



**Committee:** PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS REGULATORY COMMITTEE

**Date:** MONDAY, 20<sup>TH</sup> APRIL 2009

**Venue:** LANCASTER TOWN HALL

**Time:** 10.30 A.M.

## A G E N D A

- 1 Apologies for Absence
- 2 Minutes of the Meeting held on 9th March 2009 (previously circulated)
- 3 Items of Urgent Business authorised by the Chairman
- 4 Declarations of Interest

### Planning Applications for Decision

#### Community Safety Implications

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

### Category A Applications

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

- |          |                        |  |                             |                      |
|----------|------------------------|--|-----------------------------|----------------------|
| <b>5</b> | <b>A5 08/01424/OUT</b> | <b>Warton Grange Farm, Farleton Close, Warton</b>                        | <b>Warton Ward</b>          | <b>(Pages 1 - 5)</b> |
|          |                        | Outline application for agricultural worker's dwelling for Mr. P. Barker |                             |                      |
| <b>6</b> | <b>A6 09/00053/FUL</b> | <b>Brantholme, Hasty Brow Road, Slyne</b>                                | <b>Slyne-with-Hest Ward</b> | <b>(Pages 6 - 9)</b> |
|          |                        | Erection of stables for Mr. Phil Rogerson                                |                             |                      |

7	<b>A7 09/00024/CU</b>	<b>Berrys Farm, Conder Green Road, Conder Green</b>	<b>Ellel Ward</b>	<b>(Pages 10 - 12)</b>
		Change of use of agricultural land to form commercial fishing lake for Mr. T. Lawson		
8	<b>A8 09/00105/FUL</b>	<b>Greaves Park, Bowerham Road, Lancaster</b>	<b>Scotforth West Ward</b>	<b>(Pages 13 - 16)</b>
		Erection of a two storey rear extension to form 11 bedrooms and internal alterations to form an additional 11 bedrooms in upper floors of existing building, alterations to car park layout and erection of retaining wall to the rear for Whitbread Group PLC		
9	<b>A9 09/00106/LB</b>	<b>Greaves Park, Bowerham Road, Lancaster</b>	<b>Scotforth West Ward</b>	<b>(Pages 17 - 19)</b>
		Listed building application for the erection of a two storey rear extension to form 11 bedrooms and internal alterations to form an additional 11 bedrooms in upper floors of existing building, alterations to car park layout and erection of retaining wall to the rear for Whitbread Group PLC		
10	<b>A10 09/00203/OUT</b>	<b>Land Adacent 81 Grosvenor Place and No 1 Grosvenor Court, Carnforth</b>	<b>Carnforth Ward</b>	<b>(Pages 20 - 23)</b>
		Outline application for the erection of a detached bungalow and double garage for Mr. Lewis Bibby		
11	<b>A11 09/00060/FUL</b>	<b>Land at Rear of 85-91, North Road, Carnforth</b>	<b>Carnforth Ward</b>	<b>(Pages 24 - 31)</b>
		Erection of a dwelling for Mr. Allan Lloyd-Haydock		

### Category D Applications

Applications for development by a District Council

**12 A12 09/00231/DPA Former Bubbles Site, Marine Poulton (Pages 32 -  
Road Central, Morecambe Ward 33)**

Renewal of temporary change of use of land for siting of fairground from 1 May to 31 October 2009 for Lancaster City Council

**13 Delegated Planning Decisions (Pages 34 - 40)**

**14 Planning Enforcement Schedule (Pages 41 - 47)**

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS**

**(i) Membership**

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

**(ii) Substitute Membership**

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

**(iii) Queries regarding this Agenda**

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

**(iv) Changes to Membership, substitutions or apologies**

Please contact Members' Secretary, telephone 582170, or alternatively email [memberservices@lancaster.gov.uk](mailto:memberservices@lancaster.gov.uk).

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

Published on Tuesday, 7<sup>th</sup> April 2009

<b>Agenda Item</b> A5	<b>Committee Date</b> 20 April 2009	<b>Application Number</b> 08/01424/OUT
<b>Application Site</b> Warton Grange Farm Farleton Close Warton Carnforth		<b>Proposal</b> Outline application for agricultural workers dwelling
<b>Name of Applicant</b> Mr P. Barker		<b>Name of Agent</b> Mr Graham Salisbury
<b>Decision Target Date</b> 5 March 2009		<b>Reason For Delay</b> Negotiations and Consultation Responses
<b>Case Officer</b>	Mr Andrew Holden	
<b>Departure</b>	No	
<b>Summary of Recommendation</b>	Refusal	

### **1.0 The Site and its Surroundings**

- 1.1 The site is located within the farm complex known as Warton Grange Farm on the south eastern edge of the village of Warton. The farm holding comprises 111 hectares of agricultural land for a working dairy herd. The farm buildings are all located on the edge of the village with the main farmhouse being one of a group of terraced dwellings at the edge of the village. The complex has been operational for many years. The farmhouse has an occupancy restriction and was developed as part of the conversion and construction of the Farleton Close residential development. The application site is within a small copse of deciduous trees on the southern edge of the farm complex alongside the group and modern portal framed agricultural buildings. The site is outside the village of Warton and within the Arnside and Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

### **2.0 The Proposal**

- 2.1 The application is seeking to gain outline consent for an agricultural workers dwelling. The outline proposal seeks to agree the means of access to the site and the scale of development. Layout, appearance and landscaping are to be Reserved Matters, and thus the subject of a further application. The initial proposal sought to develop a large four bedroom property of approximately 230sq.m (2500 sq.ft) in floor area. Following discussion with the agent the overall site area for development has been reduced in addition to the floor area of the dwelling. The application now seeks to develop a smaller dwelling with a total floor area no greater than 150 Sq m.

### **3.0 Site History**

- 3.1 The site has been the subject of a series of applications relating to the accommodation of an agricultural worker. A static caravan was placed at the site without the benefit of planning consent. The applicant had been in a position where he could gain a non-national farm worker but was required to provide residential accommodation as part of the contract through the agency who supplied the personnel. Consequently, the site has been the subject of three applications to seek

consent for the residential caravan. The siting of a caravan was approved in Sept 2008 on a temporary basis until Sept 2010 to enable a permanent solution to be considered/explored. The current application is seeking to develop a permanent form of residential accommodation within the farm group.

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
07/00576/CU	Retrospective consent for the retention of use of land for siting of a temporary agricultural workers caravan.	Refusal
07/01652/CU	Retrospective consent for the retention of use of land for siting of a temporary agricultural workers caravan.	Refusal
08/00838/CU	Retrospective consent for the retention of use of land for siting of a temporary agricultural workers caravan.	Approved on a temporary basis until Sept 2010 to enable a permanent solution to be considered.

**4.0 Consultation Responses**

4.1 The following responses have been received from statutory consultees:

Statutory Consultee	Response
County Land Agent	The report is appended in full as a background paper. They conclude that the enterprise meets the functional need for two farm workers to be readily available at most times, but it is not considered that there is a need for two dwellings on the unit because the villages of Warton and Millhead are sufficiently close to provide accommodation for one of the farm workers.
County Highways	No objections to the proposal subject to the provision of garage/parking facilities.
Environment Agency	Objects - The proposal lies within a Zone 3 Flood Risk Area and the application submitted is contrary to Policy SC7 (Development and the Risk of Flooding) in the Lancaster District Core Strategy (2008).  They advise that the objection could be overcome by the applicant submitting an appropriate Flood Risk Assessment demonstrating that the development can proceed safely without exacerbating any existing problems.
Environmental Health	Objects – Recommends refusal because no Desk Study has been submitted with the proposal. In addition, control suggested over hours of construction, if approved.
Parish Council	Do not support the application - Greenfield site. The farm is situated within the village where adequate housing is available. Provision could have been made when the farm buildings were redeveloped as housing some time ago rather than being sold off.

**5.0 Neighbour Representations**

5.1 None received within the statutory consultation period.

**6.0 Principal Development Plan Policies**

6.1 National policy guidance is driven by Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 7 – Sustainable Development in Rural Areas. Material considerations include social inclusion, effective protection and enhancement of the environment, prudent use of natural resources and the maintenance of a high stable economy.

6.2 In considering the location of new housing in the rural areas planning policy seeks to ensure that housing is located within villages that are substantial in size and have basic services to ensure that they are as locationally sustainable as practicable. PPS 7 identifies that there may be exceptions to these village location, but that isolated rural housing “will require special justification for planning permission to be granted. Where the special justification for an isolated new house relates to essential need for a worker to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside, planning authorities should follow the advice in Annexe A to this PPS”.

6.3 Further guidance within Annexe A states: -

“One of the few circumstances in which isolated, residential development may be justified is when accommodation is required to enable agricultural full time workers to live at or in the immediate vicinity of their place of work. The guidance adds clarity to this general statement with further commentary stating that it will often be as convenient and more sustainable for such workers to live in nearby towns or villages, or suitable existing dwellings, so avoiding new and potentially intrusive development in the countryside. However, there will be some cases where the nature and demands of the work concerned make it essential for one or more people engaged in the enterprise to live at, or very close to, the site of their work”.

6.4 The principal development plan policies are Saved Policies E3, E4, E11 and H8 of the Lancaster District Local Plan; and Lancaster Core Strategy Policies SC1, SC3, SC5, SC7 and E1.

### **Lancaster District Local Plan -**

Policy E3 - Seeks to resist development in the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) which would directly or indirectly have a significant adverse effect upon the character or harm the landscape quality.

Policy E4 - Countryside Area, permits development within the area which is in scale and keeping with the landscape, is appropriate to its surroundings and makes adequate arrangements for access, servicing and parking.

Policy E11 - will only permit development in flood risk areas where there are adequate flood protection measures in place or the proposal will provide them without adverse environmental impacts.

Policy H7 (partly superseded) - Directs development to large rural villages providing it is appropriate in terms of design, impact upon the village character.

Policy H8 - Limits development for new dwellings outside main rural villages to those essential to the needs of agricultural, sited to minimise impact, essential employment needs and is appropriate to the area in terms of design, materials and landscaping.

### **Lancaster Core Strategy -**

Policy SC1 - Seeks to ensure that development proposals are as sustainable as possible, including location, environmental impact, flood risk, compatibility and integration within the landscape.

Policy SC3 - Seeks to develop healthy, sustainable rural communities recognising specific housing needs but seeks to protect, conserve and enhance important rural landscapes and the distinctive characteristics of rural settlements.

Policy SC5 - Seeks to ensure that development proposals achieve quality in design, reflecting and enhancing the positive characteristics of its surroundings, including quality landscape (AONB's).

Policy SC7 - Seeks to ensure that development is not exposed to unacceptable levels of Flood Risk.

Policy E1 - Seeks to improve the District's environment by protecting landscapes of national importance, resisting development where flood risk can not be properly managed.

**7.0 Comment and Analysis**

- 7.1 It is considered that the main issues relating to the development is determining a need for a dwelling in this location outside of the village, in open countryside and in the AONB. In assessing the location a number of other factors also need to be considered, such as the scale of the dwelling, flood risk, and AONB impact.
- 7.2 The County Land Agent's full consultation response is appended to this report. The Land Agent has found that the enterprise is of sufficient scale to satisfy the 'functional need' for a second worker, and that two workers need to be readily available at most times. Furthermore, the enterprise has been operating for a considerable period of time and following examination of recent accounts, the business is considered to be on a sufficiently sound financial footing to address the 'financial test'.
- 7.3 The Land Agent comments further that the enterprise operated with a second worker housed within the village of Warton until 2007. It was only at this time (and the employment of an agency worker with a demand to be housed) that the temporary caravan was introduced and a second worker accommodated on site, albeit initially without the benefit of planning consent and currently on a temporary basis (until September 2010) until a permanent solution could be fully considered. The enterprise differs little in terms of operational demands from its 2007 position.
- 7.4 The applicant argues that the second worker should be housed at the unit to enable efficient operation of the holding, and that in the interest of operational effectiveness and efficiency the worker should be housed within sight and sound of the farm buildings. A further argument raised by the applicant is that the cost of local housing is so high that it prevents low-paid farm workers from purchasing accommodation in the village.
- 7.5 It is considered by the Land Agent that the enterprise should be responsible for the housing of workers. In addition, local housing costs have been falling and a research into house prices and location has shown both historically and currently that low-cost 2 and 3-bedded housing is available in Millhead only 700m to 800m from the farm group (See appendix 1 of the County Land agent Report). Indeed, very recent research has also revealed a 2-bedded property available in Main Street in Warton and at a similar distance to the farm group. It is clear that there is a constant, ready supply of low cost housing close to the farm.
- 7.6 The application is an outline one with 'scale' being identified as matter for consideration at this time. As originally submitted the application sought to develop a 2-storey property (in excess of 250 sq.m) located within a substantial curtilage. Development on this scale was not considered appropriate to the needs of the farm enterprise given the presence of an existing family-sized farmhouse. In addition the proposal would potentially visually upon the setting of the village and the character of the AONB. Following discussions with the agent the overall site curtilage has been reduced and the scale of the building reduced to a dwelling with a total floor area no greater than 150 sq.m. An area of additional tree planting was also introduced to the south of the dwelling to aid screening.
- 7.7 The Land Agent concludes that whilst there is a functional need for two farm workers to be readily available at most times, there is not a need for two dwellings on the unit as the villages of Warton and Millhead are sufficiently close to provide available accommodation for one of the farm workers. As a consequence there is not considered to be a need for the development of new housing within the designated Countryside Area.
- 7.8 As it is concluded that there is no agricultural justification for the dwelling, the proposal should also be considered on its own merits as a dwelling in open countryside. The dwelling's location is unsustainable, being within the Countryside Area, outside Warton Village (which in any case is not one of the villages identified for further development) and is location within the AONB. The proposal is also considered to unduly impact upon the AONB landscape as it introduces built development in an area previously made over to tree planting and open pastoral land. Therefore the proposal is contrary to Saved Policies H7, H8, E3 and E4 of the Lancaster District Local Plan and Policies SC1, SC3, SC5 and E1 of the Lancaster Core Strategy.
- 7.9 AONB's are nationally designated areas with a high status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. Policy informs that the conservation of natural beauty of the landscape should be given great weight in policy and development control issues. Saved policies LDLP E3 and E4 and Core Strategy policies SC5 and E1 seeks to protect countryside areas in general and AONB's

designations in particular. Development of a large dwelling outside of the village is considered to detract from the setting of the village and the character of the AONB. In addition a dwelling of such size was also not commensurate with the needs of the enterprise given the presence of the main farmhouse within the village and the farm group. The revision to the scheme reduced the scale of the dwelling and improved its potential to be screened by the addition of an extended belt of tree planting to the south. The revised scale of the dwelling does reduce the potential for impact but given the lack of demonstrable need for the building the development is considered to unduly change the area to the detriment of its character.

- 7.10 In addition the flood risk objections referred to in paragraph 4.1 of this report raises justifiable objection from the Environment Agency, which the local planning authority concur with.

### **8.0 Conclusions**

- 8.1 It is concluded that whilst the farm enterprise supports the functional test for a second worker to be employed within the enterprise, the need for a second dwelling cannot be supported given the very close relationship between the neighbouring areas of housing and the farm group. Furthermore, the Countryside Area designation and location within the Arnside and Silverdale AONB would preclude the development of all but essential dwellings. As such the development should be refused.

### **Recommendation**

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

1. No demonstrable need for the dwelling - contrary to saved policy H8 of Lancaster District Local Plan
2. Within the AONB and Countryside Area - contrary to saved policies H7, H8, E3 and E4 of the Lancaster District Local Plan and Policies SC1, SC3, SC5 and E1 of the Lancaster Core Strategy.
3. Within a Zone 3 Flood Risk Area - contrary to saved policy E11 of Lancaster District Local Plan and Core Strategy policy SC1 and SC7.

### **Human Rights Act**

This recommendation has been reached after consideration of the provisions of The Human Rights Act. Unless otherwise stated in this 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.

### **Background Papers**

1. Report of the Lancashire County Land Agent (25 February 2009)

<p><b>Agenda Item</b></p> <p>A6</p>	<p><b>Committee Date</b></p> <p>20 April 2008</p>	<p><b>Application Number</b></p> <p>09/00053/FUL</p>
<p><b>Application Site</b></p> <p>Brantholme</p> <p>Hasty Brow Road</p> <p>Slyne</p> <p>Lancaster</p> <p>Lancashire</p> <p>LA2 6AG</p>	<p><b>Proposal</b></p> <p>Erection of Stables</p>	
<p><b>Name of Applicant</b></p> <p>Mr Phil Rogerson</p>	<p><b>Name of Agent</b></p> <p>JMP Architects</p>	
<p><b>Decision Target Date</b></p> <p>5 May 2009</p>	<p><b>Reason For Delay</b></p> <p>None.</p>	
<p><b>Case Officer</b></p>	<p>Andrew Drummond</p>	
<p><b>Departure</b></p>	<p>No.</p>	
<p><b>Summary of Recommendation</b></p>	<p>Approve with conditions.</p>	

## 1.0 The Site and its Surroundings

1.1 The application site is situated within the extensive grounds of the substantial, detached residential property known as Brantholme, which is currently being redeveloped. The property and its grounds are slightly remote from neighbouring settlements being situated south of Hest Bank and south east of Slyne in an area of open countryside.

1.2 The site is accessed off Hasty Brow Road along a narrow country lane (named Townfield Lane) that continues up to the property's gates. Except for a few agricultural fields, the lane only serves Brantholme though it does continue down to the Lancaster Canal forming part of the local bridleway network. Once through the gates, a long, tree-lined driveway continues up the hill to the south elevation of the house. The application site is accessed off the southern end of this driveway.

The extensive grounds fall away to the west, south and east of the house, providing views not only over the site, but beyond. However, despite the site's elevated position, it is not very visible from neighbouring areas due to the mature trees that surround the house on 3 sides. It is only open on the western side, but even here the property and the application site are generally screened due to the local topography.

1.3 The site is in an area that is designated as both Green Belt and a Countryside Area. An area known as Reanes Wood is designated as a County Biological Heritage Site (BHS). The southern end of this nature conservation area falls to the east of Brantholme, but does not border the application site. There is also a Tree Preservation Order that protects the trees that surrounds Brantholme that accommodated the house and driveway.

**2.0 The Proposal**

- 2.1 The application seeks planning permission for a 'L' shaped stable block with a concrete yard and sand ménage within an undeveloped field which forms part of Brantholme's private grounds.
- 2.2 Due to the shape of the stable block, it would appear to be the same length (11.4m) when viewed from the north, east, south and west. The actual depth of the stables would be 3.65m with the overhang of the roof adding a further metre to the roof's depth to provide shelter to the internal sections of the stable block. The stables would measure 3.4m in height to the ridge of the shallow pitched roof and comprise 3 stables and 2 tack rooms. It is proposed to build the stables using asphalt shingle for the roof, and dark stained timber for the walls and doors. The rainwater goods would be in black UPVC. The sand ménage would measure 20m by 40m.
- 2.3 The stables would be accessed from Brantholme's driveway across a new concrete yard. A further concrete strip is proposed from the yard to the ménage. The total area of concrete proposed would measure about 190m<sup>2</sup>. The distance from the site access to the local bridleway on Townfield Lane via the driveway is very short.
- 2.4 Though the proposal would be separated from the adjacent bridleway by a line of hedgerow, which forms the south boundary of the site, further landscaping is proposed to provide natural screening to the stables. The proposed landscaping scheme comprises 18 English oak trees. A timber post and rail fence is proposed to the north and west boundaries of the application site with the protected pine trees that line the driveway forming the east boundary.

**3.0 Site History**

- 3.1 Relevant, recent applications on this property are as follows:

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
08/00217/FUL	Alterations and extensions	Withdrawn
08/00566/FUL	Alterations and extensions	Approved
08/01020/FUL	Replacement dwelling	Approved
08/01360/FUL	Replacement garage building	Approved

**4.0 Consultation Responses**

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

Consultees	Response
County Highways	No objection.
Parish Council	Comments not received at the time of compiling this report - comments will be reported verbally.
Environmental Health	No objection.
Tree Officer	Replanting (18 oak tree in the first planting season post-completion of the development) and tree maintenance regime is satisfactory. Proposals are generally satisfactory generally subject to conditions regarding the location and construction of barrier fencing (which must be inspected and approved by an arboriculturist prior to the commencement of any site activity); further details of additional protection measures to protect root systems of the pine trees; and no site fires permitted.

**5.0 Neighbour Representations**

- 5.1 No correspondence has been received at the time of compiling this report. Any comments subsequently received will be reported verbally.

## **6.0 Principal Development Plan Policies**

6.1 National Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 2 - Green Belts – states that the construction of new buildings inside a Green Belt is inappropriate unless it is for, amongst a few other categories of development, essential facilities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation and for other uses of land which preserve the openness of the Green Belt and which do not conflict with the purposes of including land in it. An example of such a facility includes small stables for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation. The visual amenities of the Green Belt should not be injured by proposals for development within or conspicuous from the Green Belt which might be visually detrimental by reason of their siting, materials or design.

6.2 Lancaster District Local Plan - adopted April 2004 – policies E2, E4 and R10 are relevant.

Policy E2 (Green Belt) - Development within the Green Belt will not be permitted except for agricultural/forestry purposes, essential facilities for outdoor sports and recreation, cemeteries and other uses which preserve the openness of the Green Belt and which do not conflict with the purposes of including land in it, or limited extension, alteration or replacement of existing dwellings.

Policy E4 (Countryside Area) – Development within the Countryside Area will only be permitted where it is in scale and keeping with the character and natural beauty of the landscape, is appropriate to its surroundings in terms of siting, scale, design materials, external appearance and landscaping, does not adversely affect nature conservation or geological interests and makes satisfactory access, servicing, cycle and car parking arrangements.

Policy R10 (Equestrian Development) - Equestrian development within the countryside will be permitted where it is appropriate in design terms to its surroundings, existing buildings on site are made use of wherever possible, the proposal does not have an unacceptable impact on rural roads and contains sufficient arrangements for access and parking, it does not have an adverse effect on nature conservation, best versatile agricultural land or any public rights of way, and it is located near an adequate network of bridleways / safe riding routes and close to existing settlements.

## **7.0 Comment and Analysis**

7.1 Most development in the Green Belt is classified as inappropriate. However, depending on the use and size of the development, some proposals are deemed appropriate. The construction and use of small stables are specifically stated in national policy as being appropriate within Green Belt locations and as such in principle the proposal is appropriate.

7.2 In terms of the development's impact on the openness of the Green Belt, due to the local topography and the hedge-lined roads, the application site is only visible from the bottom of Townfield Lane and the some points along the raised residential road that runs parallel to the main highway known as Hasty Brow Road. It is proposed to construct the stables in the corner of the field which is partially screened by pine trees and hedgerow. This screening would be enhanced by the planting of 18 new oak trees. However, if in the near future the stables are no longer required, the land should be restored to its original state as an undeveloped site is by its very nature more open and more natural to its setting. A condition can be imposed to this effect.

7.3 It is also proposed to use materials that will help minimise the impact of the stables on its setting. The use of dark stained timber for the elevations and asphalt shingles for the roof covering will help make the stables appropriate to their surroundings. However, the large expanse of concrete and sand will look incongruous in this rural setting. As such, an alternative material should be used for the stable yard. Similarly the type and colour of material proposed for the ménage should be appropriate to its setting, and not such a stark contrast as tan coloured sand on its surroundings. Appropriate conditions can be applied to control these aspects of the development.

7.4 The proposed landscaping scheme is appropriate to its setting, and is acceptable to the Council's Tree Officer. The planting of these 18 trees will help naturally screen the stable block. Though it is not proposed to remove or lop any of the protected trees that line the driveway, the access to the stable yard is between 2 of these protected trees. It is therefore imperative that before any development commences that a root protection measure is agreed with the Council and then implemented by the applicant. This can be adequately conditioned.

- 7.5 The application site is easily accessible from the driveway of the residential house, the home of the applicant. By limiting the use of the stables to the residents of this property, the development will have virtually no impact on the local highway network as it will generate very few additional journeys. The application site's proximity to Townfield Lane, a public bridleway, is highly beneficial and in line with Local Plan policy.
- 7.6 In terms of nature conservation, the proposal is unlikely to have an adverse effect. However, it is important to protect the ecological interest that does exist in and around the site, and as such it is reasonable to restrict the use of artificial lighting. By not allowing the use of external illumination at the site, it will have the added benefits of preserving the rural amenity of the area and limiting the development's impact on its setting.

### **8.0 Conclusions**

- 8.1 By controlling certain aspects of this development, any impacts on the local environment and the openness of the Green Belt can be minimised. It is therefore recommended that planning permission be granted subject to a number of conditions.

### **Recommendation**

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

1. Standard 3 year consent
2. Development to accord with plans
3. Colour and type of material to used in the ménage shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the local planning authority
4. Details of the material used to surface the yard shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the local planning authority
5. The location and construction of the tree protection barrier fencing must be inspected and approved by the local planning authority prior to the commencement of any site activity in relation to the proposed development
6. Ground protection measures for the protected pine trees shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the local planning authority and then be established in close proximity to the site access prior to the commencement of any site activity in relation to the proposed development
7. The proposed landscape proposals shall be planted in the first planting season post completion of the development and then maintained thereafter in accordance with the maintenance regime
8. No form of external illumination shall be provided to the stables, ménage and access
9. The stables shall be retained for the stabling of horses and storage of associated equipment and feed, and shall be for the private use of Brantholme's residents only. The stables shall not be separately occupied, sold, disposed of or otherwise let
10. Once constructed, in the event that the stables are not used for stabling for a period of 6 months, the stables and associated bases, the yard, the ménage and the fencing shall be removed and the area restored with a grass covering

### **Human Rights Act**

This recommendation has been reached after consideration of the provisions of The Human Rights Act. Unless otherwise stated in this 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.

### **Background Papers**

None.

<p>Agenda Item A7</p>	<p>Committee Date 20 April 2009</p>	<p>Application Number 09/00024/CU</p>
<p><b>Application Site</b> Berrys Farm Conder Green Road Conder Green Lancaster</p>	<p><b>Proposal</b> Change of use of agricultural land to form commercial fishing lake</p>	
<p><b>Name of Applicant</b> Mr T Lawson</p>	<p><b>Name of Agent</b> Mrs Julia Pye</p>	
<p><b>Decision Target Date</b> 7 May 2009</p>	<p><b>Reason For Delay</b> None</p>	
<p><b>Case Officer</b></p>	<p>Mr Martin Culbert</p>	
<p><b>Departure</b></p>	<p>No</p>	
<p><b>Summary of Recommendation</b></p>	<p>Grant permission with conditions.</p>	

**1.0 The Site and its Surroundings**

1.1 The site is located on the north side of the road between Galgate and Conder Green, to the west of the access road junction to Parkside Farm and adjacent to the existing holiday cottage barn conversion development at Berry’s Farm. The site is a relatively flat open field surrounded by hedgerows and further open fields, on the edge of the wider River Conder floor plains. The surrounding land rises to the north and east but is flat to the south and west.

**2.0 The Proposal**

2.1 This proposal is a full application to excavate and develop two small lakes, (Total area: 3 acres), for the purposes of recreational fishing but on a commercial basis to aid the agricultural diversification of the applicants holding. Revised plans have been requested with both lakes located towards the western side of the site where the land is very flat and the boundary hedges will provide screening. Gentle mounds of 1-1.5 metres in height will be erected around the southern sides of each lake, feathered out into the surrounding field, with small areas of grouped tree/shrub planting to give a natural appearance to the development. Access would be directly from Berrys Farm, across the intervening existing 5 van certified caravan site field, all parking would be within the existing farm yard area on existing hard standing and would utilities the existing vehicular access. The land surrounding the lakes would continue to be grazed by sheep and cattle to retain character and quality of landscape.

**3.0 Site History**

3.1 The site has no relevant planning history.

**4.0 Consultation Responses**

4.1 The following responses have been received from statutory consultees:

<b>Statutory Consultee</b>	<b>Response</b>
County Highways	No objections subject to access visibility improvements.
Environment Agency	No objection subject to the site being surveyed for newts.
Environmental Health	No objections.

**5.0 Neighbour Representations**

5.1 No third party representations have been received within the statutory consultation period.

**6.0 Principal Development Plan Policies**

6.1 The principal development plan policies are Lancaster District Local Plan (2004) Saved Policies E4, which seek to protect the designated Countryside Area from inappropriate development; and E21, which promotes agricultural diversification in the form of business and tourism uses.

**7.0 Comment and Analysis**

7.1 In its revised form, this is a relatively minor development on the edge of Conder Flood Plain. In this location the landscape impact will be minimal and being located just outside and above the defined flood area of the river, will not interface with river flood flows or generate other flood risk issues. Being a very low key use, the proposals are not likely to have any significant impact on the residential amenities of the nearby dwellings at Conder House or Parkside Farm. All surplus excavation arising will be used within the holding to fill existing man made hollows created by previous agricultural drainage works etc to restore the agricultural workability and landscape quality of the holding.

**8.0 Conclusions**

8.1 It is considered that this proposal is compliant with development plan policies and can be supported.

**Recommendation**

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

1. Standard full Planning Permission.
2. Amended Plans
3. Development and use to be retained and operated by the occupier of Berrys Farm in conjunction with the operation of the associated agricultural holding, 4 holiday cottages and certificated 5 van caravan site.
4. Development in accordance with approved plans.
5. Ecological survey and mitigation measures to be agreed.
6. Landscaping, access paths, gates and fences to be agreed.
7. Maximum number of fishing pegs to be agreed.
8. Details of any fishing peg structures to be agreed.
9. All car parking to take place within the walled farm yard.
10. Access visibility to be improved.
11. Motor cycle, cycle parking and disabled spaces to be agreed.

**Human Rights Act**

This recommendation has been reached after consideration of the provisions of The Human Rights Act. Unless otherwise stated in this 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.

**Background Papers**

1. None.

Agenda Item A8	Committee Date 20 April 2009	Application Number 09/00105/FUL
<b>Application Site</b> Greaves Park Bowerham Road Lancaster Lancashire	<b>Proposal</b> Erection of a two storey rear extension to form 11 bedrooms and internal alterations to form an additional 11 bedrooms in upper floors of existing building, alterations to car park layout and erection of retaining wall to the rear	
<b>Name of Applicant</b> Whitbread Group PLC	<b>Name of Agent</b> Cliff Walsingham And Company	
<b>Decision Target Date</b> 8 May 2009	<b>Reason For Delay</b> None	
<b>Case Officer</b>	Mr Martin Culbert	
<b>Departure</b>	No	
<b>Summary of Recommendation</b>	Approve with conditions	

## **1.0 The Site and its Surroundings**

- 1.1 The site is a large stone built former house located within the Greaves Park just to the south of Bowerham Road and the Pointer Roundabout. The building is a Listed Grade II structure dating from the 1840's, in the Jacobean Revival style and forms a large suburban villa of considerable presence, character and appearance. It is surrounded on all sides by wooded parkland with open boundaries and used as public amenity space. The site set well back off the surrounding roads, accessed from Bowerham Road via a long curving drive and is bounded on its northern side by a large car park. There are no immediate residential properties on the West Side of Greaves Road. The site is less than half a mile from the City Centre and has good public transport links.
- 1.2 The site is the subject of a Tree Preservation Order 242 (1996). The Listed Building is located within the Greaves Conservation Area and is within an area of Urban Greenspace and an Area of Key Urban Landscape.

## **2.0 The Proposal**

- 2.1 This proposal is a full application to demolish a more recent single storey rear extension and to erect a two storey extension essentially within the service yard to the rear of the building to contain a hotel entrance and 11 en-suite bedrooms. This would be surrounded to the east and south by a new retaining wall to stabilise the adjacent bank and retained trees. The new extension would form a T-shape across the end of the older rear two storey extension, thus connecting into the upper floors of the main building, the rooms of which would be converted to form a further 11 en-suite bedrooms.
- 2.2 The internal alterations to the Listed Building would be kept to the minimum, with virtually all of the original features retained.

2.3 The proposed extension has been designed to be subservient to the original building but in a style complementary to it. It would be faced in Ashlar stone under slate roofs to match the main building. The proposal would also be accompanied by minor alterations to the car park layout to address the hotel entrance, which reduces the capacity by two spaces to 74.

**3.0 Site History**

3.1 The site has a long past residential history of education and commercial uses culminating in its present use as a public house/restaurant. The original villa has had two previous major extensions, one in the 1890's and one in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century and a small number of subsequent minor additions. However, whilst there have been a number of advertisement applications for the building in recent times, there are no previous applications which affect the consideration of the current proposal.

**4.0 Consultation Responses**

4.1 The following responses have been received from statutory consultees:

Statutory Consultee	Response
County Highways	No objections – Cycle parking condition requested.
English Heritage	No objections.
Environmental Health	No objections - Condition regarding any unexpected contamination requested
County Archaeologist	No objection - Condition regarding recording the building requested
Lancaster Civic Society	No objection in principle but concerns about the detailed design of the extension
Tree Protection Officer	No objection to the proposals including the removal of the six trees proposed - various conditions to protect the retained trees requested.

**5.0 Neighbour Representations**

5.1 One letter has been received objecting to the proposal on the grounds of potential high visibility signage, poor design, inappropriate construction, unsustainable based use, inappropriate budget use in high profile site, increased late night noise and disturbance, increased congestion and danger to children playing next to access.

**6.0 Principal Development Plan Policies**

6.1 Saved Lancaster District Local Plan Policies E29 (Green Spaces), E1 (Open Land of Key Townscape Importance), E35 (Conservation Areas and their Surroundings), E36 (Change of Use), E33 and E39 (Alterations and Extensions) and E24 (Listed Buildings at Risk) are of particular relevance to the consideration of this application. The general thrust of these policies in the preserve and enhance the quality of both the built and natural environment and to encourage the re-use of Listed Building where possible to secure their continued preservation.

**7.0 Comment and Analysis**

7.1 The site is sustainably located and also benefits from adequate car parking, good public transport and pedestrian links and has no immediate residential neighbours. The parkland setting is ideal for a hotel and will further encourage much-needed tourism in the area. The hotel use itself is unlikely to have any significant impact on visual or residential amenity.

7.2 The upper floors of the building are currently seriously under used and deteriorating in condition at a considerable rate. It is considered therefore that a viable use must soon be found for this floorspace if the future of the building is to be secured. Therefore the proposals, which are considered to represent a viable hotel proposal, both in scale and form, would seem to be an ideal solution.

- 7.3 Six trees are proposed for removal to accommodate the development; namely specimens 1444; 1442; 1443; 1435; 1434; 1432. None of these trees are dominant, or are significant landscape trees. Their proposed removal would not have a detrimental impact on the setting of the site or on local amenity value. However their removal would require a planned replacement planting scheme to be submitted and agreed in writing. The proposed development is an opportunity to further enhance the age range and species of trees within the site, ensuring the continuation of tree cover in this area long into the future. Currently, the dominant age class is that of mature trees, with little evidence of new planting undertaken in the past decade.
- 7.4 All other tree work proposals will be considered as a separate matter and any further proposed works must be detailed and submitted on a Tree Works Application/Notification Form, with written consent obtained from the local planning authority prior to undertaking any works.
- 7.5 There are, at present, issues with the hipped roof form of this building. Revised proposals complete with parapetted gables (to reflect the design of the main building and address the concerns of the Civic Society) have been requested and are anticipated in time for committee. There are also some detailed issues surrounding the provision of plumbing services to/from some rooms but it is anticipated that these too will be addressed in the revisions prior to the meeting.

### **8.0 Conclusions**

- 8.1 Subject to the receipt of satisfactory amended proposals as described above, it is suggested that this proposal would conform in principle to all of the specific policy requirements outlined above and would provide a very useful accommodation facility to complement the present use of the building, in a very convenient and picturesque setting close to the city centre. On this basis the proposal can be supported.

### **Recommendation**

That subject to the receipt of satisfactory amended plans, Planning Permission **BE GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard Full Permission
2. Amended Plans
3. Development in accordance with approved plans
4. Samples of stone and slate to be agreed
5. Details of the stonework coursing, painting, heads, sills, jambs, quoins, retaining wall and copings to be agreed.
6. Details of the roof eaves, verges, ridges, flashings and rainwater goods to be agreed.
7. Details of the windows and doors including external reveals and finishes to be agreed.
8. Full details of all works to the interior and exterior of the Listed Building including a written schedule of works to be agreed.
9. Archaeological record of the existing building to be agreed.
10. Details of cycle parking to be agreed.
11. Detailed method statement for all works in proximity of trees to be agreed
12. Protective barrier fencing to be provided
13. No site fires
14. No cement wash out areas within 15 m of trees
15. Details of landscaping, including replanting schedule, to be agreed
16. Unexpected contamination to be reported, investigated and remediated.

### **Human Rights Act**

This recommendation has been reached after consideration of the provisions of The Human Rights Act. Unless otherwise stated in this 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.

### **Background Papers**

1. None

<b>Agenda Item</b> A9	<b>Committee Date</b> 20 April 2009	<b>Application Number</b> 09/00106/LB
<b>Application Site</b> Greaves Park Bowerham Road Lancaster Lancashire	<b>Proposal</b> Listed building application for the erection of a two storey rear extension to form 11 bedrooms and internal alterations to form an additional 11 bedrooms in upper floors of existing building, alterations to car park layout and erection of retaining wall to the rear	
<b>Name of Applicant</b> Whitbread Group PLC	<b>Name of Agent</b> Cliff Walsingham and Company	
<b>Decision Target Date</b> 3 April 2009	<b>Reason For Delay</b> N/A	
<b>Case Officer</b>	Mr Martin Culbert	
<b>Departure</b>	N/a	
<b>Summary of Recommendation</b>	Approve	

## **1.0 The Site and its Surroundings**

1.1 The site is a large stone built former house located within the Greaves Park just to the south of Bowerham Road and the Pointer Roundabout. The building is a Listed Grade II structure dating from the 1840's, in the Jacobean Revival style and forms a large suburban villa of considerable presence, character and appearance. It is surrounded on all sides by wooded parkland with open boundaries and used as public amenity space. The site set well back off the surrounding roads, accessed from Bowerham Road via a long curving drive and is bounded on its northern side by a large car park. There are no immediate residential properties on the West Side of Greaves Road. The site is less than half a mile from the City Centre and has good public transport links.

1.2 The site is the subject of a Tree Preservation Order 242 (1996). The Listed Building is located within the Greaves Conservation Area and is within an area of Urban Greenspace and an Area of Key Urban Landscape.

## **2.0 The Proposal**

2.1 This application is for Listed Building Consent for the works discussed under application 09/00105/FUL which also appears on this Committee. The proposal is as described in the preceding report.

## **3.0 Site History**

3.1 The site history is as described in the preceding report.

#### **4.0 Consultation Responses**

4.1 The following responses have been received from statutory consultees:

<b>Statutory Consultee</b>	<b>Response</b>
English Heritage	No objections
County Archaeologist	No objection- condition re recording the building requested
Civic Society	No objection to the principle proposals but concerned about the detail of the design of the proposed extension

#### **5.0 Neighbour Representations**

5.1 One letter has been received objecting to the proposal on the grounds of potential high visibility signage, poor design, inappropriate construction, unsustainable based use, inappropriate budget use in high profile site, increased late night noise and disturbance, increased congestion and danger to children playing next to access.

#### **6.0 Principal Development Plan Policies**

6.1 Saved Lancaster District Local Plan Policies E35 (Conservation Areas and their Surroundings), E36 (Change of Use), E33 and E39 (Alterations and Extensions) and E24 (Listed Buildings at Risk) are of particular relevance to the consideration of this Listed Building application. The general thrust of these policies is to preserve and enhance the quality of both the built environment and to encourage the re-use of Listed Building where possible to secure their continued preservation.

#### **7.0 Comment and Analysis**

7.1 The key issue in terms of the Listed Building is the design of the extension and the re-use of the upper floors. With regard to the latter point, this is a critical issue because the upper floors of the building are currently seriously under used and deteriorating in condition at a considerable rate. It is considered therefore that a viable use must soon be found for this floorspace if the future of the building is to be secured. Therefore the proposals, which are considered to represent a viable hotel proposal, both in scale and form, would seem to be an ideal solution.

7.2 There are, at present, issues with the hipped roof form of this building. Revised proposals complete with parapetted gables (to reflect the design of the main building and address the concerns of the Civic Society) have been requested and are anticipated in time for committee. There are also some detailed issues surrounding the provision of plumbing services to/from some rooms but it is anticipated that these too will be addressed in the revisions prior to the meeting.

#### **8.0 Conclusions**

8.1 Subject to the receipt of satisfactory amended proposals as described above to satisfy the design issues, the proposal can be supported.

#### **Recommendation**

That Listed Building Consent **BE GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard Full Permission
2. Amended Plans
3. Development in accordance with approved plans
4. Samples of stone and slate to be agreed
5. Details of the stonework coursing, painting, heads, sills, jambs, quoins, retaining wall and copings to be agreed.
6. Details of the roof eaves, verges, ridges, flashings and rainwater goods to be agreed.

7. Details of the windows and doors including external reveals and finishes to be agreed.
8. Full details of all works to the interior and exterior of the Listed Building including a written schedule of works to be agreed.
9. Archaeological record of the existing building to be agreed.
10. Details of cycle parking to be agreed.
11. Detailed method statement for all works in proximity of trees to be agreed
12. Protective barrier fencing to be provided
13. No site fires
14. No cement wash out areas within 15 m of trees
15. Details of landscaping to be agreed
16. Unexpected contamination to be reported, investigated and remediated.

## **Human Rights Act**

This recommendation has been reached after consideration of the provisions of The Human Rights Act. Unless otherwise stated in this 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.

## **Background Papers**

1. None

<b>Agenda Item</b> A10	<b>Committee Date</b> 22 April 2009	<b>Application Number</b> 09/00203/OUT
<b>Application Site</b> Land adjoining 81 Grosvenor Place and 1 Grosvenor Court, Carnforth	<b>Proposal</b> Outline application for the erection of a detached bungalow and double garage	
<b>Name of Applicant</b> Lewis Bibby	<b>Name of Agent</b> Greg Gilding	
<b>Decision Target Date</b> 4 May 2009	<b>Reason For Delay</b> Not applicable	
<b>Case Officer</b>	Peter Rivet	
<b>Departure</b>	No	
<b>Summary of Recommendation</b>	Approval with conditions	

### **1.0 The Site and its Surroundings**

- 1.1 This application is one which was originally expected to be dealt with under delegated powers. It has been referred to Committee for decision because of the issues involved, and the relatively large number of representations received.
- 1.2 The site is a patch of unused and overgrown land at the southern end of Grosvenor Place, backing on to the end of Redruth Drive. There is a hawthorn hedge with a couple of trees in it along the southern site boundary but none of them are of the quality usually regarded as warranting special protection. The surrounding area is residential.

### **2.0 The Proposal**

- 2.1 The applicant proposes to develop the land with a two bedroom bungalow. The design shown has been chosen to avoid overlooking and privacy issues with the end-of-terrace house opposite. The scheme also includes a double garage at the eastern end of the site. The application site as submitted did not take in the proposed path at the western end of the site but the plans have been modified to include it.
- 2.2 Some of the details of the new dwelling as shown, particularly the very shallow roof pitch, could be improved upon but as the proposal has been submitted in outline form there is no reason to seek changes at this stage.

### **3.0 Site History**

- 3.1 A previous application involving this site was submitted in 2003. It involved a very high density of development, which would have given rise to significant privacy and overlooking issues. Because of this permission was refused.

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
03/00010/FUL	Erection of 5 houses with parking spaces	Refused

#### **4.0 Consultation Responses**

4.1 The following responses have been received from statutory consultees:

Statutory Consultee	Response
Carnforth Town Council	Supports - will result in the satisfactory development of this unsightly location.
County Highways	No objection - The footpath route from Redruth Drive to Grosvenor Place is an important one for access to Carnforth Town Centre. The realigned path should therefore be designed to a standard which will allow adoption by the highway authority to ensure that it is protected and maintained in future. Conditions should be attached to any consent to ensure this. At the same time it should also be a requirement that a vehicular turning space and off street parking are provided for the new dwelling.
Environmental Health	Advises that no contaminated land study has been submitted for this development. Consent should not be given without one. If permission is granted, a condition should be attached controlling the hours times when construction work takes place.
Ramblers Association	Welcomes the formalisation of a route from the Redruth Drive to Grosvenor Place. However they would prefer an upgrade of the existing (unofficial) route if possible; the new one will only be satisfactory if the steps can be replaced with a ramp making it accessible to all.

#### **5.0 Neighbour Representations**

5.1 Six letters from local residents have been received objecting to (or citing concerns regarding) the proposals. The reasons for opposition include the following:

- Loss of privacy and impacts of footpath lighting;
- Footpath is unnecessary as one already exists;
- Impacts of noise and disturbance;
- Drainage/sewer problems;
- Loss of trees and potential tree root damage;
- Footpath maintenance issues (dog fouling, litter, graffiti, etc);
- Footpath/cycle link will encourage motorcycle use;
- Closure of the existing (unofficial) footpath route;
- Traffic hazard caused by construction work;
- Persimmon Homes indicated footpath would never be built (not a planning consideration);

#### **6.0 Principal Development Plan Policies**

6.1 Policy SC1 of the Lancaster District Core Strategy states that 90% of new dwellings should be accommodated within the existing urban areas. Policy CE1 states that the Council will improve walking and cycling networks, creating links and removing barriers and ensuring that development is integrated with pedestrian and cycle networks.

6.2 Lancaster District Local Plan Policy H19 states that new residential development within existing housing areas in Lancaster, Morecambe, Heysham and Carnforth will be permitted which:

- Would not result in the loss of green space or other areas of locally important open space
- Would not have a significant adverse effect on the amenities of nearby residents
- Provides a high standard of amenity
- Makes adequate provision for the disposal of sewage and waste water, and
- Makes satisfactory arrangements for access, servicing and cycle and car parking.

## **7.0** **Comment and Analysis**

- 7.1 Despite the objection raised by one of the neighbours, the principle of developing this infill site with a single dwelling is generally uncontroversial. The site is large enough to accommodate the form of development proposed satisfactorily. The construction of the footpath and cycle link raises more complex issues.
- 7.2 When the northern end of Redruth Drive (then known as Dixon's Field) was developed, provision was made in the estate layout for a pedestrian and cycle link to Grosvenor Place. That part of it on the Redruth Drive side of the boundary was constructed in accordance with the approved plans, but the owner of the application site was not at that time prepared to allow public access over the relevant part of his land. Consequently the end of the path was fenced off and at present it leads nowhere. This application provides an opportunity to complete it, in line with the objectives set out in Policy CE1 of the Core Strategy.
- 7.3 There is an existing alternative route, a path branching off the "official" one from Crag Bank to the A6, which is well used but has no official status. A recent site visit with the Council's Access Officer established that it is relatively easily graded, and capable of being navigated by a relatively active wheelchair user, but it is unlit and its surface is very poor. The northern end of it cuts across the application site. Retaining the path in its present form would make this land very difficult to develop.
- 7.4 The construction of the proposed new link is not as straightforward as it appears on the site plan as there is a significant drop in land level (approximately 1.5 metres) from the existing path between Nos. 127 and 129 Redruth Drive to the surface of Grosvenor Place. This will necessitate the use of a gradient steeper than that usually regarded as appropriate for cycle and wheelchair use. The version put forward shows a split route combining a flight of steps with a ramp alongside.
- 7.5 The path would be of less use to cyclists than to pedestrians as the route from Grosvenor Place to Market Street and the railway station involves the use of Haws Hill, which is a one way street. However it will be of benefit to residents of the estate and has the potential to reduce significantly the number of journeys which have to be made by car from Redruth Drive and its side roads. The possible misuse of the path by motorcyclists can be addressed by placing a staggered pair of barriers across it.
- 7.6 Members will take note of the objections received from local residents, particularly those from the occupiers of houses immediately adjoining the route of the path. For the reasons indicated the path is not a new proposal, but the completion of an existing commitment. The link will be of benefit to considerably more people than those that say they will be disadvantaged by it. The option of upgrading the existing, unofficial path has been suggested but apart from its impact on the development potential of the land, most of it is outside the applicant's control. Improving it could not be made a condition of planning permission.
- 7.7 The County Council (as highway authority) has specifically requested a lamppost at the side of the path, to fill the gap between the nearest existing ones in Redruth Drive and Grosvenor Place. It will be seen that this is one of the concerns raised by objectors, but the orientation of the two houses in Redruth Drive is such that it is unlikely to adversely affect them.
- 7.8 As the Environmental Health Service's comments point out no contaminated land study has yet been submitted in support of the proposal. The proposed use is a sensitive one and the full history of the site is unknown. As this is an outline application, it is possible to deal with the issues concerned by condition; and as such a study should be expected of the prospective developer before any detailed consent is granted.

## **8.0** **Conclusions**

- 8.1 The development of this piece of derelict land is to be welcomed and the footpath link will fill a gap in the existing network. It is recommended that the proposal should be supported.

**Recommendation**

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

1. Standard three year condition.
2. Amended plans 13 March 2009.
3. Outline permission - full details to be submitted.
4. Development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
5. Contaminated land study to be provided.
6. Construction work to take place only between 08:00 and 18:00 Mondays to Saturdays, with no work on Sundays or officially recognised public holidays.
7. Constructional details of footpath link to be agreed.
8. Footpath link to be completed, including removal of the section of boundary fence, before the new dwelling is made available for occupation.
9. Street lamp alongside path to be provided.
10. Turning space within curtilage of new dwelling to be provided.
11. Off street parking/garaging to be provided and retained.

**Human Rights Act**

This recommendation has been reached after consideration of the provisions of The Human Rights Act. Unless otherwise stated in this 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.

**Background Papers**

None

<b>Agenda Item</b> A11	<b>Committee Date</b> 20 April 2009	<b>Application Number</b> 09/00060/FUL
<b>Application Site</b> Land rear of 85-91 North Road, Carnforth	<b>Proposal</b> Erection of a dwelling	
<b>Name of Applicant</b> Mr Allan Lloyd-Hancock	<b>Name of Agent</b> N/A	
<b>Decision Target Date</b> 6 April 2009	<b>Reason For Delay</b> Awaiting consultation replies	
<b>Case Officer</b>	Peter Rivet	
<b>Departure</b>	No	
<b>Summary of Recommendation</b>	Refusal	

### **1.0 The Site and its Surroundings**

- 1.1 This is a backland site on the west side of North Road, behind a row of cottages. It was at one time used for the storage of vehicles awaiting repair but these have been removed. Access to it is by means of a driveway at the side of 91 North Road.
- 1.2 The surrounding area is residential, but it is within easy walking distance of the town centre and bus and train services.

### **2.0 The Proposal**

- 2.1 The applicant wishes to erect a four bedroom detached house. It would incorporate a double garage on the ground floor.
- 2.2 The materials specified for the external finishes are natural stone for the walls, and slate for the roof.

### **3.0 Site History**

- 3.1 This application is the latest in a long series of proposals involving the site. The previous owner obtained outline consent for a dwelling was in 2000. This was renewed in 2003. The first reserved matters application was refused consent, but a subsequent amended version was approved.
- 3.2 Since then two different versions of the applicant's preferred design, involving a larger house, have been refused consent. Both have been the subject of appeals, and both have been dismissed. Copies of the two appeal decisions appear at the end of this report.

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
01/80/0188	Erection of a detached bungalow	Refused
01/81/0746	Erection of hall for worship	Refused
01/83/1250	Use of land for storing private motor vehicles	Refused
01/84/0280	Use of land for storing private motor vehicles awaiting repair	Approved
01/85/0435	Renewal of consent for storage of private motor vehicles awaiting repair	Approved
92/01200/FUL	Erection of private garage units	Withdrawn
00/00471/OUT	Outline application for the erection of a new dwelling house	Approved
03/00803/OUT	Renewal of outline application for the erection of a new dwelling house	Approved
06/00134/REM	Reserved matters application for the erection of a detached dwelling with integral garage	Refused
06/00536/REM	Reserved matters application for the erection of a detached dwelling	Approved
07/00208/FUL	Erection of a new dwelling	Refused
07/00018/REF	Appeal against refusal	Dismissed
08/00345/FUL	Erection of a new dwelling	Refused
08/00027/REF	Appeal against refusal	Dismissed

#### **4.0 Consultation Responses**

4.1 The following responses have been received from statutory consultees:

Statutory Consultee	Response
Carnforth Town Council	Objects – They see nothing in the present proposal to cause them to alter their previous objection - they are surprised at the developer's persistence.
County Highways	No Objection. The access issue has already been considered. The car parking and turning areas within the curtilage are acceptable.
Environmental Health	Point out that no contaminated land study has been submitted with the current application (it was with the original proposal). If consent is granted, a condition should be attached controlling the hours when construction work takes place.

#### **5.0 Neighbour Representations**

5.1 Two neighbour letters have been received objecting to the proposal on the grounds that the house is too big for the site; the appropriateness of the site access; the legality of the developer to use the site access (not a planning consideration); and impacts upon residential amenity.

#### **6.0 Principal Development Plan Policies**

6.1 Policy SC1 of the Core Strategy stresses the importance of locating new development in places where it is convenient to walk, cycle and travel by public transport between the site and homes, workplaces, shops, schools, health centres, recreation and leisure and community facilities, and use land which has previously been developed. Policy SC2 requires that 90% of all new dwellings within the District should be accommodated within the existing urban areas of Lancaster, Morecambe, Heysham and Carnforth.

6.2 Lancaster District Local Plan "saved" Policy H19 requires that new housing in Lancaster, Morecambe, Heysham and Carnforth should:

- Not result in the loss of green space or other important local space;
- Provide a high standard of amenity;
- Make adequate provision for the disposal of sewage and waste water; and,
- Make satisfactory arrangements for access, servicing, cycle and car parking.

## **7.0 Comment and Analysis**

- 7.1 When the original outline permission was granted it was on the basis that the site was suitable for a modest sized family house. The first reserved matters application did not meet that specification; the second one, while still involving a substantial dwelling, was considered to be acceptable. However the present owner of the site has sought to develop it with an even larger house.
- 7.2 The present proposal is in effect a variant of the last two. In the Design and Access statement accompanying the proposal it is stated that the previously approved dwelling would have a floorspace of 109.44 sq metres and the one now proposed has a floorspace of 112.09 sq m. It is argued that the design will overcome the privacy problems which concern the local planning authority by locating the end gable of the house in the same position as that of the approved dwelling. It is claimed that the house now proposed would have little or no impact on neighbours.
- 7.3 Despite this the house is virtually identical to the one which was the subject of the previous appeal, The southern end of it would be less than 4m from the site boundary, which was a specific point of concern to the Inspector determining the last appeal. It is true that the distance on this side was similarly restricted on the approved scheme (06/00536/REM) but this was for a smaller three bedroom house of a different design. In pre-application discussions the applicant asked whether such an arrangement might be acceptable, which suggested that he was thinking in terms of reverting to a dwelling of the earlier type; but this has proved not to be the case.

## **8.0 Conclusions**

- 8.1 In the circumstances the present proposal is recommended for refusal, for the same reason as the last one.
- 8.2 It is open to the applicant to appeal against refusal. However Members may wish to note that as this would be the third successive appeal involving what is effectively the same form of development, it may be open to the City Council to make a claim for costs against the appellant on the grounds of unreasonable behaviour.

## **Recommendation**

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

1. The proposal is contrary to "Saved" Policy H19 of the Lancaster District Local Plan - insufficient outlook from the principal rooms of the dwelling, would not provide the required high standard of amenity.

## **Human Rights Act**

This recommendation has been reached after consideration of the provisions of The Human Rights Act. Unless otherwise stated in this 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.

## **Background Papers**

1. Appeal decision letter 07/00018/REF
2. Appeal decision letter 08/00027/REF



## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 4 December 2007

by **Richard Clegg BA(Hons) DMS MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State  
for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate  
4/11 Eagle Wing  
Temple Quay House  
2, The Square  
Temple Quay  
Bristol, BS1 6RN

☎ 0117 372 6372  
✉ email: enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk

Decision date:  
4 March 2008

**Appeal Ref: APP/A2335/A/07/2045232**

**Land to the rear of 85-91 North Road, Carnforth, Lancashire, LA5 9LX**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Paddle Ltd against the decision of Lancaster City Council.
- The application Ref 07/00208/FUL, dated 31 January 2007, was refused by notice dated 10 April 2007.
- The development proposed is the erection of a new dwelling.

### Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

### Main issues

2. I consider that the main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposed development on:
  - (i) The character and appearance of this part of Carnforth.
  - (ii) The living conditions of future occupants of the dwelling and the residents of 85-91 North Road.

### Reasons

3. The appeal site is located in a predominantly residential area, and that part which would form the curtilage of the dwelling is set back from North Road behind a row of terrace houses. The principle of residential development on the site was established with the granting of outline planning permission for the erection of one dwelling, which was renewed in 2003. Reserved matters were subsequently approved in 2006 for a house at the back of the site. The house now proposed would also be in this position, and it would be a larger building: the appellant calculates that the footprint would be about 12.5% greater, and this is not disputed by the Council. A large gable projecting from the left hand side of the front elevation would account for the greater part of the increase in size of the dwelling. The gable would extend almost to the ridge level of the main roof and there would be no fenestration on this part of the building. In consequence the proposed house would present a somewhat more imposing and severe appearance than the 2006 scheme. However the gable would project little more than 1m from the rest of the front elevation, and the overall form and design of the house would not be dissimilar to that of the previous scheme. Accordingly, I do not consider that, in this secluded position, the appeal proposal would appear out of keeping with its surroundings or result in

overdevelopment of the site. I conclude that the proposed development would not be damaging to the character and appearance of this part of Carnforth.

4. The Council has published a residential design code as supplementary planning guidance (SPG12). This sets out certain separation distances between dwellings: there should normally be a gap of at least 21m where windows of habitable rooms face each other and 12m where a habitable room faces a side wall with no such window. The Council calculates that the distance between the proposed house and the rear of the terrace properties on North Road would be about 9m, but this is not consistent with the submitted plans, which indicate that it would be slightly further just to the south-east boundary, beyond which is a footway and the private rear amenity space of Nos 87-91 North Road. The accuracy of the submitted plans has not been disputed by the Council and, having regard to my visit, I am satisfied that they correctly indicate the position of the house in relation to nearby properties.
5. The site plans indicate that there would be about 17-18m between the projecting gable and the rear elevations of Nos 87-91 North Road. As the gable would have no windows the relationship would be similar to that referred to in SPG12 between windows of habitable rooms and a side wall with no such windows. The minimum separation distance of 12m sought in the SPG would be clearly exceeded, and I do not consider that this part of the house would appear overbearing from the nearby cottages and their amenity space and that of No 85, nor result in an appreciable loss of light. On the right hand side of the front elevation two main windows would look towards the rear of No 91 North Road at a distance of about 18m. This is below the 21m sought, but as this part of the house would be less than 1m closer than the position of the dwelling in the extant scheme, and there would still be a clear gap to No 91, the relationship with the existing house would not be materially different, and in particular the proposal would not have a significant adverse effect on privacy within No 91 or its amenity space. I have taken into account that the appeal site is at a slightly higher level than the houses to the south-east, but, having regard to the relationship between the properties, I do not consider that the proposed house would unacceptably worsen the living conditions of the occupiers of the nearby dwellings on North Road.
6. I am, however, concerned about the outlook for future occupiers of the proposed house. The lounge would have two window openings: a relatively small window in the rear elevation and patio doors and adjacent lights in the south-west side elevation. This main window would be less than 4m from the boundary with the property to the south-west, where the design statement explains that it is intended to erect screen fencing, and the nearby conifers on the adjacent land would also restrict the outlook from this room, which would be constrained and gloomy. The size of the lounge, which would be the largest ground floor room in the house, reinforces my concern in this regard. In contrast, the 2006 scheme includes an additional window to the lounge in the front elevation. I conclude that the proposed development would result in unacceptable living conditions for the future occupiers of the house. As such it would not provide a high standard of amenity and would conflict with Policy H19 of the Lancaster District Local Plan.
7. Carnforth Town Council and two local residents have expressed concerns about the nature of the access to the site. However the access is wide and should

enable vehicles to manoeuvre without adversely affecting highway safety. Moreover, I note that the Council raises no objection in this regard. I have found that the proposal would not be out of keeping with its surroundings, but the absence of harm in this regard, and in relation to highway safety, does not justify development which would result in unacceptable living conditions for future occupiers. Therefore, for the reasons given above, and having regard to all other matters raised, I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Richard Clegg*

INSPECTOR



# Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 October 2008

by I D Jenkins BSc CEng MICE MCI WEM

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State  
for Communities and Local Government

The Planning Inspectorate  
4/11 Eagle Wing  
Temple Quay House  
2 The Square  
Temple Quay  
Bristol BS1 6PN

☎ 0117 372 6372  
email: [enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:enquiries@pins.gsi.gov.uk)

Decision date:  
27 October 2008

Appeal Ref: APP/A2335/A/08/2079421

Land to the rear of 85-91 North Road, Carnforth, Lancs, LA5 9LX

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
- The appeal is made by Paddle Ltd against the decision of Lancaster City Council.
- The application Ref 08/00345/FUL, dated 11 March 2008, was refused by notice dated 2 June 2008.
- The development proposed is the erection of a new dwelling.

## Decision

1. I dismiss the appeal.

## Main issue

2. I consider that the main issue in this case is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of future residents of the proposed dwelling, with particular reference to outlook.

## Reasons

3. On the 4 March 2008 the Inspectorate issued an appeal decision, Ref. APP/A2335/A/07/2045232, on a previous application to erect a new dwelling within the appeal site. That appeal was dismissed and is a significant material consideration in the case now before me. The Council has stated that the current appeal scheme differs in that the lounge of the proposed house would have two extra windows, one each side of the chimney breast on the southeastern elevation. This is not disputed by the appellant.
4. The main window serving the large proposed lounge, which would comprise patio doors with side lights, would be contained within the southwestern elevation of the proposal. This window would be less than 4 metres from the southwestern boundary of the site, which would be enclosed by a 1.8 metre high fence. I saw that a row of tall conifers is situated close to, and parallel with, this appeal site boundary on adjacent land. I consider that as a result of its close proximity to the proposed fence and existing trees the outlook from this main window would be poor. My finding in this respect is consistent with that of the Inspector who dealt with the previous appeal.
5. The proposed lounge would also be served by three other windows. One of them, in common with the previous appeal scheme, would be located within the rear elevation of the building. The other two, as I have indicated, would be contained within the southeastern elevation of the proposed dwelling and to my mind they would be relatively narrow. In my judgement, due to their limited

- proportions, these windows would not enhance the outlook from the lounge to any significant degree. I consider overall that, due to the restricted outlook from the proposed lounge, future residents would experience an unpleasant sense of enclosure when using that room and in this respect the proposal would not provide a high standard of amenity.
6. Outline planning permission for the erection of a dwelling within the appeal site, which was granted in 2000, was renewed in 2003 and reserved matters were approved in 2006, Ref. 06/00536/REM. The lounge of the approved dwelling would be smaller than that proposed in the case before me. The southwestern sidewall of the approved house, which would contain a window arrangement similar to the appeal proposal, would by comparison be positioned further away from the southwestern boundary of the site. Furthermore, the approved southeastern lounge wall would contain a window that would be wider than each of the two windows contained within the same wall of the scheme before me. To my mind the outlook from the approved lounge would be better than that provided by the lounge of the appeal proposal.
  7. I conclude that the proposed development would unacceptably harm the living conditions of future residents of the proposed dwelling, with particular reference to outlook, contrary to saved Policy H19 of the *Lancaster District Local Plan, 2004*.
  8. I have considered all of the other matters raised. Based on dimensions agreed by the main parties at the site visit I am satisfied that the appeal site has been shown to the identified scale on the planning application plans. The appellant has suggested that the proposal would tidy up the vacant site. However, I give this argument little weight. In my view, whilst it is somewhat overgrown, the site is not unsightly.
  9. The southeastern wall of both the approved and proposed dwellings would face towards the rear elevations of a terraced row of small cottages, Nos. 91-85, which appear to contain habitable room windows. This wall of the proposal would contain one less habitable room window at first floor level than would be contained within the same elevation of the approved house and so the potential for overlooking of those neighbouring windows would be slightly less. Nonetheless, in my judgement neither this, nor any other matters raised are sufficient to outweigh the considerations which have led to my conclusion on the main issue.
  10. For the reasons given above I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

*Ian D Jenkins*

INSPECTOR

<b>Agenda Item</b> A12	<b>Committee Date</b> 20 April 2009	<b>Application Number</b> 09/00231/DPA
<b>Application Site</b> Former Bubbles site, Marine Road Central, Morecambe	<b>Proposal</b> Renewal of temporary change of use of land for siting of fairground from 1 May to 31 October 2009	
<b>Name of Applicant</b> Lancaster City Council	<b>Name of Agent</b> Ann Wood - Property Services	
<b>Decision Target Date</b> 21 April 2009	<b>Reason For Delay</b> None	
<b>Case Officer</b>	Peter Rivet	
<b>Departure</b>	No	
<b>Summary of Recommendation</b>	Limited period consent	

### **1.0 The Site and its Surroundings**

1.1 The site of this application is the seaward side of Morecambe Promenade, immediately to the north east of the Midland Hotel.

### **2.0 The Proposal**

2.1 This is the latest in a series of applications for temporary consent for the use of part of the land as a fairground. The last one, 08/00261/DPA, expired in October 2008.

### **3.0 Site History**

The site was formerly part of the "Bubbles" complex. Summer use of the site as a fairground started in 2002, when the first of the series of limited period planning permissions was granted.

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Decision</b>
02/00135/DPA	Change of use to fairground/amusement park	Limited period consent
03/00297/DPA	Renewal of consent for fairground/amusement park	Limited period consent
04/00422/DPA	Renewal of consent for fairground/amusement park	Limited period consent
05/00066/DPA	Renewal of consent for fairground/amusement park	Limited period consent
06/00295/DPA	Renewal of consent for fairground/amusement park	Limited period consent
07/00233/DPA	Renewal of consent for fairground/amusement park	Limited period consent
08/00261/DPA	Renewal of consent for fairground/amusement park	Limited period consent

#### **4.0 Consultation Responses**

4.1 The following responses have been received from statutory consultees:

<b>Statutory Consultee</b>	<b>Response</b>
County Highways	No objections
Environmental Health	No objections
Lancashire Fire and Rescue	No objections

#### **5.0 Neighbour Representations**

5.1 None, at the time this report was prepared.

#### **6.0 Principal Development Plan Policies**

6.1 The site is within the Morecambe Conservation Area. "Saved" Policy E35 of the Lancaster District Local Plan states that development which would adversely affect important views into and across a Conservation Area will not be permitted.

#### **7.0 Comment and Analysis**

7.1 The current proposal is for the use of land rather than building work but the policy guidelines remain relevant. In the long term a more permanent form of development is called for but a further limited period consent for a fairground will not prejudice this. The reopening of the Midland Hotel has increased the likelihood of this happening.

7.2 The Environmental Health Service has expressed concern in the past about possible noise nuisance. This is a matter dealt with by the Control of Pollution Act and the use does not appear to have given rise to any recent complaints. As with previous consents, it is recommended that an appropriate advice note should be attached to the consent.

#### **8.0 Conclusions**

8.1 Central government advice discourages granting a series of limited period planning permissions, on the basis that if an experience shows that a use is acceptable, there are no grounds for refusing a permanent consent. However this is a case where it is important to keep open the option of a more permanent form of development. In the circumstances a further temporary permission is appropriate.

#### **Recommendation**

That planning permission **BE GRANTED** subject to the following condition:

1 Temporary consent - to expire 31 October 2009.

#### **Human Rights Act**

This recommendation has been reached after consideration of the provisions of The Human Rights Act. Unless otherwise stated in this 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.

#### **Background Papers**

None.

## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

## LANCASTER CITY COUNCIL

APPLICATION NO	DETAILS	DECISION
08/00855/FUL	17 Porrit Avenue, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a shed to the rear for Mr R Nelson (Castle Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01079/CU	12 Slyne Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Change of use and conversion of barn into dwelling for Mr W Bardsley (Torrisholme Ward)	Application Refused
08/01080/LB	12 Slyne Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Listed building application for conversion of barn into dwelling for Mr W Bardsley (Torrisholme Ward)	Application Refused
08/01190/FUL	East Lodge, Quernmore Road, Caton Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of new house to include change of use of adjacent land from agricultural to domestic for Mr And Mrs Hill (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01188/CU	3 North Road, Carnforth, Lancashire Change of Use from dwelling (Class C3) to cafe (Class A3), with maisonette over and new external staircase and alterations to rear for Mrs Elizabeth Davies (Carnforth Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01218/FUL	Ripley St Thomas C Of E School, Ashton Road, Lancaster Renewal of permission for temporary building previously approved in app no. 06/00920/FUL for The School Governors (Dukes Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01241/FUL	11 Cedarwood Place, Lancaster, Lancashire Retrospective application for the retention of an enclosed single storey decked area to side for Mr Gary Gates (John O'Gaunt Ward)	Application Refused
08/01249/LB	Ripley St Thomas C Of E School, Ashton Road, Lancaster Renewal of Listed Building application for a temporary building previously approved in app no. 06/01003/LB for The School Governors ( Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01253/CU	2 Lancaster Road, Overton, Morecambe Change of use and conversion of attached barn to dwelling for Mrs Caroline Barry (Overton Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01262/FUL	63 Victoria Street, Morecambe, Lancashire Replacement of ground and first floor windows for Wright And Lord Solicitors (Poulton Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01285/FUL	9 Portland Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of raised decked area to the rear for Mr Barry Hankin (Dukes Ward)	Application Refused
08/01318/FUL	49 Dale Street, Lancaster, LA1 3AP Erection of a two storey extension to rear for Mr S. Patel (John O'Gaunt Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01344/LB	8 Castle Park, Lancaster, Lancashire Listed building application for replacement of landing window for Mr D Fatkin (Castle Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

08/01345/LB	8 Castle Park, Lancaster, Lancashire Listed building application to replace street level cellar grating with solid cover including ventilation for Mr D Fatkin (Castle Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01356/FUL	Higher Barn, Aughton Road, Aughton Retrospective application for the retention of 2no. dormer windows and a balcony for J J Metcalfe Ltd (Halton With Aughton Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01367/CU	The Hermitage, Low Road, Halton Change of use from workshop to 3 bed dwelling for Mr Philip Pendlebury (Halton With Aughton Ward)	Application Refused
08/01370/AD	Agricultural Building Field Number 2683, Walnut Bank Road, Lancaster Erection of an agricultural storage building for Mr G Surtees (Scotforth West Ward)	Prior Approval Granted
08/01379/FUL	Valentine Cottage, Aughton Road, Aughton Removal of existing window to replace with new door for Miss C Burn (Halton With Aughton Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01380/FUL	41 Primrose Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of an extension for Ms N. J. Dowbiggin (John O'Gaunt Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01393/CU	Christie Park, Lancaster Road, Morecambe Retrospective application for the Change of use of an area of existing car park to accommodate a temporary club shop facility for Morecambe Football Club Ltd (Poulton Ward)	Application Refused
08/01395/FUL	Roeburnscar, Harterbeck, Wray Erection of a single storey extension to the rear and side extension for Dr R Everett (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01421/FUL	Lowood, Garstang Road, Cockerham Amendments to previously approved application 08/00366/FUL for Mr D Armer (Ellel Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01430/FUL	52 Windsor Grove, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of a single storey extension to side and rear and attached garage for Mr D. Rowes (Harbour Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01432/FUL	Allotment Gardens, St Martins Road, Lancaster Raising of wall height from 1.5m to 2m high for Ms Carol Woulfe (John O'Gaunt Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01435/FUL	2 Lythe Brow Barn, Quernmore Road, Quernmore Installation of additional roof-lights to rear elevation and windows to the side elevation for Mr Jonathan Brakewell (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01437/FUL	1 Steward Avenue, Lancaster, LA1 4HP Erection of two dormer windows to the front and two dormer windows to the rear for Ms Sue Minter (John O'Gaunt Ward)	Application Permitted
08/01442/FUL	Dr Kruger, 58 North Road, Lancaster Retrospective Application for the retention of UPVC windows on first floor for Mr Mustaq Patel (Dukes Ward)	Application Refused
09/00005/FUL	Animal Care Sanctuary, Blea Tarn Road, Lancaster Installation of a three-bladed turbine on a 15 metre galvanised steel mast for Animal Care (Ellel Ward)	Application Permitted

## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

09/00006/FUL	Newland House, Starbank, Bay Horse Proposed conversion of existing redundant outbuildings to form domestic garage with associated access for Mr Keith Miller (Ellel Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00007/FUL	28 Hornby Road, Caton, Lancaster Erection of single storey extension and dormer to the rear for Miss M Flynn (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Application Refused
09/00020/FUL	Arkolme CE Primary School, Main Street, Arkholme Relocation of boundary fence, installation of replacement gates and windows and provision of cycle storage for Governors Of Arkholme CE Primary School (Kellet Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00019/CU	126 Ullswater Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Change of use of two storey building (ancillary A1 and ancillary C3) to one residential dwelling (C3) for Mr Trevor Wilson (Bulk Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00021/FUL	67 Lythe Fell Avenue, Halton, Lancaster Erection of a two storey side extension and a single storey rear extension for Mr And Mrs Milburn (Halton With Aughton Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00022/LB	Old Hall Farm, 5 Littledale Road, Brookhouse Listed building application for installation of air vent to the front wall and installation of a wood burning stove for Dr Miles Rucklidge (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00026/CU	Trough Beck, Wyresdale Road, Quernmore Change of use of former swimming pool building to form holiday cottage for Mr Malcolm Appleby (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00029/FUL	Craggs Cottage, Craggs Lane, Tatham Demolition of existing store and erection of a stable block with replacement domestic store for Mr Robert Guy (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00030/CU	Lancaster University, Bailrigg Lane, Lancaster Change of use of unused agricultural barn to form graduate support space, including alterations and extensions to the barn and associated access and parking. for Lancaster University (University Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00040/OUT	105 Halton Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Outline application for erection of three bedroom dwelling and relocation of detached garage for Mr T Rose (Skerton East Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00046/FUL	Tesco Store, Lancaster Road, Carnforth Erection of a micro wind turbine for Tesco Plc (Carnforth Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00047/FUL	12 Hawthorn Avenue, Brookhouse, Lancaster Erection of a dormer roof extension to the rear for Mr And Mrs Humphrey (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Application Refused
09/00050/LB	Lower Thrushgill, Botton Road, Wray Listed building application for the erection of an extension for Ms Sheena Robertson (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted

## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

09/00052/FUL	7 Beech Road, Halton, Lancaster Erection of a single storey extension to the rear for Mr Nigel Harrison (Halton With Aughton Ward)	Application Refused
09/00054/CU	111 West End Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Change of use to mixed use incorporating residential and childminding for Mr G Wheeler (Harbour Ward)	Application Refused
09/00056/FUL	Boundary House Farm, Lancaster Road, Thurnham Replacement Agricultural Building for livestock / dairy building for Mr J Kellett (Ellel Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00058/FUL	Brantbeck, Tarnwater Lane, Ashton Erection of a new dairy cattle cubicle house (phase 1 of 2) for Mr M Capstick (Ellel Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00059/FUL	Brantbeck, Tarnwater Lane, Ashton Agricultural determination for the erection of a lean to dairy cattle cubicle house for storage of machinery and feed (Phase 2 of 2) for Mr M Capstick (Ellel Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00065/FUL	Second Floor Flat 24 Sandylands Promenade, Heysham, Morecambe Alterations and extensions to rear roof for Mr Scott Bowker (Heysham North Ward)	Application Refused
09/00066/LB	16 & 17 Second Terrace, Sunderland Point, Morecambe Listed building application for replacement of roof tiles for E And K Gilchrist (Overton Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00068/FUL	52 - 58 Yorkshire Street West, Morecambe, Lancashire Demolition of existing shops and construction of a 2 storey building to accommodate 3 shops at ground floor level and 2 flats at first floor level for Mr Tom Murfitt (Heysham North Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00070/ADV	410 Heysham Road, Heysham, Morecambe Application for the retention of an internally illuminated free standing, double sided unit. for Miss Helen Groth (Heysham South Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00076/ELDC	Littlegarth, 6 Hasty Brow Road, Slyne Application for a Lawful Development Certificate for continuous use of land as part of residential curtilage for Mr H Brakewell (Slyne With Hest Ward)	Split Decision
09/00077/PLDC	5 Greenacre Road, Hest Bank, Lancaster Application for a Proposed Lawful Development Certificate for the erection of a single storey extension to the rear for Mr And Mrs Leach (Slyne With Hest Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
09/00073/FUL	Botton Mill Cottage, Botton Road, Wray Erection of first floor extensions to the sides for Mr Mick Lewis (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00074/LB	Botton Mill Cottage, Botton Road, Wray Listed building consent for erection of first floor extensions to the sides and internal alterations to staircase for Mr Mick Lewis (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00079/FUL	2 Kirkes Road, Lancaster, LA1 3DP Proposed two storey rear extension & internal alterations for Mr M. Edmondson (John O'Gaunt Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

09/00081/FUL	15 Longmere Crescent, Carnforth, Lancashire Erection of single storey extension to the side and rear for Mr And Mrs Denby (Carnforth Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00082/FUL	38-44 Yorkshire Street, Morecambe, Lancashire Proposed alterations to ground floor to create 2 self contained retail shops for Mr T. Siddique (Harbour Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00083/FUL	24 Shireshead Crescent, Lancaster, LA1 4LD Construction of new external chimney stack for Mrs K Whiteley (Scotforth East Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00085/FUL	Nether Kellet Village Hall, Shaw Lane, Nether Kellet Overcladding of existing roof with metal roofing slate design for Nether Kellet Parish Council (Kellet Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00086/FUL	13 Rothesay Road, Heysham, Morecambe Erection of lean-to extensions to side and rear for Mrs Bickerstaff (Overton Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00087/FUL	66 Lancaster Road, Overton, Morecambe Erection of garage to the side for Mr Peter West (Overton Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00088/FUL	Vue Cinema, Church Street, Lancaster Installation of glazed doors at each end of Anchor Lane for Vue Entertainment Ltd (Dukes Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00090/FUL	34 Winthorpe Avenue, Morecambe, Lancashire Retrospective application for the retention of a conservatory for Mrs Donna Palmer (Westgate Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00091/FUL	Land At Farcross Close, Lancaster Road, Overton Erection of a 13.5m x 9.15m agricultural building for Mr Wayne Barnes (Overton Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00093/FUL	Ashleys, Thwaite Brow Lane, Bolton Le Sands Erection of a 2 storey extension for Mr P Brown (Bolton Le Sands Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00095/FUL	2 Abingdon Grove, Heysham, Morecambe Conversion of garage to bedroom and shower room for Mr Gary Buckley (Heysham South Ward)	Application Refused
09/00096/FUL	18 Hatlex Lane, Hest Bank, Lancaster Demolition of detached garage and erection of replacement extension for Mr And Mrs Garner (Slyne With Hest Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00097/FUL	Hay Carr, Preston Lancaster Road, Ellel Amendment to approved application 06/00594/FUL to include additional utility/porch/gym accommodation and link to existing dwelling for Mr And Mrs Higginson (Ellel Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00102/ADV	The Pavilion, Bridge Lane, Lancaster Erection of 2 non illuminated panel signs to front elevation for Mr David Andrew (Castle Ward)	Application Refused
09/00101/FUL	8 Airedale, Galgate, Lancaster Erection of a first floor extension above existing garage for Mr J Faulconbridge (Ellel Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00109/FUL	17C Quernmore Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a conservatory to the rear for Rt Rev Cyril Guy Ashton (Bulk Ward)	Application Permitted

## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

09/00112/CU	Car Audio Lancaster, 14 Church Street, Lancaster Change of use of first and second floors to form self contained flat and alterations to shop front for Mr Graham Sutton (Dukes Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00111/FUL	478 Marine Road East, Morecambe, Lancashire Installation of a first floor balcony to front elevation for Mr Bristow (Bare Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00118/FUL	Lower Thrushgill, Botton Road, Wray Erection of an extension for Ms Sheena Robertson (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00119/FUL	Tarnwater, Milnthorpe Road, Yealand Conyers Erection of extensions and alterations to existing building for Mr Phillip Rogerson (Silverdale Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00121/FUL	62 Crag Bank Road, Carnforth, Lancashire Erection of an extension to rear and creation of off street parking to front for Mr And Mrs Chambers (Bolton Le Sands Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00128/FUL	89 Balmoral Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of a replacement garage to the rear for Mr John Baggott (Harbour Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00136/FUL	Christ Church C E School, Derwent Road, Lancaster Extension of existing macadam play surface, erection of external brick store and associated fencing works for The School Governors (Bulk Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00141/FUL	Higher Snab Farm, Aughton Road, Gressingham Erection of an agricultural building for AT Burrow And Son (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00149/CU	32 St Margarets Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Change of use of lounge to place of worship for Mrs H Bennett (Bare Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00151/FUL	6 Penrith Avenue, Heysham, Morecambe Erection of first floor extension and conservatory to the rear for Mr D Rothwell (Heysham Central Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00152/FUL	40 Greenways, Over Kellet, Carnforth Erection of a detached garage for Mr T Mawson (Kellet Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00156/FUL	Ambulance Station, Woodlands Drive, Heysham Insert window to west elevation, block up garage door to east elevation and demolish storage building to create 4 parking spaces for Mr C Baker (Heysham Central Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00162/ADV	Co-operative Food Store, 5 - 7 Hornby Road, Caton Erection of illuminated fascia sign, pole sign and window graphics for Co-operative Group (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00164/FUL	Clairmont, The Rise, Lancaster Erection of a 2 storey side extension for Mrs Anu Garg (Scotforth West Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00167/FUL	Seamore, Moneyclose Lane, Heysham Conversion of roof space to form additional floor space to existing bedroom for Mr J Billington (Overton Ward)	Application Permitted

## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

09/00171/CU	31 Edward Street, Morecambe, Lancashire Change of use from public house (Class A4) to a mixed martial arts studio/gymnasium (Class D2) for Mr J Waldie (Poulton Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00176/FUL	32 Winchester Avenue, Lancaster, LA1 4HX Erection of dormer to the front for Mr A. Ireland (John O'Gaunt Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00186/FUL	71 Sunnybank Road, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Erection of front and rear roof dormers for Mr And Mrs P Wilson (Bolton Le Sands Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00191/FUL	Royal Lancaster Infirmary, Ashton Road, Lancaster Erection of an extension to mortuary building for University Hospitals Of Morecambe Bay NHS Trust (Dukes Ward)	Application Permitted
09/00208/CPA	73 Slyne Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a single storey rear extension, re-roofing, new rear dormers and new side entrance with disabled access ramp for LCC Directorate For Children And Young People (Skerton East Ward)	No Objections

**PLANNING ENFORCEMENT SCHEDULE**

<b>DISTRICT</b>	<b>FILE REF.</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY</b>	<b>NATURE OF BREACH</b>	<b>PRESENT POSITION</b>
Lancaster	109/2/193	Cuba, Mary Street, Lancaster.	Unauthorised advertisements.	S16 Requisition for information issued 18/06/07. Not returned- considering appropriate action.
	109/2/199	Railton Hotel, Station Road, Lancaster.	Untidy land.	S215 Notice issued – agreed works – monitoring – compliance achieved.
	109/2/200	Land, Alfred Street, Lancaster.	Unauthorised use of land as a car park.	EN issued – appeal submitted – dismissed. Non-compliance with notice – successful prosecution 27/3/09. Site now closed but awaiting removal of cabin.
	109/2/198	Total Fitness, Caton Road, Lancaster.	Display of unauthorised signs.	S16 requisition for information sent. Warned any further unauthorised advertising will result in prosecution. Evidence of recent offence – considering action.
	109/2/202	Woodside, Ashton-with-Stodday.	Change of use of land to form car park.	S330 served. Two applications received, both refused. Appeal received. Appeal dismissed – instructions sent to Legal for Enforcement Notice. Enforcement Notice issued- compliance achieved. File closed.
	109/2	66 Penny Street, Lancaster	Installation of a new shop front & display of unauthorised sign.	S 330s issued. Sign removed. Application received for a new shop front. A new owner has been revealed – he is seeking compliance from his tenant.
	109/2/206	West Bank Stables, Greaves Park, Lancaster.	Construction of decked area.	Retrospective application refused. Appeal dismissed. S 330s issued. Considering E.N. Agent in negotiations. EN issued. Appeal against EN in progress.
	109/2	11 Standen Park, Lancaster	Unauthorised works to a listed building.	S330 issued – Agreed to carry out works as per PP.
	109/2/212	Ridge Hotel (former), Patterdale Road, Lancaster	Untidy land.	S215 served. Compliance required by 20 <sup>th</sup> May 2009 (to remove debris and erect a fence)

## PLANNING ENFORCEMENT SCHEDULE

DISTRICT	FILE REF.	DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY	NATURE OF BREACH	PRESENT POSITION
Lancaster	10. 109/2	58 North Road, Lancaster	Replacement upvc windows @ first floor level.	S330 issued. Planning application refused. Awaiting appeal.
	11. 109/2/210	NHS Offices (former Reebok International), Moor Lane, Lancaster	Display of unauthorised signs on a listed building.	Retrospective application submitted – refused. Appeal submitted – dismissed. S16 issued and returned. Awaiting a further application for advertisement and LB consent for an alternative sign.

## PLANNING ENFORCEMENT SCHEDULE

DISTRICT	FILE REF.	DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY	NATURE OF BREACH	PRESENT POSITION
Morecambe & Heysham	109/3/301	20 Lonsdale Avenue, Morecambe.	Erection of a building.	Renewed attempts to secure full compliance with Enforcement Notice.
	109/3/308	10 Queen Street, Morecambe.	Unauthorised roller shutters.	Enforcement Notice served 24/10/05. Appeal dismissed. Action to recommence.
	109/3/325	Trinity Methodist Church, Marine Rd West, Morecambe.	Unauthorised works to a listed building.	S330 issued 10/01/06. Planning application and Listed Building Application refused – awaiting further application. Conservation Officer in discussions. S215 Notice issued. Compliance with notice.
	109/3	221 Marine Road, Morecambe.	Unauthorised works to Listed Building – works not in accordance with approved plan.	S330 issued and returned. Considering what further action is required. Planning Permission granted – awaiting implementation but continue consideration of formal action.
	109/3/313	236+237 Marine Road, Morecambe.	Construction of front and rear dormers.	EN issued – non-compliance. Adjourned in Court 27/03/09. New date 24 April 09.
	109/3/326	29 Green Street, Morecambe	Untidy land.	S215 Notice served. Not complied with. Considering prosecution.
	109/3	35 Heysham Road, Heysham	Construction of raised patio area and balconies.	S330 issued. Awaiting application.
	109/3	33 Albert Road, Morecambe	Insertion of two windows.	S330 issued – planning application submitted but still pending.
	109/3/320	7 Hurstleigh Drive, Heysham	Erection of a wall in breach of a condition.	Non-compliance with BCN so prosecution took place on 27/03/09 – successful – defendants fined and ordered to pay costs.
	109/3	19 Beecham Street, Morecambe	Untidy land.	S330 served. Ongoing discussions.
	109/3	228 Westminster Road, Heysham	Siting of a shipping container.	S330 issued – not returned. Considering EN. Further S330 issued. Container removed.

Morecambe & Heysham	23.	109/3	6 Crewgarth Road, Morecambe	Erection of a fence.	S330 issued and returned. Considering next course of action.
	24.	109/3	238 Marine Road Central, Morecambe	Installation of a flue and erection of screens.	S330 issued. Awaiting an application.

**PLANNING ENFORCEMENT SCHEDULE**

<b>DISTRICT</b>	<b>FILE REF.</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY</b>	<b>NATURE OF BREACH</b>	<b>PRESENT POSITION</b>
Carnforth	109/4/28	9 Grosvenor Court, Carnforth.	Non compliance with Condition re: obscure glazing and opening windows.	Prosecution successful – still no compliance – holding off further prosecution for now.
	109/4/29	Meadowbanks, Stiles Lane, Carnforth.	Siting of a caravan. Erecting of a menage. Siting of trailers.	PCN served. Meeting held. Considering situation. Advised of need for planning permission. – application pending.
	109/4	25 Edward Street, Carnforth	Use of residential as an office.	PP refused. Appeal dismissed. Awaiting compliance.

## PLANNING ENFORCEMENT SCHEDULE

DISTRICT	FILE REF.	DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY	NATURE OF BREACH	PRESENT POSITION
Rural Areas	28.	109/5/320 Lot 2, Hampson Farm, Stoney Lane, Galgate.	Removal of hedgerow. Unauthorised works and unauthorised use.	Enforcement Notices issued. Appeal submitted- Inquiry held. Notice upheld – non compliance. – prosecution being considered but new application submitted.
	29.	109/5 Bridge House Farm Tea Rooms, Wray.	Failure to comply with condition no. 6 details of western boundary.	S330 issued and returned.
	30.	109/5 Near Moss Farm, Gulf Lane, Cockerham	Breach of condition re: limit of season for caravan occupancy.	S330 issued and returned.
	31.	109/5 Land North of Beaumont Grange, Slyne-with-Hest.	Erection of a building in connection with commercial / equestrian / livery.	Monitoring for compliance with conditions. (Highway works undertaken). File closed.
	32.	109/5/352 Kilross House, Flat Lane, Yealand Conyers.	Columns and window frames.	Failure to return s330, instructions sent to Legal to prosecute re non-return. Instructions sent to issue Breach of Conditions notice. Notices served. Appeal lodged. Awaiting full compliance (delayed due to illness).
	33.	109/5/ Letterbox Field, Ford Lane, Silverdale.	Erection of building not in accordance with approved plans.	Section 330 issued – Not returned – Application received. Application approved. Monitoring for compliance with conditions.
	34.	109/5/360 Overton Memorial Hall, Overton.	Installation of a security barb wire.	Compliance achieved.
	35.	109/5/364 Greenacre Farm, Green Lane, Heaton-with-Oxcliffe.	Non compliance of conditions re toilet block roofs & turning head	S 330 issued but not returned. BCN issued. Compliance.
	36.	109/5/363 The Boat House, Church Brow, Halton.	Display of unauthorised signs.	S 16 issued Not returned considering prosecution. Further S16 received 6/4/09. Signs to be removed in the next two weeks.
	37.	109/5/365 Land at Birkland Barrow, Birkland Barrow Road, Over Kellet.	Siting of a caravan for residential purposes.	S 330s issued. Planning application refused. E.N. issued. Compliance not achieved within time limit, waiting for response from owner.
	38.	109/5/361 Bain beck Farm, Kirkby Lonsdale Road, Arkholme.	Breach of condition – works taking place outside of buildings.	Awaiting further application.

## PLANNING ENFORCEMENT SCHEDULE

DISTRICT		FILE REF.	DESCRIPTION OF PROPERTY	NATURE OF BREACH	PRESENT POSITION
Rural Areas	39.	109/5	Pillacroft Wood, Aughton.	Siting of a storage building.	Retrospective application refused. S 330s issued. Applicant considering alternative location. EN issued.
	40.	109/5/362	Land rear of Temple Court, Yealand Redmayne.	Siting of a caravan for agricultural worker.	Retrospective application refused. S 330 issued and returned. E.N issued. Appeal received. Appeal upheld. Temporary permission for 3 years given.
	41.	109/5/366	Brantholme Hasty Brow Slyne With Hest.	Demolition of dwelling & erection of new dwelling.	Temporary stop notice & Planning Contravention Notice issued. New planning application being considered. P.P.granted.
	42.	109/2/194	Higher Moorhead, Quernmore.	Erection of a building & unauthorised use.	S330 issued 4/01/06. Planning Application refused 26/06/06. Enforcement Notice issued. Appeal dismissed – awaiting compliance, but new application submitted.
	43	109/2/207	Vianova formerly Tillery Garth Quernmore	Siting of a caravan & erection of a bungalow.	E. Notice to be issued shortly for removal of caravan & demolition of dwelling. EN issued. Appeal lodged. Public enquiry to be held 13/8/09.
	44	109/5	Land rear of The Golden Ball, Lancaster Road, Heaton with Oxcliffe	Use of land as a caravan site.	S330's issued. Considering action.
	45	109/5	Barn, Burton Road, Priest Hutton	Siting of a shed and a chalet.	S330's issued. Considering serving Enforcement Notice.
	46	109/5	The Sands, Carr Lane, Middleton	Breach of condition re: winter storage.	S330 issued. Advised the owner of the need to submit an application to vary or remove condition.
	47	109/5	7 Manor Crescent, Slyne	Erection of a fence.	S330 issued. Fence to be reduced.