located in the Abraham Heights area of Lancaster, close to the western extent of Fairfield Millennium Green. The site is unallocated in the Lancaster District Local Plan Proposals Map.
- 1.2 8 Levens Close is a detached two storey dwellinghouse featuring a brown brick exterior underneath a concrete tile pitched roof with white uPVC windows are installed throughout. To the front elevation is a driveway and lean to porch whilst to the rear is a conservatory and a 120m² rear garden enclosed by 1.8m fencing.

2.0 The Proposal

- 2.1 This application seeks consent for the demolition of the existing rear conservatory and the erection of a two storey extension in its place. The proposed extension will measure 3.8m in depth, 3.3m in width and have a hipped roof with a maximum ridge height of 6m. The extension will be finished with matching brick, concrete roof tiles and white uPVC windows.

3.0 Site History

- 3.1 One previous application has been received by the Local Planning Authority.

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
17/00517/FUL	Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of a two storey rear extension	Approved

4.0 Consultation Responses

4.1 No statutory/non-statutory consultees were required to be consulted as part of this application.

5.0 Neighbour Representations

5.1 Two letters of objection have been received objecting to the proposal on the following planning grounds: scale, overdevelopment, overbearing, out of character, loss of privacy and loss of daylight.

6.0 Principal National and Development Plan Policies

6.1 Local Planning Policy Overview – Current Position

At the 20 December 2017 meeting of its Full Council, the local authority resolved to publish the following 2 Development Plan Documents (DPD) for submission to the Planning Inspectorate:

- (i) The Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD; and,
- (ii) A Review of the Development Management DPD.

This enables progress to be made on the preparation of a Local Plan for the Lancaster District. The DPDs were published on the 9 February for an 8 week consultation in preparation for submission to the Planning Inspectorate for independent Examination. If an Inspector finds that the submitted DPDs have been soundly prepared they may be adopted by the Council, potentially in late 2018.

The **Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD** will replace the remaining policies of the Lancaster District Core Strategy (2008) and the residual 'saved' land allocation policies from the 2004 District Local Plan. Following the Council resolution in December 2017, it is considered that the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD is a material consideration in decision-making, although with limited weight. The weight attributed to this DPD will increase as the plan's preparation progresses through the stages described above.

The **Review of the Development Management DPD** updates the policies that are contained within the current document, which was adopted in December 2014. As it is part of the development plan the current document is already material in terms of decision-making. Where any policies in the draft 'Review' document are different from those adopted in 2014, and those policies materially affect the consideration of the planning application, then these will be taken into account during decision-making, although again with limited weight. The weight attributed to the revised policies in the 'Review' will increase as the plan's preparation progresses through the stages described above.

6.2 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Paragraph **7, 12, 14, 17** – Sustainable Development and Core Principles
Paragraphs **56-64** – Requiring Good Design

6.3 Development Management DPD

DM35 – Key Design Principles

6.4 Lancaster District Core Strategy (adopted July 2008)

SC5 – Achieving Quality in Design

7.0 Comment and Analysis

7.1 The key considerations in the assessment of this application are:

- General design
- Impacts on residential amenity

7.2 General Design

7.2.1 The principal of a two storey rear extension has already been established on this site through application 17/00517/FUL. This application is a resubmission of the approved scheme and features an amended footprint. The proposed extension features a small hipped roof arrangement which matches the previously approved scheme. This roof arrangement ensures that the massing of the proposed extension is reduced, and as such is considered to appear as a subservient addition to the rear of this dwelling. The increased depth at first floor height of 1.1m is of a relatively small scale and does not serve to unbalance or otherwise cause harm to the appearance of the original dwelling. The application site benefits from a good sized domestic garden of 120m², so the construction of an extension measuring 12.5m² in floor area is not deemed to constitute overdevelopment of the site. It is also noted that the proposed extension is to replace an existing conservatory. The use of matching brickwork, roofing tiles and finishing details will ensure that the development respects the character of the surrounding built form. A condition requiring the use of matching materials is recommended. On this basis, the design of the proposed extension is considered to be acceptable.

7.3 **Impacts on residential amenity**

7.3.1 The previously approved extension featured a stepped footprint (reduced depth) at first floor level. This revised scheme has a matching ground and first floor depth. In order to mitigate the increase in depth the extension has also been moved 0.8m away from the shared boundary with No. 6 Levens Close. Strong objections regarding the scale and resulting overbearing presence of the extension have been received from neighbouring residents. The relocation of the extension 0.8m away from the shared boundary with No. 6 combined with the small hipped roof arrangement serves to mitigate the potential overbearing presence of the extension upon the rear garden of No. 6 whilst the outlook that is currently available from the rear elevation windows of No. 6 will be retained. As a result the proposed extension is considered not to have an excessively overbearing presence upon this closest neighbour.

7.3.2 Concerns have been raised regarding the potential of the proposed development to reduce daylight levels serving No. 6. The rear gardens of these properties benefit from being south facing with the development site being located to the east of No. 6. The proposed development does not extend over the 45 degree line for the closest rear elevation windows at ground and first floor level of No. 6. As such, although the proposed development is likely to result in a degree of daylight reduction, given the orientation of these properties and the fact that the development will not impinge upon the 45 degree rule, the reduction in daylight is considered not to be excessive.

7.3.3 Neighbouring residents are concerned about the potential for the development to impact upon existing privacy levels. At present the rear garden of the application site is enclosed by 1.8m fencing. This is considered to ensure that views from ground floor windows are restricted, ensuring adequate privacy is maintained. A condition requiring the 1.8m fence currently forming the western shared boundary with No. 6 Levens Close to be retained is recommended. The rear gardens of the properties on Levens Close already experience a degree of overlooking due to the presence of first floor windows. The rear garden of No. 37 Leighton Drive is also overlooked from the rear elevation windows of the properties on Levens Close due to its location immediately to the south. The views of neighbouring garden spaces achieved from the proposed first floor window of the extension are considered not to be significantly more intrusive than those already achieved. The occupants of No. 37 Leighton Drive are concerned that direct views to their rear elevation windows will result in significant reductions to privacy. It is acknowledged that although the extension will reduce the separation distance between these windows to 13.6m – as opposed to 16.5m – given the existing levels of overlooking and the oblique angles between these properties, it is considered that acceptable levels of privacy will be retained.

7.3.4 The development also proposes the implementation of a first floor side elevation window to serve a new study room. It is proposed to use obscure glazing to this window to prevent direct overlooking of No. 6. The use of obscure glazing to this window is considered acceptable given the room is to be used as a study, as opposed to a habitable room, such as a bedroom.

8.0 **Planning Obligations**

8.1 There are no planning obligations to consider as part of this application.

9.0 Conclusions

9.1 This application is a resubmission of a previously approved two storey rear extension. The amended proposed two storey rear extension is considered acceptable in terms of scale, location and design. The use of a hipped roof arrangement and its location away from the shared boundary is considered to ensure the development does result in an excessively overbearing presence on the neighbouring property. Furthermore, the extension will not impinge upon the rear elevation windows of the neighbouring property, and as such acceptable levels of daylight will be retained. Due to existing levels of mutual overlooking the construction of the proposed extension will not result in a loss of privacy.

Recommendation

That Planning Permission **BE GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard three year timescale
2. Development to be in accordance with the approved plans
3. Materials used to match those of the rear elevation of the property
4. Obscure glazing to the first floor side elevation study room window
5. Retention of the western boundary fence

Article 35, Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015

Lancaster City Council has made the recommendation in a positive and proactive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development, working proactively with the applicant to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. The recommendation has been taken having had regard to the impact of development, and in particular to the relevant policies contained in the Development Plan, as presented in full in the officer report, and to all relevant material planning considerations, including the National Planning Policy Framework, National Planning Practice Guidance and relevant Supplementary Planning Documents/ Guidance.

Background Papers

None

<p>Agenda Item</p> <p>A8</p>	<p>Committee Date</p> <p>4 June 2018</p>	<p>Application Number</p> <p>18/00308/FUL</p>
<p>Application Site</p> <p>1 Downham Cottages Chapel Lane Galgate Lancaster</p>		<p>Proposal</p> <p>Erection of a two storey side extension</p>
<p>Name of Applicant</p> <p>Mr & Mrs J Barnes</p>		<p>Name of Agent</p> <p>Greg Gilding</p>
<p>Decision Target Date</p> <p>8 May 2018</p>		<p>Reason For Delay</p> <p>Committee Cycle</p>
<p>Case Officer</p>		<p>Mr Sam Robinson</p>
<p>Departure</p>		<p>No</p>
<p>Summary of Recommendation</p>		<p>Refusal</p>

Procedural Matters

This form of development would normally be dealt with under the Scheme of Delegation. However, Councillor Helen Helme has requested that the application be reported to the Planning Committee on grounds of the proposal would not harm the adjacent Listed building.

1.0 The Site and its Surroundings

- 1.1 1 Downham Cottages is a domestic end terraced property comprised rendered walls underneath a slate roof with uPVC windows and doors installed throughout. It forms part of the Crofter’s Fold development, though fronts onto Chapel Lane. The property features a front, side and rear garden circa with a detached outbuilding located towards the southern elevation. A small stone boundary is located at the front with timber fence panels making up the rear boundaries.
- 1.2 The local area comprises the Methodist Church, the Grade II Listed Galgate Silk Mill, and a number of residential properties, including the Grade II Listed Chapel Cottage immediately to the south of the site on land about 1m lower than that of 1 Downham Cottages.
- 1.3 The site is designated as Countryside Area in the Land Allocations DPD which forms part of the emerging Local Plan.

2.0 The Proposal

- 2.1 The proposal is for a two storey side extension. It is proposed to feature a splayed footprint and gable roof and measures approximately 4.15m in width when measured from the front elevation, 6.45m in depth with a maximum height of 6.65m. It would be finished with rendered walls, underneath a slate roof with uPVC windows. Landscaping, boundary treatments and access to the site will remain the same.

3.0 Site History

3.1 A number of relevant planning applications relating to this site have previously been received by the Local Planning Authority. These include:

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
17/01540/FUL	Erection of a two storey side extension	Refused

4.0 Consultation Responses

4.1 The following responses have been received from statutory and non-statutory consultees:

Consultee	Response
Parish Council	No Objection
Conservation Officer	Objection – The proposal would have an over dominant effect on the immediate setting of the heritage asset.

5.0 Neighbour Representations

5.1 One objection has been received citing that the reasons for refusal on the previous application have not been addressed.

6.0 Principal National and Development Plan Policies

6.1 National Planning Policy Framework

The National Planning Policy Framework indicates that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development (**paragraph 14**). The following paragraphs of the NPPF are relevant to the determination of this proposal:

Paragraph 17 – 12 Core Principles

Paragraph 56 and 57 – Requiring Good Design

Paragraph 132 – Impact on Designated Heritage Asset

Paragraph 134 – Less Than Substantial Harm to the Designated Heritage Asset

6.2 Local Planning Policy Overview – Current Position

At the 20 December 2017 meeting of its Full Council, the local authority resolved to publish the following 2 Development Plan Documents (DPD) for submission to the Planning Inspectorate:

- (i) The Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD; and,
- (ii) A Review of the Development Management DPD.

This enables progress to be made on the preparation of a Local Plan for the Lancaster District. The DPDs were published on the 9 February for an 8 week consultation in preparation for submission to the Planning Inspectorate for independent Examination. If an Inspector finds that the submitted DPDs have been soundly prepared they may be adopted by the Council, potentially in late 2018.

The **Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD** will replace the remaining policies of the Lancaster District Core Strategy (2008) and the residual 'saved' land allocation policies from the 2004 District Local Plan. Following the Council resolution in December 2017, it is considered that the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD is a material consideration in decision-making, although with limited weight. The weight attributed to this DPD will increase as the plan's preparation progresses through the stages described above.

The **Review of the Development Management DPD** updates the policies that are contained within the current document, which was adopted in December 2014. As it is part of the development plan the current document is already material in terms of decision-making. Where any policies in the

draft 'Review' document are different from those adopted in 2014, and those policies materially affect the consideration of the planning application, then these will be taken into account during decision-making, although again with limited weight. The weight attributed to the revised policies in the 'Review' will increase as the plan's preparation progresses through the stages described above.

6.3 Development Management DPD

DM 30 – Development Affecting Listed Buildings
DM 32 – The Setting of Designated Heritage Assets
DM 35 – Key Design Principles

6.4 Lancaster District Core Strategy

SC1 – Sustainable Development
SC5 – Achieving Quality Design

7.0 Comment and Analysis

7.1 The key considerations in the assessment of this application are:

- General design
- Impacts upon residential amenity
- Impacts upon listed building

7.2 General Design

7.2.1 In terms of design, Policy DM35 of the DM DPD states that new development should make a positive contribution to the identity and character of the area through good design, having regard to local distinctiveness, appropriate siting, layout, palette of materials, separation distances, orientation and scale. DM35 carries on to say that development should make a positive contribution to the surrounding landscape or townscape and that it should ensure that there is no significant detrimental impact in relation to overshadowing, visual amenity, privacy, overlooking, massing and pollution.

7.2.2 When considering that the existing dwelling measures approximately 4.7m in width and that the proposed extension measures 4.15m, the dwelling is almost doubling in width. The proposed extension features a 0.6m set down from the ridge and 0.8m set back from the front elevation and whilst it is appreciated that the proposal has been scaled down since the previous application it is considered that the reduction would still significantly unbalance the row of four terrace properties. Whilst there may be some merit in pursuing a single storey side extension, the site is considered too narrow for the siting of a two storey side extension and is not thought to be appropriately sited or to be of an appropriate scale, and is tantamount to overdevelopment of the site.

7.3 Impacts Upon Residential Amenity

7.3.1 The proposed extension will be approximately 2.8m away from Chapel Cottage and 8m from the nearest property on Teesdale (no.8) and is approximately set in 1m from the southern boundary. Due to the siting of the proposed extension, it is considered that it would be located uncomfortably close to Chapel Cottage creating an overbearing and over-dominating feature especially when considering the higher land level of the application site. The separation distance to 8 Teesdale, whilst further than that of Chapel Cottage, is still within close proximity and the addition of a first floor window would allow for overlooking towards the private amenity space. As such it is considered that the proposal by reason of its siting, scale, separation distances and orientation would have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of nearby residential occupiers.

7.4 Impacts Upon Listed Building

7.4.1 Policy DM32 (The Setting of Designated Heritage Assets) of the DM DPD states that the Council recognises the significance of setting to a heritage asset and proposals that fail to preserve or enhance the setting of a designated heritage will not be supported by the Council. This reflects the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Listed building and Conservation Area) Act. This is further reinforced by Paragraph 132 of the NPPF which states that when considering the impact of

a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation.

7.4.2 As referenced above, to the south of the site is the Grade II Listed Chapel Cottage that is approximately 1m lower than the application site with the proposed extension approximately 2.8m away. When considering the combination of the distance from the proposed extension to the Listed building and the elevated position of the application site, the proposed extension is thought to have an over-dominant (detrimental) effect on the immediate setting of the heritage asset and this view is shared with the Conservation Officer.

7.4.3 Furthermore, paragraph 134 of the NPPF goes on to state where the proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal. This scheme as proposed would have a detrimental impact on the designated heritage asset by reason of its proximity and over-dominating effect without any public benefit to outweigh this harm. In fact, as discussed above, there is further harm.

8.0 Planning Obligations

8.1 There are no planning obligations to consider as part of this application.

9.0 Conclusions

9.1 For the reasons outlined above, it is considered that the proposal is contrary to policies DM30, DM32 and DM35 of the Development Management DPD, and to NPPF paragraphs 56 (good design), 57 (high quality inclusive design), 132 (impacts on designated heritage assets) and 134 (less than substantial harm to the designated heritage asset) and as such is recommended for refusal.

Recommendation

That Planning Permission **BE REFUSED** for the following reasons:

1. The application site is considered to be too narrow for the siting of a 4.15m wide, two storey side extension and by reason of this excessive width and overdevelopment of the site, the proposal would significantly unbalance the row of four terraced properties leading to an incongruous dwelling when viewed from the wider area. As such it is considered that the proposed development is contrary to Policy DM35 of the Development Management DPD and the provisions of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), paragraphs 17 and 56.
2. The proposed two storey extension would be inappropriately sited adjacent to the neighbouring properties, including the Grade II Listed Building of Chapel Cottage, by reason of its separation distance and elevated position of the application site. Consequently the development proposal is thought to have an over-dominant and overbearing effect on the immediate setting of the Listed Building and nearby residential occupiers. As such it is considered that the proposed development is contrary to Policy DM30, DM32 and DM35 of the Development Management DPD and the provisions of the NPPF, paragraphs 17, 56, 132 and 134.

Article 35, Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015

Lancaster City Council takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals, in the interests of delivering sustainable development. As part of this approach the Council has provided access, via its website, to detailed standing advice for householder development in the Lancaster District (the Householder Design Guide), in an attempt to positively influence development proposals. Regrettably the proposal fails to adhere to this document, or the policies of the Development Plan, for the reasons prescribed in the Notice. The applicant is encouraged to consult the Householder Design Guide prior to the submission of any future planning application.

Background Papers

None

Agenda Item A9	Committee Date 4 June 2018	Application Number 18/00468/FUL
Application Site 61 Gloucester Avenue Lancaster Lancashire LA1 4EF		Proposal Erection of a single storey side and rear extension
Name of Applicant Mr & Mrs Nicholas Wilkinson		Name of Agent Mr Steve Donnelly
Decision Target Date 12 June 2018		Reason For Delay N/A
Case Officer		Mr Sam Robinson
Departure		No
Summary of Recommendation		Approval

Procedural Matters

This form of development would normally be dealt with under the Scheme of Delegation. However, as the applicant is a City Councillor, and as such the application must be determined by the Planning Committee.

1.0 The Site and its Surroundings

- 1.1 61 Gloucester Avenue is a two storey detached property located in south Lancaster close to Scotforth Road. The building comprises a mix of white wet dash rendered walls underneath a dark blue/grey slate roof with white uPVC windows and doors installed throughout. The site has a large garden to the rear measuring 240m² with 2m to 3m high conifer hedges to the southern and western boundary and a detached garage located on the eastern boundary.
- 1.2 The immediate area is residential in nature with other domestic properties surrounding the site. Access to the property is via a driveway to the side which leads to the detached garage and rear garden.

2.0 The Proposal

- 2.1 The proposal is for a single storey side and rear extension which will form a dining room and kitchen. The proposed extension will measure approximately 4.3m in depth and 7.75m in width with differing heights of 3m and 3.2m due to land levels. Chosen materials include white wet dash rendered walls topped with a dark grey GRP flat roof with finished with white uPVC windows and doors. Access to the site and boundary treatments remain unaffected.

3.0 Site History

- 3.1 The application site has no relevant planning history.

4.0 Consultation Responses

4.1 No statutory and non-statutory consultees were consulted as part of this application.

5.0 Neighbour Representations

5.1 No comments received within the statutory consultation period.

6.0 Principal National and Development Plan Policies

6.1 National Planning Policy Framework

The National Planning Policy Framework indicates that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development (**paragraph 14**). The following paragraphs of the NPPF are relevant to the determination of this proposal:

Paragraph **17** – 12 Core Principles

Paragraph **56 and 57** – Requiring Good Design

6.2 Local Planning Policy Overview – Current Position

At the 20 December 2017 meeting of its Full Council, the local authority resolved to publish the following 2 Development Plan Documents (DPD) for submission to the Planning Inspectorate:

- (i) The Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD; and,
- (ii) A Review of the Development Management DPD.

This enables progress to be made on the preparation of a Local Plan for the Lancaster District. The DPDs were published on the 9 February for an 8 week consultation in preparation for submission to the Planning Inspectorate for independent Examination. If an Inspector finds that the submitted DPDs have been soundly prepared they may be adopted by the Council, potentially in late 2018.

The **Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD** will replace the remaining policies of the Lancaster District Core Strategy (2008) and the residual 'saved' land allocation policies from the 2004 District Local Plan. Following the Council resolution in December 2017, it is considered that the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD is a material consideration in decision-making, although with limited weight. The weight attributed to this DPD will increase as the plan's preparation progresses through the stages described above.

The **Review of the Development Management DPD** updates the policies that are contained within the current document, which was adopted in December 2014. As it is part of the development plan the current document is already material in terms of decision-making. Where any policies in the draft 'Review' document are different from those adopted in 2014, and those policies materially affect the consideration of the planning application, then these will be taken into account during decision-making, although again with limited weight. The weight attributed to the revised policies in the 'Review' will increase as the plan's preparation progresses through the stages described above.

6.3 Development Management DPD

DM35 – Key Design Principles

6.4 Lancaster District Core Strategy

SC1 – Sustainable Development

SC5 – Achieving Quality in Design

7.0 Comment and Analysis

7.1 The key considerations in the assessment of this application are:

- General design
- Impacts on residential amenity

7.2 General Design

7.2.1 As referenced earlier, the materials will largely match the existing dwelling and the works will be contained towards the rear of the site. A small proportion of the extension will be visible from the front elevation as it projects 1m from the side (western) elevation. However, it is set back about 6.4m from the front elevation and screened effectively by the existing vegetation on site so only passing views are afforded.

7.2.2 The proposed extension will utilise the footprint of the existing conservatory so the form of development is already in situ. The proposed extension will be slightly larger than existing but the matching materials and typical design will complement the host dwelling. As such it is considered that the scheme will not have an adverse impact on the visual amenity of the wider area and is acceptable from a design point of view.

7.3 Impacts on Residential Amenity

7.3.1 The proposal includes openings to all elevations with the main large doors located on the rear (south) elevation overlooking the applicant's own garden. The western elevation features one window with the western boundary and a detached garage beyond providing excellent screening between no.61 and 1 Devon Place. The eastern elevation includes a porch area with a door and window and whilst this faces towards the driveway and ground floor window at 59 Gloucester Avenue, a porch is not classed as a habitable room and would not be used as a primary viewing location. As such it is considered that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on privacy levels for nearby residential properties.

7.3.2 In terms of impact on light, the modest projection and height of the proposal, separation distances between properties and existing boundary treatments will ensure that light levels are maintained at acceptable standards for adjacent properties.

8.0 Planning Obligations

8.1 There are no planning obligations to consider as part of this application.

9.0 Conclusions

9.1 The proposal will not have an adverse impact on nearby residential amenity whilst the choice of design and materials will ensure that it complements the existing dwelling.

Recommendation

That Planning Permission **BE GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard 3 year timescale
2. Development in accordance with plans

Article 35, Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015

In accordance with the above legislation, Lancaster City Council has made the recommendation in a positive and proactive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development, working proactively with the applicant to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. The recommendation has been made having had regard to the impact of development, and in particular to the relevant policies contained in the Development Plan, as presented in full in the officer report, and to all relevant material planning considerations, including the National Planning Policy Framework, National Planning Practice Guidance and relevant Supplementary Planning Documents/ Guidance.

Background Papers

None

Agenda Item A10	Committee Date 4 June 2018	Application Number 18/00484/FUL
Application Site Salt Ayre Sports Centre Doris Henderson Way Heaton With Oxcliffe Lancaster		Proposal Erection of a single storey extension and bin store and creation of a seated area and children's playground/outdoor activity area to the front
Name of Applicant Mr Simon Kirby		Name of Agent
Decision Target Date 8 June 2018		Reason For Delay N/A
Case Officer		Mr Andrew Clement
Departure		No
Summary of Recommendation		Approval

Procedural Matters

This form of development would normally be dealt with under the Scheme of Delegation. However, Lancaster City Council is the applicant, and as such the application must be determined by the Planning Committee.

1.0 The Site and its Surroundings

1.1 The application site relates to Salt Ayre Sports Centre, owned by Lancaster City Council. The development site is approximately 70 metres south of the nearest dwellinghouse in the residential area of Scale Hall Farm and is located south of Morecambe Road. Vehicle access to the site is off Ovangle Road and is shared with the Waste Recycling Centre and ASDA delivery access. The sports centre is to the east of Salt Ayre landfill site, immediately south of the Lancaster to Morecambe Greenway green corridor (the Lancaster-Morecambe cycle and pedestrian route), and directly north of the River Lune. Salt Ayre is a purpose built sports, fitness and recreation facility, and as such it is a designated Outdoor Sports Facility, with existing provision for three grass sports pitches, a jump tower recently developed through permission 17/01094/VCN, a floodlit athletics track, a 0.8 mile cycle track circuit, 295 space car park and approximately 5,738sqm of internal leisure space.

2.0 The Proposal

2.1 This application proposes a single storey front extension to the north of the main entrance to the building, projecting 4 metres from the west elevation at a length of 14.6 metres, under a shallow lean-to roof with a maximum height of 2.75 metres and 2.5 metres tall eaves. This additional internal space will facilitate an extension to the existing kitchen for the café area, with a parlour servery to the kitchen and externally accessed equipment store. A 0.75 metre eaves overhang is to project externally westwards from single storey extension roof. The parlour servery will face externally onto a paved area containing picnic tables, with a new playground area proposed on the existing lawn. The playground is to be enclosed by a 0.9 metre tall timber fence. The bin store has been removed and is to be relocated to the north of the proposed front extension, bounded by 1.8 metre tall timber

fence and lockable gates. The play equipment is indicative only at this stage and therefore the specific equipment does not form part of this planning application.

3.0 Site History

3.1 The site has a long planning history dating back to 1993 with the construction of an eight lane floodlit athletics track through permission 93/00071/DPA. Various other sporting developments have been granted planning permission, the vast majority between 1993 and 2000, although not all have been developed. More recently planning permission was granted for the erection of an extension, alterations to the main entrance and construction of a jump tower with a briefing cabin.

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
93/00071/DPA	Construction of an eight lane floodlit athletics track	Permitted
94/01116/DPA	Erection of second phase of sports centre development comprising swimming pool, projectile hall, minor hall, health suite, caretaker's flat and ancillary accommodation.	Permitted
95/00896/FUL	Erection of new club house	Permitted
16/00552/FUL	Erection of an extension, alterations to the main entrance and construction of a jump tower with a briefing cabin	Permitted

4.0 Consultation Responses

4.1 The following responses have been received from statutory and non-statutory consultees:

Consultee	Response
Public Realm Officer	No adverse comment
County Highways	No adverse comment
Environmental Health	No observation received to date - any comments received will be reported verbally.

5.0 Neighbour Representations

5.1 No observations received to date, with the site notice consultation period expiring on 15 May 2018.

6.0 Principal National and Development Plan Policies

6.1 National Planning Policy Framework

The National Planning Policy Framework indicates that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development (**paragraph 14**). The following paragraphs of the NPPF are relevant to the determination of this proposal:

Paragraph 17: Core planning principles
Section 1: Building a strong, competitive economy
Section 7: Requiring Good Design
Section 8: Promoting healthy communities

6.2 Development Management DPD

DM4: The Protection of Cultural Assets
DM21: Walking and Cycling
DM22: Vehicle Parking Provision
DM26: Open Space, Sports & Recreation Facilities
DM35: Key Design Principles
DM49: Local Services

6.3 Lancaster District Core Strategy and Local Plan – saved policies

SC1: Sustainable Development
SC5: Good Design

6.4 Local Planning Policy Overview – Current Position

At the 20 December 2017 meeting of its Full Council, the local authority resolved to publish the following 2 Development Plan Documents (DPD) for submission to the Planning Inspectorate:

- (i) The Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD; and,
- (ii) A Review of the Development Management DPD.

This enables progress to be made on the preparation of a Local Plan for the Lancaster District. The DPDs were published on the 9 February for an 8 week consultation in preparation for submission to the Planning Inspectorate for independent Examination. If an Inspector finds that the submitted DPDs have been soundly prepared they may be adopted by the Council, potentially in late 2018.

The **Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD** will replace the remaining policies of the Lancaster District Core Strategy (2008) and the residual 'saved' land allocation policies from the 2004 District Local Plan. Following the Council resolution in December 2017, it is considered that the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD is a material consideration in decision-making, although with limited weight. The weight attributed to this DPD will increase as the plan's preparation progresses through the stages described above.

The **Review of the Development Management DPD** updates the policies that are contained within the current document, which was adopted in December 2014. As it is part of the development plan the current document is already material in terms of decision-making. Where any policies in the draft 'Review' document are different from those adopted in 2014, and those policies materially affect the consideration of the planning application, then these will be taken into account during decision-making, although again with limited weight. The weight attributed to the revised policies in the 'Review' will increase as the plan's preparation progresses through the stages described above.

7.0 Comment and Analysis

7.1 The key considerations arising from the proposal are:

- Principle of the Development;
- Scale, Design and Landscape Impact;
- Residential Amenity;
- Highways and Parking;

7.2 Principle of the Development

7.2.1 The proposal forms part of a wider renovation of the sports facilities at Salt Ayre following the implemented of those through 16/00552/FUL and subsequent variations. Internal refurbishments of the café area have already taken place, and the current application seeks to expand upon the kitchen facilities serving this existing area, with the addition of an external picnic benched area through a proposed parlour servery. Beyond this a replacement bin storage area and playground area are proposed.

7.2.2 Subject to the issues discussed later in this report, the principle of the development to refurbish and expand the existing sports centre facilities is acceptable, and the proposal is compatible with policies DM4, DM49 and NPPF Sections 1 and 8.

7.3 Scale, Design and Landscape Impact

7.3.1 The proposed development to the main sports centre building will extend the building footprint by 58.6 sq.m through the single storey front extension. This proposal is modest in scale, with an eaves and ridge height both subservient to the eaves of the existing frontage where the development is to project from. The walls are to be finished in matching red brick and timber effect panelling materials, congruent to both the original building and the recently refurbished entrance. The shallow lean-to roof is to be finished in a dark grey flat roof system. The proposed extension would only be visible within the sports centre site, and would appear inconspicuous due to sympathetic materials and modest scale.

- 7.3.2 Externally the application proposes to position a number of picnic benches across an existing paved area. All existing trees are to be retained, which softens the appearance of the hard surfacing of the previously turfed area. Planning permission is not required for benches, bins and picnic benches provided by the local authority, and fencing under 2 metres in height around the proposed play area and bin store also benefits from permitted development rights, although the access gates to the bin store do require consent due to their height. An area of playground is proposed, although it should be noted that no play equipment is included as part of this proposal, as this is indicative at this stage. Depending on the height and volumes amongst other criteria, some or all of the play equipment may benefit from permitted development rights, therefore not requiring planning permission. Anything exceeding this criteria would require a subsequent separate planning application.
- 7.3.3 The proposed paved seating area and play area with indicative equipment over the previously lawned area to the front of the sports centre raises no concern regarding scale and landscape impact. Similar to the front extension, this area is visually contained within the site, and will be viewed in the context of the existing sports facilities, hard surfaced areas and jump tower. The proposed bin store will ensure waste facilities are kept out of sight, which will result in a visual improvement.
- 7.3.4 Due to the sympathetic materials proposed, modest scale and visually contained location of development, the proposal is considered to have an acceptable landscape and visual impact. The development is consistent with Policy DM35 and NPPF Section 7.

7.4 Residential Amenity

- 7.4.1 The proposed single storey extension and external developments are located approximately 70 metres south of the nearest residential dwelling. The Lancaster to Morecambe Greenway green corridor, cycle and pedestrian route is located between the proposed development and nearest residential properties, which provides an existing visual and acoustic barrier of two lines of trees, protecting the residential amenity of the properties to the north. The café use proposes opening hours of 8am to 8pm, and the external playground is very unlikely to be used beyond these times, particularly given the level of human surveillance in the area from sport centre clients and employees. Whilst Environmental Health has not commented, given the existing use of the site and the fact that a playground previously occupied a nearby site on the north side of the green corridor immediately adjacent to dwellings in the area, the proposal is considered to have no detrimental impact upon residential amenity.

7.5 Highways and Parking

- 7.5.1 The proposed bin store is to be located within an existing parking area to the north of the proposed extension, resulting in the loss of two parking spaces from this area. The site has an existing parking provision of 295 vehicle spaces, and is accessible on foot and by bicycle due to the close proximity to the Lancaster to Morecambe Greenway, and via public transport with bus stops at the adjacent ASDA site and along Morecambe Road. The County Highways consultation response returned no adverse comment, and the proposal resulting in the loss of two vehicle parking spaces is considered to have no severe impact upon parking or the public highway, compatible with policies DM21 and DM22.

8.0 Planning Obligations

- 8.1 There are no planning obligations to consider as part of this application.

9.0 Conclusions

- 9.1 The proposed development will expand and improve upon the recreational and catering facilities at the sports centre site. Due to the visual containment of the site, modest scale and sympathetic materials proposed, it is considered that the development will have an acceptable landscape and visual impact, with no detrimental impact on highways, parking or residential amenity. Therefore the application can be supported.

Recommendation

That Planning Permission **BE GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard 3 year timescale

2. Development to be carried out in accordance to approved plans
3. Protection/retention of existing trees

Article 35. Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015

In accordance with the above legislation, Lancaster City Council has made the recommendation in a positive and proactive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development, working proactively with the applicant to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. The recommendation has been made having had regard to the impact of development, and in particular to the relevant policies contained in the Development Plan, as presented in full in the officer report, and to all relevant material planning considerations, including the National Planning Policy Framework, National Planning Practice Guidance and relevant Supplementary Planning Documents/ Guidance.

Background Papers

None

Planning & Highways Regulatory Committee - Quarterly Reports

- (a) **Planning Application Determination Timescales**
The table provides performance figures for the determination of Major Applications, Minor Applications and Other Applications by Planning Officers in accordance with national timescales.

- (b) **Number of Planning Applications and Related Cases**
The table lists the number of planning applications and other planning application-related cases that are received by the Development Management Service per quarter.

- (c) **New Tree Preservation Orders Made**
The table lists the location of new Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) made during the last quarter.

- (d) **Number of Applications for Works to Trees**
The table lists the number of Tree Works applications received in respect of protected trees (protected by TPO or by Conservation Area status)

- (e) **Planning Appeal Decisions**
The table lists the planning appeal decisions issued by the Planning Inspectorate during the last quarter.

- (f) **Planning Enforcement Casework**
The table lists the planning enforcement case turnover by Planning Enforcement Officers during the last quarter.

- (g) **Planning Enforcement Casework – Performance Standards**
The table lists the performance against planning enforcement standards stated in the Planning Enforcement Charter.

(a) Planning Application Determination Timescales

Period	Major Applications Determined In Time *	Major Applications Determined In Under 13 Weeks	Minor Applications Determined In Time *	Minor Applications Determined In Under 8 Weeks	Other Applications Determined In Time *	Other Applications Determined Under 8 weeks
Jan - Mar 2017	90%	67%	99%	64%	99%	70%
Apr - Jun 2017	100%	94%	100%	63%	99%	83%
Jul - Sep 2017	100%	90%	98%	91%	100%	90%
Oct – Dec 2017	100%	50%	100%	68%	100%	90%
Jan - Mar 2018	100%	70%	100%	78%	97%	88%
Apr - Jun 2018						
Jul - Sep 2018						
Oct – Dec 2018						

Year	Major Applications Determined In Time *	Major Applications Determined In Under 13 Weeks	Minor Applications Determined In Time *	Minor Applications Determined In Under 8 Weeks	Other Applications Determined In Time *	Other Applications Determined Under 8 weeks
2014 Average	88%	75%	59%	58%	69%	68%
2015 Average	95%	64%	46%	43%	64%	63%
2016 Average	100%	65%	86%	62%	93%	83%
2017 Average	97.5%	75%	99%	71.5%	99.5%	83%
2018 Average						

* Total applications determined in time includes those where the applicant and the local planning authority have agreed an extension of time.

Annual Average to Date Only

(b) Number of Planning Applications and Related Cases

	Jan-Mar 2017	Apr-Jun 2017	Jul-Sep 2017	Oct-Dec 2017	2017 TOTAL	Jan-Mar 2018	Apr-Jun 2018	Jul-Sep 2018	Oct-Dec 2018	2018 TOTAL
Major Applications	25	12	23	16	76	9				
Minor Applications	70	78	88	53	289	83				
Other Applications	183	207	188	173	751	188				
Discharge of Planning Condition Applications	50	56	40	55	201	55				
Non-Material Amendment Applications	12	11	14	10	47	9				
Variation of Legal Agreement/Condition Applications	3	3	4	0	10	2				
Prior Approval (Commercial/ Householder PA, Flexible Use etc) or Ecclesiastical Applications	14	11	9	13	47	10				
TOTAL NUMBER OF DECISION-MAKING APPLICATIONS	357	378	366	320	1421	356				
Pre-Application, Consultations and EIA Screening/Scoping Opinions										
Environmental Screening and/or Scoping Opinions	8	2	8	6	24	7				
Infrastructure Planning Commission Consultations	0	0	0	0	0	0				
Pre/Post-Application Advice Submissions or Charged Meetings (inc. Specialist Heritage Advice)	31	40	50	54	175	45				

(c) New Tree Preservation Orders Made

Tree Preservation Order Number	Date Made	Location	Extent of Protection
640(2018)	05.01.18	2 Well Lane, Yealand Redmayne	T1-T4
641(2018)	05.01.18	Home Farm, Ellel Grange,	A1
642 (2018)	06.02.18	Springfield House, Ball Lane, Caton	A1 & A2
643 (2018)	16.02.18	89, Silverdale Road, Yealand Redmayne	T1
644 (2018)	16.02.18	Croftlands, Shore Road, Silverdale	T1-T8
645 (2018)	27.02.18	Land between Halton Fishing Club Hut and Hydro-electric Turbine, Halton	T1-T5, G1 & W1
646 (2018)	07.03.18	Capernwray Dive Centre, Capernwray Road, Capernwray	A1 & A2
647 (2018)	19.03.18	Land north of Foundry Lane, Halton	W1 & W2
648 (2018)	23.03.18	Land adjacent to 1, Sunny Hill, Lancaster	G1-G4
649 (2018)	26.03.18	Moor End, Lodge Lane, Melling	T1-T3

* T = Individual Tree; G = Group of Trees; W = Woodland of Trees; A = Area of Trees.

(d) Number of Applications for Works to Trees

	Applications for Works to Trees Protected by Tree Preservation Orders	Applications for Works to Trees Protected by Conservation Area Status
January-March 2017	18	19
April-June 2017	21	25
July-September 2017	18	27
October-December 2017	16	19
TOTAL APPLICATIONS 2017	73	90
January-March 2018	28	30
April-June 2018		
July-September 2018		
October-December 2018		
TOTAL APPLICATIONS 2018		

(e) Planning Appeal Decisions

Application Number	Application Site	Proposal	Appeal Decision
16/01515/OUT	Land at Bowerham Lane, Lancaster	Outline application for the erection of up to 30 dwellings and new access	Appeal Allowed
17/00509/FUL	14 Hayfell Avenue, Morecambe	Construction of a dormer extension to the front elevation and erection of a single storey side extension	Appeal Dismissed
17/00409/VCN	Land adj. 7 Dalesview Crescent, Heysham	Variation of conditions	Appeal Dismissed on substantive matters in Conditions 2 and 4; Appeal Allowed in respect of change to wording on Condition 2.
17/00363/OUT	Woodside, Ashton Road, Ashton with Stodday	Outline application to erect a dwelling	Appeal Allowed
16/00735/FUL	267 - 268 Marine Road Central, Morecambe	Replacement of pitched roof with a shallow pitched roof and parapet wall to front elevation	Appeal Dismissed
16/01544/RCN	Lancaster Volkswagen, Vickers Way, Heaton With Oxcliffe	Removal of conditions - Alterations, refurbishment and extension of existing motor vehicle dealership to form larger vehicle showroom and new bodyshop	Appeal Dismissed
17/00211/FUL	Land North Of Ashford House, Ashton Road, Lancaster	Retrospective application for an equine and agricultural storage building	Appeal Dismissed

(f) Planning Enforcement Casework – Volume and Breakdown of Cases

Period		Number of Current Live (Allocated) Enforcement Cases (at the time of compiling this table)							New Cases Received Within the Quarter	Closed Cases Within the Quarter
	Breach of Condition	Conflicts with Approved Plans	(Separate) Conservation Area Development	Unauthorised Adverts	Unauthorised Development	Unauthorised Use	Untidy Land (& Tipping)	Works Affecting a Listed Building		
Jan - Mar 2017	32	19	2	31	92	62	24	43	113	75
Apr - Jun 2017	38	14	3	28	85	73	25	30	107	88
Jul - Sep 2017	43	23	3	40	93	85	26	27	116	90
Oct - Dec 2017	37	23	4	36	88	80	22	28	70	87
Jan - Mar 2018	35	22	4	30	92	86	24	18	95	76
Apr - Jun 2018										
Jul - Sep 2018										
Oct - Dec 2018										

(g) Planning Enforcement Casework – Performance Standards

Period	Breaches Remedied Within 60 Working Days	% of Cases closed within the Quarter, where the Initial Investigations were concluded within Enforcement Charter Standards	% of Cases where Notice Compliance Site Visits Occurred Within 5 Working Days	Number of New Notices Issued by Enforcement Officers
Jan – Mar 2017	36%	80%	50%	3
April-June 2017	30%	64%	100%	9
Jul – Sep 2017	40%	56%	75%	6
Oct – Dec 2017	43%	53%	50%	0
2017 AVERAGE/ TOTALS	37% AVERAGE	63% AVERAGE	69% AVERAGE	18 TOTAL
Jan - Mar 2018	49%	55%	0%	2
Apr - Jun 2018				
Jul - Sep 2018				
Oct - Dec 2018				
2018 AVERAGE/ TOTALS				

LANCASTER CITY COUNCIL

APPLICATION NO	DETAILS	DECISION
17/00166/DIS	Land East Of Railway Line, St Michaels Lane, Bolton Le Sands Discharge of conditions 3, 5, 6, 9, 11, 12 and 13 on approved application 15/01167/FUL for Oakmere Homes (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision
17/00842/FUL	19 Low Road, Middleton, Morecambe Creation of new vehicular access for Mr L Bolton (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
17/00883/FUL	Lancaster Police Station, Thurnham Street, Lancaster Installation of a new external door to the North elevation for Mrs Katreena Carr (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
17/01030/CU	Woodhouse Shoe Repairs, 93 Euston Road, Morecambe Change of use of existing storeroom/workshop at rear to one-bed flat for Mr Mark Crowther (Poulton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
17/01479/FUL	Farr Bank, Uggle Lane, Lancaster Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of a 2-storey dwelling (C3) for Mr & Mrs Makinson (Scotforth West Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
17/01516/FUL	NTG Papermill Limited, 15 Lansil Way, Lancaster Creation of a new road layout for Mr Steve Oxley (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00024/DIS	31 Claremont Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Discharge of condition 5 on 17/01487/CU for Mr C.I. Hemingway (Harbour Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00029/DIS	Sweetings Farm, Sandside, Cockerham Discharge of conditions 4 and 5 on approved application 16/01306/OUT for Mrs Lawson (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision
18/00036/DIS	Sea View, Ringstones Lane, Lowgill Discharge of conditions 3, 4, 5 and 6 on approved application 17/00466/CU for Mr Morphet (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision
18/00039/DIS	84 King Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Discharge of conditions 3 and 4 on approved application 15/00622/CU for Back2base Properties Ltd (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision
18/00044/DIS	Pony Wood, Aldcliffe Road, Lancaster Discharge of conditions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 on approved application 15/01440/FUL for Mrs H Short (On Behalf Of Fairfield Association) (Marsh Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00045/DIS	Aldi, Marine Road West, Morecambe Discharge of conditions 3, 4, 5,6 and 11 on approved application 17/00534/FUL for Mr Stuart Parks (Harbour Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

18/00045/FUL	Former Moorlands Hotel, Quarry Road, Lancaster Change of use of ground floor from Public House (A4) to form 8 self-contained studio flats (C3) for student accommodation and installation of a raised walkway for Hanif Patel (John O'Gaunt Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
18/00046/DIS	Red Door Cafe And Gallery, Red Door, Church Brow Discharge of conditions 3 and 4 on approved application 17/01573/LB for Mr & Mrs William Norris (Halton-with-Aughton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00049/DIS	Land Rear Of Cemetery, Back Lane, Carnforth Discharge of conditions 3, 10, 12, 13 and 16 on approved application 17/01450/VCN for Mr Graham Wallbank (Carnforth And Millhead Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
18/00050/DIS	Land Rear Of Cemetery, Back Lane, Carnforth Discharge of conditions 10 and 15 on approved application 15/01630/REM for Mr Graham Wallbank (Carnforth And Millhead Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
18/00051/DIS	Watson House, Whitebeck Lane, Priest Hutton Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 16/00586/FUL for Mr & Mrs Andrew Foulds (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00052/DIS	Watson House, Whitebeck Lane, Priest Hutton Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 16/00587/LB for Mr & Mrs Andrew Foulds (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00060/DIS	55 Stankelt Road, Silverdale, Carnforth Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 18/00136/FUL for Mr Paul Holgate (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00069/FUL	5-7 Great John Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Change of use of mixed use unit comprising of retail (A1) and residential (C3) into cafe/bar (A3/A4) and yoga studio (D2) with associated holiday and manager's accommodation (sui generis) for Ms N Temple (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00081/FUL	21B Hest Bank Lane, Hest Bank, Lancaster Retrospective application for the retention of a timber outbuilding, raising of rear garden land levels and construction of a retaining timber wall in the rear garden for Mr Aaron Tyson (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00083/VCN	Sandside Caravan Park, St Michaels Lane, Bolton Le Sands Modification of condition no 2 on 01/86/976 (re: tents) for use of part field 0034 for touring caravans in place of tents (pursuant to the variation of condition 3 on planning permission 93/00501/FUL to extend the season from 1st February to 12th January in any one year) for Falcon Leisure Ltd (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00089/ADV	Unit 3, South Barn, Low West End Farm Advertisement application for the display of 2 non-illuminated double pole mounted signs for Mr Michael Townley (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

18/00104/FUL	5 Steward Avenue, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a single storey side extension and conversion of garage into living room for Mr Simon Nunney And Mr Mark Randal (John O'Gaunt Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00137/FUL	1 - 3 Osborne Grove, Morecambe, Lancashire Demolition of existing building and erection of 6 dwellings with associated access and landscaping for Palamountain (Harbour Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00148/CU	377 Heysham Road, Heysham, Morecambe Change of use of mixed use unit comprising of a dwelling (C3) and bed and breakfast (C1) to supported living accommodation (C3b) for Mersten Ltd (Heysham Central Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00150/FUL	Bambers Farm, Moss Lane, Thurnham Erection of a cattle housing building for Mr Martin Ayrton (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00155/FUL	15 Main Road, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Erection of a replacement rear conservatory for Mr & Mrs Low (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00156/LB	15 Main Road, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Listed building application for a replacement rear conservatory, insertion of internal wall and door opening and partial removal of internal wall and internal glazing for Mr & Mrs Low (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00167/FUL	69 Main Street, Warton, Carnforth Erection of a first floor rear extension for Mr P Parker (Warton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00173/FUL	9 Cambridge Avenue, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension for Mr S. Patel (John O'Gaunt Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00179/FUL	2 Higher Stockbridge Barn, High Road, Tatham Installation of twenty-five 1m x 1.5m photovoltaic panels on south-facing pitched slate roof of annex for Mr & Mrs Richard and Anne Wilson (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00185/FUL	Mole End Barn, Woodman Lane, Burrow Erection of a double garage with single storey link extension for Mr And Mrs Handley (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00189/FUL	Land To The South East Of , Carpenters Cottage, Main Road Erection of an agricultural storage/livestock building and extension to private access track for Mr Justin Wilkinson (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00190/FUL	Police Station, Grosvenor Road, Carnforth Change of use of former police station to 2 3-bed dwellings (C3) with associated parking, erection of a new front bay window and canopy and a single storey rear extension for Mr John Noye (Carnforth And Millhead Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00191/FUL	11 Clarksfield Road, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Erection of a single storey rear extension and two storey side extension. for Mrs Rachel Barnes (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

18/00197/ADV	Land Adjacent, Campbell Drive, Lancaster Advertisement application for the display of one non-illuminated lettering fascia sign, two externally illuminated logo fascia signs, seven non-illuminated signs, one non-illuminated totem, one non-illuminated vinyl glazing logo and three non-illuminated banner frames for Co-operative Group (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00198/FUL	Land To The Rear Of The Estate Office, The Rake, Abbeystead Construction of a helicopter landing site and associated access path for Mr Douglas Williams (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00212/FUL	Mill Farm, Burrow Road, Burrow Erection of an extension to existing agricultural building and construction of a roof linking two existing agricultural buildings to create an area for sheep handling for P And M Crackles (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00213/FUL	Hawthorn Bank, Cove Road, Silverdale Erection of a two storey dwelling (C3), alterations to existing access arrangements and extension to existing vehicular access road for Mr & Mrs M Hallam (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
18/00217/FUL	Old Coach House, Cantsfield Road, Cantsfield Demolition of existing single storey rear extension, insertion of opening to rear of garage and erection of retaining walls to form access to rear and erection of a 2 storey detached garage with ancillary accommodation for Mrs Diana Sharratt (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00220/FUL	6 Cloughton Drive, Lancaster, Lancashire Change of use of garage to beauty salon (sui generis), removal of garage door and installation of a replacement window to the front for Mrs J. Armistead (Scotforth East Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00226/PLDC	11 Ten Row, Glasson Dock, Lancaster Proposed lawful development certificate for conversion of garage into living accommodation for Mrs Julie Young (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
18/00235/VCN	91 King Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Retrospective application for the erection of a single storey rear extension, construction of canopy and installation of a flue to the rear (pursuant to the variation of conditions 2 and 3 on planning permission 16/00267/FUL to amend the plans) for Mr He Wuyi (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00236/FUL	Hill Top Barn, Kellet Road, Over Kellet Replacement of flat garage roof with a dual pitched roof for Mr Malcolm Walker (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00245/PLDC	15 Broadstone Court, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed Lawful Development Certificate for the erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr & Mrs Brian Mason (John O'Gaunt Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
18/00248/FUL	119 Aldcliffe Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Retrospective application the erection of a garage extension to existing outbuilding for Mr Goodwin (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

18/00249/FUL	Tarn Farm, Gulf Lane, Cockerham Change of use and conversion of redundant agricultural barn into holiday accommodation for Mr Sutcliffe (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn
18/00253/FUL	22 Lister Grove, Heysham, Morecambe Erection of a hip to gable roof, construction of dormer extensions to the front and rear elevations and erection of a front porch for Mr Kevin Dines (Heysham South Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00261/ADV	44 Market Street, Carnforth, Lancashire Advertisement application for the display of 2 non-illuminated fascia signs for Mr Neil Anderton (Carnforth And Millhead Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00262/FUL	The High Farm, Docker Lane, Arkholme Creation of an earth banked slurry lagoon for Mr GEOFF PYE (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00263/FUL	5 Lawson Close, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a two storey side and rear extension, erection of a single storey rear extension and erection of a single storey front extension with installation of a canopy for Mr & Mrs L Sutcliffe (Scotforth West Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn
18/00264/FUL	65-67 Main Street, Hornby, Lancaster Demolition of attached garage and change of use of mixed use unit comprising of retail (A1) and a 3-bed flat (C3) to a mixed use unit comprising of retail (A1), a 2-bed flat and a 3-bed 2 storey dwelling (C3) with associated access and extension to existing raised platform at the side for Mr & Mrs S Emery (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00265/FUL	46 Regent Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Construction of a rear balcony with external staircase and wall to the side for Mr & Mrs Grahame Love (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00267/FUL	Burnsall, Gaskell Close, Silverdale Erection of a single storey side and rear extension, construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation, erection of a terrace to the rear and erection of a detached car port for Mr & Mrs Ray & Joanna Beale (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00272/FUL	Torrisholme Methodist Church, Norwood Drive, Morecambe Demolition of existing boiler room/store and erection of single storey side extension for Torrisholme Methodist Church (Torrisholme Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00274/PLDC	42 Milking Stile Lane, Lancaster, Lancashire Construction of dormer extension to rear elevation for Mr & Mrs L. Marshall (Marsh Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
18/00275/LB	14 Second Terrace, Sunderland Point, Morecambe Listed building application for the erection of a single storey rear extension for Edward Levey (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

18/00278/FUL	Land Off, Powderhouse Lane, Lancaster Upgrading of existing telecommunications apparatus including removal of existing 14m pole and replacement with a 25m pole and installation of two equipment cabinets for CTIL, VF (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00284/FUL	13 The Meadows, Yealand Redmayne, Carnforth Erection of a two storey side and rear extension for Mr B Hayhurst (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00286/LB	May Barn And Manor Farm Barn, Chapel Lane, Overton Listed building application for works to facilitate the change of use of 2 dwellings into 1 dwelling, removal of existing window, creation of new external doorway, replacement of existing window with door, removal of internal walls and installation of new partition walls for Mr N. Pike (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00288/FUL	1 - 15 William Pennys, Regent Street, Lancaster Replacement of flat roof with pitched roof and installation of rooflights for Lancaster Charity (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00290/AD	Green Hill House Farm, Dunald Mill Lane, Nether Kellet Erection of an agricultural storage building for Mr Ian Ward (Halton-with-Aughton Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Not Required
18/00294/FUL	2A Albany Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of single storey side and rear extension for Ms Williams (Harbour Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00296/FUL	73 Croftlands, Warton, Carnforth Erection of a single storey rear extension and construction of front and rear dormer extensions for Mr Sharpe (Warton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00297/FUL	19 Portland Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Replacement of mono pitch roof with flat roof including raising the height of existing rear extension and erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr & Mrs Brunwin (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00305/PLDC	9 Hurstleigh Drive, Morecambe, Lancashire Proposed Lawful Development Certificate for the erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr & Mrs Dunphy (Heysham South Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
18/00307/FUL	28 Oak Drive, Halton, Lancaster Erection of a conservatory to the side elevation for Mr John Nicholson (Halton-with-Aughton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00312/FUL	Rose Garth, Stanmore Drive, Lancaster Erection of a detached two-storey dwelling, demolition of part of the existing dwelling and erection of a single storey rear extension for Mrs Barbara Vollands (Scotforth West Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00320/PLDC	19 Haverbreaks Place, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed Lawful Development Certificate for the construction of a dormer extension to the side elevation for Mr & Mrs Jalil (Scotforth West Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

18/00326/FUL	34 Longlands Lane, Heysham, Morecambe Erection of a single storey side extension for Mr Dixon (Heysham Central Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00329/FUL	10 Ashton Walk, St Nicholas Arcade, Lancaster Change of use of retail unit (A1) to a juice bar (A3), alterations to the shop front and installation of a roller shutter for Juicafe Ltd (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00330/ADV	10 Ashton Walk, St Nicholas Arcade, Lancaster Advertisement application for the display of a non-illuminated hanging sign for Juicafe Ltd (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00331/FUL	Kings Arms Hotel, 248 Marine Road Central, Morecambe Installation of replacement timber framed windows to the front and rear elevations and a metal gate to the ground floor of the rear elevation for Stonegate Pub Company (Poulton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00332/PLDC	10 Rydal Road, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Proposed Lawful Development Certificate for the construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation for Mr Steve Thomas (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
18/00340/FUL	81 Redruth Drive, Carnforth, Lancashire Erection of a first floor side extension for Mr & Mrs Peacock (Carnforth And Millhead Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00342/FUL	May Barn And Manor Farm Barn, Chapel Lane, Overton Change of use of 2 dwellings into 1 dwelling, creation of a doorway from existing window opening to the front and replacement of windows with glazed double door to the front for Mr Pike (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00352/FUL	Grindleford, Kirkby Lonsdale Road, Over Kellet Construction of first floor roof terrace and first floor roof extension for Ms Lynette Berry (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00353/FUL	9 Orchard Avenue, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Erection of a two storey side extension for Ms Sue Crossley (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00354/FUL	Riverside Cottage, Bazil Lane, Overton Erection of a two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and single storey front extension for Mr Andrew Jarvis (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn
18/00359/LB	Old Coach House, Cantsfield Road, Cantsfield Listed building application for the demolition of existing single storey rear extension, insertion of opening to rear of garage and erection of retaining walls to form access to rear, insertion of new windows and doors, including new openings; and internal alterations including raising the floor level to part of the first floor, relocation of staircase, and insertion and removal of walls for Mrs Diana Sharratt (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

18/00362/FUL	Town End Farm, Melling Road, Melling Erection of a single storey side extension for Mr & Mrs Mainwairing (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00364/FUL	4 St Celas Way, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of a single storey rear and side extension for Mr Morrison (Bare Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00366/PLDC	2 Coppice Brow, Carnforth, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a conservatory to the rear, insertion of a new window and relocation of an existing window to the side elevation and insertion of a window to the rear elevation of the garage for Mr & Mrs Greenough (Carnforth And Millhead Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
18/00372/FUL	Stainderber Farm, Woodman Lane, Ireby Erection of an agricultural cattle building for Mark Fawcett (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00373/FUL	12 Coach Road, Warton, Carnforth Erection of a porch to the front elevation for Dr Sykes (Warton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00374/PLDC	10 Lowlands Road, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Proposed Lawful Development Certificate for the erection of a single storey rear extension, installation of a boiler flue and erection of a replacement detached garage for Mr & Mrs J Burnett (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
18/00382/FUL	9 Levens Way, Silverdale, Carnforth Erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr & Mrs Priestley (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00383/FUL	6 Rennie Court, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a single storey side extension for Mr M Lehmann (Scotforth West Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00384/FUL	79 Main Road, Nether Kellet, Carnforth Relevant demolition of existing outbuilding, side wall and covered storage area and erection of a single storey side extension for Mr Antony Little (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00388/PAH	29 Anstable Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of a 6 metre deep, single storey rear extension with a maximum roof height of 4 metres and a maximum eaves height of 2.350 metres for Mr Matthew Norfolk (Bare Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Not Required
18/00395/FUL	6 The Gardens, Halton, Lancaster Erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr Briggs (Halton-with-Aughton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00403/PLDC	18 Seymour Grove, Heysham, Morecambe Proposed Lawful Development Certificate for the erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr & Mrs Morris (Heysham South Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
18/00404/FUL	8 Brookhouse Road, Caton, Lancaster Erection of a single storey side and rear extension for Mr & Mrs Banks (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

18/00413/FUL	13 Rushley Drive, Hest Bank, Lancaster Erection of a single storey rear extension for Kenyon & Dewhurst (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00416/LB	91 King Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Listed building application for the retention of a single storey rear extension, installation of a flue to the rear, stone repair and re-pointing to the front elevation, construction of a bar area to ground floor, insertion of steel beam in first floor lounge, installation of plasterboard partition walls on first and second floors, installation and relocation of partition walls and doors to form a new shower and separate toilet room, infilling of existing window on the third floor and installation of replacement windows to the rear and side elevations for Mr Wuyi He (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00429/PAA	Swarthdale Farm, Swarthdale Road, Over Kellet Prior approval for change of use of an agricultural building to 3 residential dwellings (C3) for Mr Frank Huddleston (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Granted
18/00443/PLDC	158 Bare Lane, Morecambe, Lancashire Proposed Lawful Development Certificate for the construction of a hip to gable extension, dormer extension to the rear elevation and installation of rooflights for Mr Ian Hughes (Torrisholme Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
18/00444/AD	White Lund Farm, Mellishaw Lane, Heaton With Oxcliffe Agricultural determination for erection of agricultural storage building for Mr Birkett (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Not Required
18/00466/FUL	11 Mount Avenue, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a single storey rear extension and construction of a ramp access to the side for Mr Tom Greenwood (Skerton East Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn
18/00467/PAH	7 Lambrigg Close, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of a 4 metre deep, single storey rear extension with a maximum roof height of 3.274 metres and a maximum eaves height of 2.829 metres for Mr And Mrs Hirst-Greenham (Westgate Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Not Required
18/00480/FUL	23 Ellis Drive, Morecambe, Lancashire Demolition of part single storey rear extension, erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr Frank Kirkham (Bare Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted