



Committee: PLANNING REGULATORY COMMITTEE

Date: MONDAY, 29 MARCH 2021

Time: 10.30 A.M.

PLEASE NOTE

THIS WILL BE A 'VIRTUAL MEETING', A LINK TO WHICH WILL BE AVAILABLE ON LANCASTER CITY COUNCIL'S WEBSITE AT LEAST 24HRS BEFORE THE MEETING.

A G E N D A

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

1 Apologies for Absence

2 Minutes

Minutes of meeting held on 1st March 2021 (previously circulated).

3 Items of Urgent Business authorised by the Chair

4 Declarations of Interest

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

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

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

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

Planning Applications for Decision

Community Safety Implications

In preparing the reports for this agenda, regard has been paid to the implications of the

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

Local Finance Considerations

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

Human Rights Act

Planning application recommendations have been reached after consideration of The Human Rights Act. Unless otherwise explicitly stated in the report, the issues arising do not appear to be of such magnitude to override the responsibility of the City Council to regulate land use for the benefit of the community as a whole, in accordance with national law.

- | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|--|--------------------------|------------------------|
| 5 | A5 20/00554/FUL | University of Cumbria, Bowerham Road, Lancaster, Lancashire | John O'Gaunt Ward | (Pages 4 - 14) |
| | | Demolition of buildings including Sarah Witham Thompson, Gressingham and Melling Halls, Black Box Theatre, Old Dining Room and the Long Corridor and erection of a 4 storey Extra Care residential building (use class C3), partial demolition, conversion and change of use of the Art Studio from education facility (use class D1) to ancillary space associated with the Extra Care residential building and change of use and conversion of Barbon Hall and Hornby Hall from education facility (use class D1) to provide affordable residential apartments (use class C3) with associated landscaping, parking, access and service infrastructure. | | |
| 6 | A6 20/00762/FUL | University of Cumbria, Bowerham Road, Lancaster, Lancashire | John O'Gaunt Ward | (Pages 15 - 24) |
| | | Erection of a 2-storey supported living facility (C3), erection of a bin and cycle store, creation of access | | |

road and parking, and alterations of existing ground levels including retaining walls and gabion terraces, associated landscaping and service infrastructure.

- 7 A7 [20/01020/FUL](#) **Telegraph Field Pump House,
School Lane, Wray, Lancashire** **Lower Lune Valley
Ward** **(Pages 25 - 29)**
- Erection of an agricultural building for livestock/storage and creation of an area of hardstanding.

8 Delegated List (Pages 30 - 36)

ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

(i) **Membership**

Councillors Sandra Thornberry (Chair), Dave Brookes (Vice-Chair), Paul Anderton, Richard Austen-Baker, Mandy Bannon, Abbott Bryning, Keith Budden, Roger Cleet, Tim Dant, Mel Guilding, Janice Hanson, Cary Matthews, Joyce Pritchard, Robert Redfern and John Reynolds

(ii) **Substitute Membership**

Councillors Alan Biddulph (Substitute), Victoria Boyd-Power (Substitute), Jake Goodwin (Substitute), June Greenwell (Substitute), Tim Hamilton-Cox (Substitute), Colin Hartley (Substitute), David Whitworth (Substitute) and Peter Yates (Substitute)

(iii) **Queries regarding this Agenda**

Please contact Democratic Services: email democracy@lancaster.gov.uk.

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

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

KIERAN KEANE,
CHIEF EXECUTIVE,
TOWN HALL,
DALTON SQUARE,
LANCASTER, LA1 1PJ

Published on 15th March 2021.

Agenda Item	A5
Application Number	20/00554/FUL
Proposal	Demolition of buildings including Sarah Witham Thompson, Gressingham and Melling Halls, Black Box Theatre, Old Dining Room and the Long Corridor and erection of a 4 storey Extra Care residential building (use class C3), partial demolition, conversion and change of use of the Art Studio from education facility (use class D1) to ancillary space associated with the Extra Care residential building and change of use and conversion of Barbon Hall and Hornby Hall from education facility (use class D1) to provide affordable residential apartments (use class C3) with associated landscaping, parking, access and service infrastructure
Application site	University of Cumbria, Bowerham Road, Lancaster, Lancashire
Applicant	University of Cumbria & NWSDL
Agent	Clare Bland
Case Officer	Mr David Forshaw
Departure	No
Summary of Recommendation	Approval but delegated back to the Head of Planning and Place to allow the consultation period to expire

1.0 Application Site and Setting

- 1.1 This is one of two applications on the agenda for separate developments at the University of Cumbria (UoC) campus off Bowerham Road. This application was deferred from the last meeting due to late concerns expressed by the LLFA and United Utilities which officers felt could not be overcome through imposition of conditions and to seek assurances from the applicant over the accuracy of the submitted visual imagery. The applicant has submitted additional information relating to the proposed drainage system which has been assessed by the LLFA and United Utilities and confirmed the images are reasonably accurate based on Google street view. The 3D model has been inserted into the photo context to provide an indicative view of the proposal within its context.
- 1.2 This site is at the southern end of the campus near the junction of Coulston Road and Golgotha Road. The buildings to be converted are the Barbon and Hornby Halls (former barrack married quarters). The new build element will be situated to the rear (north east) of these between them and the retained College North and South buildings with its south east elevation facing and close to Coulston Road. The art studio is situated abutting the boundary wall with Coulston Road close to the Golgotha Road pedestrian/cycle entrance.
- 1.3 To the south, west and east are residential roads outside the campus. To the north west is the site of the proposed replacement student accommodation block (see report on application 20/00550/FUL). To the north and north east is the densely developed university campus buildings and circulation routes.
- 1.4 The precise location of this development is within the adopted Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD (SPLA) policy EC6 developable area of the campus and the heritage led residential

site (H3.3). It is outside the key urban landscape (EN5).

2.0 Proposal

- 2.1 This application is for demolition of a number of university buildings, the majority of which have been vacant for some time, and replacement with a 3 and 4 storey block of self-contained extra care residential apartments. Occupants will receive individual levels of care as required. Also proposed is conversion of two non-designated heritage asset buildings to provide open age apartments with no provision of care. All units will be operated by Progress Housing and be available for affordable rent at 20% below market rent levels. Accommodation will be subject to a Local Letting Plan. There will be 92 extra care units (67x1 bed and 25x2 bed) and 16 created by the conversion (8x2 bed and 8x1 bed).
- 2.2 The grounds contain landscaped gardens with a network of paths running through them and linked to the wider campus and public roads, seating areas, planting beds and a growing area and meeting/community space in the converted art studio. The extra care block will contain roof gardens, communal kitchen and dining areas, cycle and scooter facilities, admin and management area and space for on site treatment rooms, hairdressers, laundry and games/media room.
- 2.3 A new vehicular access is proposed off Golgotha Road to serve just the development. Pedestrians and cyclists will be able to go between the site and university campus to use this entrance but not vehicles. The access will necessitate a change to a section of Golgotha Road to allow two way traffic so vehicles can enter from Coulston Road. 52 parking spaces are to be provided to serve the development.

3.0 Site History

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

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
20/00762/FUL	Erection of a 2-storey supported living facility (C3), erection of a bin and cycle store, creation of access road and parking, and alterations of existing ground levels including retaining walls and gabion terraces, associated landscaping and service infrastructure	Decision pending
20/00550/FUL	Demolition of buildings including William Thompson Tower, William Thompson Offices, Primary Curriculum Building, Estates & Secondary Centre buildings and erection of an 8, 9 and 10 storey building comprising residential student accommodation in cluster flat arrangements with ancillary laundry room, cycle store, refuse store, management office and reception, plant room and associated landscaping, access and service infrastructure	Decision pending
20/00425/EIR	Screening request for a replacement student residential block in area A following the demolition of the existing 10 storey William Thompson Tower and surrounding buildings	ES not required
18/01225/PLDC	Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a fence and gates	Granted
18/01220/PREMTG	Demolition of existing teaching and accommodation blocks, conversion of 2 barrack buildings to 17 2-bed apartments, erection of 23 4-bed 3 storey townhouses and 2 4-storey student accommodation buildings comprising a total of 30 5-bed cluster flats	Advice provided
18/00399/PRETWO	Demolition of existing teaching and accommodation blocks, conversion of 2 barrack buildings to 17 2-bed apartments, erection of 23 4-bed 3 storey townhouses and 2 4-storey student accommodation buildings comprising a	Advice provided

4.0 Consultation Responses

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

Consultee	Response
Environmental Health	Conditions requested relating to noise and dust emissions during construction and provision of EV charging points
Housing Strategy	Supports the proposal as meeting an identified specialist and affordable housing need
County Highways	No objections subject to provision of a zebra crossing on Coulston Road, upgrade of bus stops on Coulston Road, restriction of use to extra care, cycle storage and implementation of the travel plan
Policy	Retention of the heritage asset buildings is supported but questions raised about the extent, need for and location of the extra care units as enabling development. Concern raised about the longer term needs of the university and short timescale of the masterplan
County Archaeology	Request condition securing a programme of archaeological works
Conservation Team	No objection subject to conditions
Arboriculture officer	No objection
Public Realm	Consider the development will provide sufficient on-site amenity, natural and semi-natural greenspace and has withdrawn its request for a contribution to improvements in Williamson Park
Civic Society	No objection to demolition of 1960s blocks and extra care units/affordable being provided. Supports retention of Barbon and Hornby buildings. Concerns about conflict between residents and students and blandness of the new build.
LLFA	The revised drainage strategy proposes to discharge at the minimum greenfield rate with excess volume stored on site. No infiltration testing has been carried out which is the first level of drainage hierarchy and the potential for this needs to be confirmed at detail design stage. The LLFA has no objection subject to conditions including requiring pre-commencement approval of the detailed drainage system.
United Utilities	No objection subject to a condition requiring pre-commencement approval of the detailed drainage system. This will enable all parties the opportunity to work together to reach a suitable outcome.
Natural England	No objections subject to condition securing mitigation through resident's pack and notice board
Police	Crime impact statement and security advice provided
Fire Officer	Standard advice
CSTEP	Require detailed Employment Skills Plan

4.2 A total of 30 neighbour responses have been received. Of these all are objections apart from two in support and two making comments. The objections can be summarised as:

- Making Golgotha Road 2 way
- Worsening of the amount and speed of traffic in the area
- Poor visibility at the Golgotha Road/Coulston Road junction
- Dangers to pedestrians
- The university entrance should be used not Golgotha Road
- Loss of parking/not enough replacement being provided/pressure on existing on road spaces
- No need for sheltered housing
- Extra care unsuitable within the campus
- 4 storeys too high, out of character and imposing
- Loss of light
- Loss of privacy
- Overshadowing of university buildings
- Effect on the skyline
- Loss of tree
- Loss of wildlife

- Pollution
- The university should have to improve parking congestion on neighbouring roads e.g. by removing parking charges
- Loss of spaces available to the university
- EV charging is not provided
- Cyclists will be forced onto Coulston Road from loss of cycle routes
- Loss of light
- Loss of trees
- Noise and disturbance
- Effect on historic buildings
- Extra traffic on Coulston Road
- Design out of character
- Building too large and cramped
- Loss of greenspace
- Locating a new zebra crossing close to bus stops and a junction is dangerous
- Surrounding streets should be residents only parking
- Loss of green space
- Golgotha Road is not wide enough to accommodate two way traffic and parking
- Head on collisions are likely on Golgotha Road and it should be made into a cul-de-sac
- Barbon and Hornby buildings will be lost against the new building
- Negative effect on the skyline
- More consultation should have taken place

Those making comments stated materials should be sandstone and not grey colour or brick and a diversion route for cyclists is needed during construction.

5.0 Analysis

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

- Principle
- Design and visual impact
- Effect on neighbours
- Heritage
- Traffic and parking
- Other material considerations

5.2 Principle of Development SPLA DPD Policies SP1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development, SP2: Lancaster District Settlement Hierarchy, EC6: University of Cumbria Campus; H3.3: Heritage Led Housing Development; Development Management DPD Policies DM8: Accommodation for Older People and Vulnerable Communities and National Planning Policy Framework Sections 2, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12 and 16.

5.2.1 SPLA policy EC6 states the Council will support sustainable growth of the campus where it accords with both the masterplan for the University of Cumbria (UoC) and all relevant planning policies. Policy H3.3 supports residential development in the interests of conserving non-designated heritage assets in this part of the campus. The main points of principle to consider are whether the development is justified in the context of these policies and ensures conservation of the non-designated heritage assets (NDHAs).

5.2.2 The University's Masterplan and Estates Strategy have been submitted with the application along with a planning statement which sets the context for the UoC's estate management. The planning statement says the UoC is the country's largest provider of initial teacher training operating from five main campus sites. Changes in government policy and the nature of learning has reduced the number of students by over 2,000 or 30% between 2013/14 to 2017/18. The UoC considers future student growth will be modest and further changes to teaching/learning methods has and will reduce the overall amount of physical space required per head (students, teachers, admin and support staff). The Lancaster campus currently operates at almost double the optimum sqm floorspace per head (14.02sqm v 7.5 sqm). To remain competitive and attempt to deal with the loss of revenue from

reduced student numbers UoC has reviewed all its business practices, including the extent and future requirements for the wider estate.

- 5.2.3 The masterplan identifies estate management issues and options and guides future development requirements. The Estates Strategy sets out initiatives focusing on reducing the amount of space and improving the efficiency and learning environment of the remaining space. This has been informed by various baseline studies including condition and suitability assessments of the buildings. Many have been found to be poor quality and unfit for purpose with poor space utilisation. Having regard to this the strategy recommends this part of the campus be disposed of and the UoC consolidate in the remaining, better quality buildings. According to the planning statement this disposal will enable UoC to facilitate a long term commitment to remain within the City and suitably manage the remaining estate. Financial re-investment in the campus will support the university's initiatives to adapt to a low carbon economy. The existing energy infrastructure is outdated and inefficient to meet modern site requirements. Energy efficiency projects have been identified including a new district heating system and photovoltaic energy to power the campus.
- 5.2.4 Preparation of the masterplan is supported, and officers have had some involvement in it. However, wider Councillor involvement and endorsement has not taken place. Concern has been raised by officers about the short, 10 year timescale of the masterplan and the ability to plan with comfort for the longer term needs of the University. In response, the applicant states the higher education sector is extremely fluid with teaching practices continuously evolving (as demonstrated during the pandemic). The UoC considers teaching, student support and administration will never return to the pre-pandemic form. Pre-pandemic, all higher education institutions were seeking to adapt their physical estates in line with new technology and advances in remote learning, alongside the growing demand for better and more dynamic, value for money teaching for students paying higher fees. Having regard to these factors the UoC considers the 10 year masterplan lifespan is appropriate and robust and, unlike a longer plan, is able to offer sufficient flexibility to meet the ever changing requirements placed on it by stakeholders. The UoC's need for a flexible and responsive masterplan (even if covering a shorter period than officers would like) is reasonable. It is accepted that the disposal of this part of the campus is based on a rigorous assessment underpinning the Masterplan and Estates Strategy and that the buildings themselves are in poor condition and unfit for purpose.
- 5.2.5 SPLA policy H3.3 states that development proposals must be conservation led with a presumption in favour of the retention and conservation of identified heritage assets including their wider setting. The policy expects enabling development to be around 15 residential units through conversion of buildings. There is no expectation of new build development although this is not precluded by the policy. A full assessment of the impact of the proposals on all NDHAs and their setting is set out in the heritage section of this report. However, retention of Barbon and Hornby through a sympathetic conversion and sympathetic and justified demolition of more modern parts of the art studio building achieve this presumption. In order to ensure the development directly relates to and secures conservation of the NDHAs it is proposed that a condition be imposed that requires completion of the conversion works before a certain point relating to the new build element, e.g. prior to occupation of the first extra care unit. In this way the requirements of H3.3 are met.
- 5.2.6 DM DPD policy DM8 supports new residential accommodation for a range of vulnerable communities where there are proven needs. Strategic Housing state: *"In terms of the need and demand for extra care... Lancashire County Council's Housing with Care and Support Strategy sets a target of providing one new extra care scheme in each district of Lancashire by 2025. This scheme would clearly contribute towards this target. In terms of Lancaster City Council's own evidence base, the Housing Needs Survey undertaken in 2018 undertaken by arc4 clearly identifies the need to ensure a range of appropriate housing provision is required to meet the needs of the ageing population, and the number of people across Lancaster aged 65 or over is predicted to increase from 28,500 in 2017 to 37,000 by 2033 (29.8%). In considering the responses to the survey, 13.8% of older people responding would consider extra care housing to rent. It is for this reason that the council's Homes Strategy (approved by Cabinet on 27 October 2020 and currently being consulted on), sets out the need to support opportunities to bring forward purpose built extra care housing for rent to enable older people to remain in independent settings for as long as possible. Therefore, the council supports this proposal. The county council's needs analysis suggests that the location of the scheme would be deemed as medium need. However, south Lancaster is a very strong housing market and is typically where many residents would choose to live. It will be critical to the success of this scheme that it not only well integrates into the existing campus, but provides an appropriate level of*

on-site services for residents creating a good community hub. In summary therefore, the Housing Strategy Team support these proposals which align to the council's Homes Strategy 2020-25 by increasing both the specialist and affordable housing required in Lancaster district."

- 5.2.7 In conclusion, it is considered the principle of development is acceptable within the context of SPLA policies EC6 and H3.3 and DMDPD policy DM8.
- 5.3 **Design and Visual Impact DMDPD DM2: Housing Standards; DM29: Key design principles; DM30: sustainable design; Policy DM46: Development and Landscape Impact; NPPF section 12**
- 5.3.1 According to the design and access statement the design of the extra care building has responded to the constraints and opportunities of the location and NDHAs and seeks to create active frontages and a new public realm to link the elements, ensure it respects the scale and mass of the NDHAs and promote their importance and setting.
- 5.3.2 The proposed building comprises of two joined but offset wings. It is predominantly 4 storeys in height dropping to 3 storeys at both ends and in the middle where the offset occurs. Materials have been revised following negotiations and are now buff sandstone brick for the lower three floors and grey cladding to the top floor and near the main entrance with light grey aluminium fenestration. The façades are broken up by Juliet balconies and insets to the 3rd floor where communal roof terraces are located. Further amendments have introduced additional glazing to communal areas on the front and rear to break up localised wall mass and provide a softer interface close to the site boundary.
- 5.3.3 The building extends away from Coulston Road with its mass viewed between existing retained campus buildings. The clearest public views are of the side (end) elevation where it is between approximately 10.5m and 12.5m from the campus boundary wall with no intervening buildings. There are existing mature highway trees on this side of Coulston Road which will filter views when in leaf, especially more oblique views from further along the road. The development will be higher than the adjacent campus/converted buildings. However, the close proximity of the old and new buildings will lessen any impact arising from the difference in height and overall mass of the new build. From a roofscape perspective, the new build will be visible but not to an extent that is harmful to the local area.
- 5.3.4 Concerns raised by officers about the functional relationship with the university have been addressed. There will be no hard boundaries between the new development and wider campus. The development will not restrict public permeability between the campus and outside. Indeed, pedestrian and cycle access will be maintained for the public, and residents of the new development will be encouraged to use the linked paths to access the wider campus. Soft planting is proposed to delineate the landscaped areas associated with the development.
- 5.3.5 All apartments will meet both nationally described space standards and M4(2) standards and three extra care apartments will meet M4(3) wheelchair user requirements. The design and impact of the scale and massing on the streetscene are considered acceptable and meet the requirements of the local plan. The applicant has confirmed the images are reasonably accurate based on Google street view. The 3D model has been inserted into the photo context to provide an indicative view of the proposal within its context. There are adjacent retained buildings which provide reference points against which the new build can be judged with a reasonable level of accuracy. The retained College North and South buildings are between approximately 10.7m (main ridge) and 11.5m (gable feature ridges) high. The Barbon and Hornby buildings are between 9.5 and 10.2m to ridge (ground levels vary around the buildings). The proposed extra care building is 12.5m high. Therefore, the new building will stand higher than surrounding retained buildings by between 1 and 3 metres which is reflected in the photo montages. By comparison, the accommodation blocks to be demolished are three storeys in height similar to the Hornby and Barbon buildings. Therefore, officers are content the submitted images are reasonably accurate as asserted by the applicant's architect.
- 5.4 **Effect on Neighbours DMDPD Policy DM 29: Key Design Principles**
- 5.4.1 The only properties directly affected by the development are on the opposite side of Coulston Road. These are traditional two storey residential properties facing the end elevation of the extra care block. Between nos. 86 and 96 Coulston Road the distance from their front elevations to the end elevation of the development ranges from approximately 27.5m to 32m. The mature highway trees

are situated in this space close to the campus boundary. This elevation contains three floors of apartments with principal habitable room windows facing the houses opposite. The addition of a third floor increases the height for potential overlooking by 3m. In accordance with standard interface distances the separation between this elevation and the facing houses should be 27m. Therefore, adequate separation is provided and no undue loss of privacy will occur.

5.4.2 At this distance it is not considered the development will have any adverse impact from being overbearing or cause any direct loss of light that justifies refusal. The development is therefore compliant with policy DM29.

5.5 Heritage DMDPD DM29: Key Design Principles; DM41: Development Affecting Non-Designated Heritage Assets or their Settings; NPPF section 16

5.5.1 There are 7 non-designated heritage assets directly affected by the proposals: **Barbon and Hornby halls** will be subject to minimal external works. All windows and doors will be replaced like for like with timber heritage style in the same colour. Metalwork and rainwater goods will be made good and repainted to match existing. Alterations are proposed to two windows in Barbon: one in the NW and one in the SW elevations to infill the lower part of each with matching stone and the upper frame replaced like for like. These are minimal works and will retain the buildings' historic character and significance. Details of all this work will be secured by condition. The conversion would ensure a new and sustainable use for these buildings and would not have a detrimental effect on their significance.

5.5.2 The **Art Studio** is a small vernacular building of limited architectural interest. The modern extensions limit the ability to understand the original building so their removal will have a positive effect on its significance.

5.5.3 The **perimeter wall** runs to the SE and SW of the application site. Alterations are proposed to form the new vehicular access on Golgotha Road by widening the existing entrance. Gateposts currently located to either side of the access will be relocated to either side of the new access layout. The wall has been subject to many alterations over the years, including in this location, and the proposed alterations will have only a limited effect on a short stretch. Removal of the modern extensions to the art studio will open up that stretch of wall to view. The significance of the overall wall will not be substantially affected.

5.5.4 **College North and South** buildings will be immediately to the rear of the extra care facility. The new development would replace existing buildings on the former parade ground in front of them.

5.5.5 **Chapel.** Situated immediately to the north, the setting of the chapel would be most affected by the greater massing of the scheme, although the separation is similar to existing buildings being demolished.

5.5.6 The linear form, scale and layout of the new build is somewhat monolithic and uniform. The spatial character is similarly linear and loses much of the attractive courtyard character of the existing post-war campus buildings it is replacing. The footprint of the building is large with limited surrounding space, exacerbated by the need for vehicular access, parking and new boundaries which affect the spacious open tree'd character of the existing campus. Sensitive landscape design is critical to mitigating these impacts. However, the form and design of the new building is distinctively modelled with a varied elevational composition and roofscape. The lively roofscape would help mitigate the 4 storey height and assimilate the building into its context. The revised materials are also an improvement and help relate the development to the character of its surroundings. The scheme would replace the tired 1960s buildings and help refresh the campus environment. Some of the more generous spatial character and variety of the campus would be lost causing minor harm to the setting of the NDHAs although this is mitigated to some extent by landscaping proposals.

5.5.7 Achieving good landscape design is essential. The linearity of the spaces is challenging and there have been welcome amendments to improve the quality, quantity and variety of outdoor amenity spaces, seating and circulation. The proposed tree planting is largely ornamental but this would not reflect the existing character of the local area which incorporates large tree species or help integrate the development into the wider landscape character. It is important the character of the existing planting is reflected in the scheme particularly close to the boundaries, subject to appropriateness of species close to buildings. Therefore, a condition is proposed requiring a more suitable soft

landscaping scheme.

- 5.5.8 In terms of policy and NPPF paragraph 197 there should be a balanced approach in assessing harm in relation to the significance of undesignated heritage assets, as reflected in policy DM41. In terms of spatial character there would be minor harm on the spacious setting of historic buildings. However, amendments mitigate the minor harm. Retention of Hornby and Barbon and improvements to the art studio are important considerations in favour of the scheme. Subject to improvements to the landscaping and further detailed information on replacement features, both secured through condition, there are no objections.
- 5.5.9 A desk-based archaeology assessment concludes that the historic and potential archaeological significance has been impacted by C20th construction but some earlier structures remain and need to be recorded. Sub-surface remains may survive so an archaeological watching brief is required during construction. Conditions requiring photographic building surveys and submission of a watching brief are proposed.
- 5.6 **Traffic and Parking SPLA EC6: University of Cumbria Campus; DMDPD DM60: Enhancing Accessibility and Transport Linkages; DM61: Walking and Cycling; DM62: Vehicle Parking Provision; NPPF section 9**
- 5.6.1 SPLA policy EC6 states proposals that may result in an increase in student numbers and/or traffic movements must include mitigation to ensure no net increase in traffic movements occurs. As the site would no longer form part of the university campus, its development will result in the loss of 72 spaces that are currently available to students, staff and visitors. To provide for parking needs of the extra care and affordable apartments a dedicated car park with 52 spaces is proposed, accessed from Golgotha Road.
- 5.6.2 A study of parking carried out on behalf of the University shows that on a typical university day no more than 65% of the total 528 on site parking spaces are used, leaving spare capacity of at least 184 spaces. Even with the loss of 72 spaces due to the extra care development sufficient parking is available on site to meet the future demands of the university. Furthermore, UoC intends to implement a parking strategy and travel plan. The parking strategy will be rolled out across the campus and includes making the proposed student accommodation car free (20/00550/FUL), providing additional cycle parking facilities and encouraging car sharing. The travel plan will ensure alternative modes of travel are encouraged. The site is well served by public transport, pedestrian and cycle links. The travel plan covers the whole campus and measures to be implemented include appointment of a co-ordinator, welcome packs for students resident on the campus, information on, and new signage for pedestrian and cycle routes; on site showers and changing facilities for staff and raising awareness of public transport and discount tickets. The travel plan will be implemented and regularly reviewed through a condition attached to the permission and is acceptable to County Highways. County Highways recognises the University contributes to some vehicles parking on surrounding residential streets but that complaints have not been received recently. The results of the parking survey suggest on-site capacity is not a major factor in this. Therefore, the loss of these spaces to university use should not give rise to additional on street parking by university users.
- 5.6.3 The parking standards for C3 residential use presents a range of parking requirements based on the number of bed spaces and a separate requirement for flatted development based on an individual case basis. This is a flatted development so it is appropriate to consider the end user requirements. Based on the operation of the extra care accommodation, which would be consistent with sheltered accommodation, 28 spaces are proposed (25 standard plus 3 disabled). For the residential flats created by conversion of the two buildings 24 spaces are proposed. This provides a total of 52 spaces which County Highways accepts as appropriate as long as the use is conditioned to provision of extra care accommodation and not open market residential.
- 5.6.4 Sole access to and from the development by vehicles is proposed via Golgotha Road. There is already a pedestrian/cycle entrance in this location which will be widened to allow two way traffic movements. Golgotha Road is currently one-way in the eastbound direction and no vehicles can approach the site from Coulston Road to the east. Although vehicles could access the site along Golgotha Road using the established one-way system, to limit the impact on local residents along that route it is proposed to provide two-way vehicle movements for a 37m length of Golgotha Road from its junction with Coulston Road. This will enable vehicles to turn off Coulston Road into

Golgotha Road for the sole purpose of accessing the development. The new layout will be clearly marked to prevent vehicles continuing along Golgotha Road and any vehicle making a wrong turn into Golgotha Road will be able to enter the site and turn round before leaving to get back onto Coulston Road.

- 5.6.5 The applicant's transport statement has assessed the cumulative impact of the three proposals on the surrounding highway network (i.e. the student block (20/00550/FUL), supported living development off Anderson Close (20/00762/FUL) and this development). The three developments are likely to generate additional two-way traffic movements numbering 23 in the AM peak and 27 in the PM peak. Four road junctions have been assessed for capacity including the proposed new access on Golgotha Road. This assessment includes the AM and PM peak hour periods in both 2020 and 2025 with and without the proposed two-way arrangement on Golgotha Road. The modelling results show that all four junctions have capacity to accommodate the additional traffic with minimal increase in queuing which will not result in any severe delays or have a detrimental impact on the operation of the junctions. Therefore, it is considered the cumulative traffic generated by the three proposed developments or this development in isolation will not result in a severe impact on the surrounding highway network.
- 5.6.6 County Highways accepts the analysis although initially raised concern about the timing of the data collection and growth years used. The former point has also been made by objectors. This has been addressed and the survey was carried out during term time when all the university's facilities were open and the growth years are consistent with DfT guidance. Further requested minor amendments to the access, internal parking and turning arrangements and parking on Golgotha Road were requested by County Highways and have been submitted for consideration and are acceptable to County Highways.
- 5.6.7 A new zebra crossing, upgrades to bus stops on Coulston Road, implementation of a travel plan and cycle storage will be secured by a condition. County Highways raises no objection and it is considered the requirements of policy EC6 will be met.

5.7 **Other Material Considerations**

- 5.7.1 Drainage and flood risk - Current drainage is through a combined system through the campus discharging to an off-site combined public sewer. Infiltration tests are not currently available so it is proposed to limit discharge to greenfield rates for all rainfall events up to the 100-year plus 40% climate change. Water runoff from hard surfaces will flow into a below ground attenuation tank under the car park from where the outflow will be controlled to the greenfield rate into the existing campus system. Infiltration may be possible, subject to testing, which will be carried out at the detailed design stage. Infiltration is the first aim in the drainage hierarchy and this must be investigated. Conditions proposed by the LLFA and United Utilities require this to be done and the final detailed drainage design agreed prior to commencement of any operations on site. Foul water will be gravity fed to the combined public sewer separately from the surface water while on site. Flood risk at the site is low apart from isolated surface water flooding of high potential. To mitigate this ground levels around the building will fall away so as not to create low points. The proposed conditions can be imposed based on the revised drainage strategy and overcome the previous concerns of the LLFA and United Utilities meeting the requirements of policies DM33 and DM34.
- 5.7.2 Ecology and trees – There are no priority habitats on site and the nearest designated site is 600m away (Lancaster Moor Hospital Grassland BHS) with no connectivity to the development site. A number of buildings were identified in a preliminary ecological assessment as having potential suitability to be used by bats. Detailed bat surveys have been carried out across the site which found that four buildings support a very low number of roosting common pipistrelles. The trees on site are used for foraging but generally low levels of activity were recorded. The four buildings are Barbon and Hornby (to be converted) and Gressingham and Melling halls (to be demolished). Therefore, a full European Protected Species Mitigation licence will be needed from Natural England before works commence. Further species protection/mitigation is proposed through use of suitable external lighting, no site clearance during bird nesting season, use of bat and bird boxes and hedgehog friendly features. These are covered by conditions. 10 trees are proposed to be removed which are all assessed as of low quality apart from 2 which are of moderate quality. A further two are in poor condition and need to be removed for safety reasons and a highway tree will be felled if County Highways agree. 33 replacement trees are included in the landscaping scheme, which can also be

designed to ensure biodiversity net gain. 29 trees within or overhanging the site are to be retained and protected while the development is being carried out. The tree protection plan is appropriate to the site with a combination of fencing, ground protection and arboricultural supervision. The site is within the Morecambe Bay buffer zone and a Habitat Regulation Appropriate Assessment has been completed which concludes the recreational pressures from the development on the designated areas can be mitigated by suitable packs distributed to all resident students. The scheme is compliant with policies DM44 and DM45.

- 5.7.3 Air Quality – A qualitative air quality assessment for the construction and operational phases has been submitted. This concludes there is a not significant risk if standard mitigation measures are used. Policy DM31 is therefore complied with.
- 5.7.4 Sustainability – An energy statement has been submitted which confirms the development has the potential to achieve a 23% reduction from Part L Building Regulations emission requirements through measures including enhanced thermal building fabric, recovery of waste heat, combined heat and power system, thermal storage water heating, air source heat pumps and solar panels. This complies with the requirements of policy DM30.

6.0 Conclusion and Planning Balance

- 6.1 The retention and conversion of three NDHAs is supported. There is a need for extra care and affordable rented accommodation so the proposed uses are acceptable. There will be a loss of 12 low quality trees but no adverse impact on the setting of a number of NDHAs. The proposed development exceeds that expected in policy H3.3 but this alone is not a reason to refuse. The impacts of this size of development on neighbours, the townscape and highway infrastructure has been assessed. The conclusion is that with suitable mitigation the development will not give rise to any undue adverse impacts sufficient to justify refusal. The development will enable implementation of measures reducing reliance on private cars and utilising carbon reduction technologies. The benefits of the proposals as a whole outweigh any negative impacts and therefore in the overall balance, the application is recommended for approval.
- 6.2 Since receipt of the revised drainage strategy and confirmation the visual images are reasonably accurate further consultation has been carried out. This will expire after the Committee meeting, so it is proposed to delegate the final decision to the Head of Planning and Place subject to not receiving any comments that relate to material planning considerations that have not previously been considered.

Recommendation

That Planning Permission **BE GRANTED** in principle subject to the following conditions, but the application be delegated back to the Head of Planning and Place to allow the consultation period to expire:

Condition no.	Description	Type
1	Time limit	Standard
2	Approved plans	Standard
3	Final Sustainable Drainage Strategy	Pre-commencement
4	Construction Phase Surface Water Management Plan	Pre-commencement
5	Foul Water Drainage	Pre-commencement
6	Employment Skills Plan	Pre-commencement
7	Access construction	Pre-commencement
8	Contaminated land	Pre-commencement
9	Building recording and written scheme of archaeology	Pre-commencement
9	Details of fenestration/rainwater goods/details for converted buildings	Pre-commencement
10	Finished floor levels (extra care building) and site levels	Pre-commencement
11	Off site highway works	Prior to commencement other than demolition
12	Materials samples	Above ground
13	Homeowner packs	Above Ground

14	Landscaping details	Above ground
15	Completion of conversion	Prior to occupation of extra care units
16	Travel Plan	Prior to occupation
17	Drainage Operation and Maintenance Plan and Verification Report	Prior to Occupation
18	Security details	Prior to Occupation
19	Car parking management strategy, cycle store and EV charging points	Prior to Occupation
20	Approved tree works	Ongoing
21	Ecological mitigation measures	Ongoing
22	Hours of construction	Ongoing
23	Landscaping Implementation	Planting season
24	Nesting birds	Specific time
25	Separate drainage	Control
26	Sustainable construction and energy efficiency	Control
27	Nationally described space standards and M4(2) and M4(3) standards	Control
28	Removal of Telecommunications Apparatus Permitted Development	Control
29	Extra Care Use within C3 Only	Control
30	Affordable Housing	Control
31	Retention of pedestrian/cycle routes	Control

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

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

Background Papers

None.

Agenda Item	A6
Application Number	20/00762/FUL
Proposal	Erection of a 2-storey supported living facility (C3), erection of a bin and cycle store, creation of access road and parking, and alterations of existing ground levels including retaining walls and gabion terraces, associated landscaping and service infrastructure
Application site	University of Cumbria, Bowerham Road, Lancaster, Lancashire
Applicant	University of Cumbria & NWSL
Agent	Clare Bland
Case Officer	Mr David Forshaw
Departure	Yes
Summary of Recommendation	Approval but delegated back to the Head of Planning and Place to allow the consultation period to expire

1.0 Application Site and Setting

- 1.1 This is one of two applications on the agenda for separate developments at the University of Cumbria (UoC) campus. This application was deferred from the last meeting due to late concerns expressed by the LLFA and United Utilities which officers felt could not be overcome through imposition of conditions. The applicant has submitted additional information relating to the proposed drainage system and location of existing water mains which has been assessed by the LLFA and United Utilities.
- 1.2 This site is in the north east corner of the campus close to the sports centre. It is currently the site of two unused tennis courts with housing on three sides on Anderson Close, Coulston Road and Clougha Avenue. The fourth side is open grass within the campus sports ground which drops down to the level of the nearby MUGA.
- 1.3 The site is within areas identified in the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD (SPLA) policies SC3 Open Space, Recreation and Leisure and EN5 Key Urban Landscape. It is outside the EC6 developable area of the campus.

2.0 Proposal

- 2.1 The development proposed is a two storey L shaped building with inverted pitches to the roof. The accommodation is for young adults with learning difficulties and 3 full time equivalent staff in self contained living units. There will be 13x1 bed apartments (one for staff), bin and cycle store and a new access off Anderson Close. The site will be surrounded by 2m high decorative fencing and railings to the boundary with the sports grounds and 1.8m close boarded fencing along the boundaries with housing. Also proposed is a re-working of the current slope down to the MUGA including construction of a retaining wall to the car park and gabions which will provide seating accessed by new steps.
- 2.2 The new access will be taken from the turning head of Anderson Close serving a car park with 11 spaces (two disabled). The grounds of the facility will be landscaped with hard and soft features

including seating areas and new tree, shrub and ornamental planting.

- 2.3 A footpath for use by the public to access the wider campus will be retained within the scheme although outside the immediate grounds of the building. Therefore, public access to and through the campus from Anderson Close will be maintained.

3.0 Site History

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

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
20/00554/FUL	Demolition of buildings including Sarah Witham Thompson, Gressingham and Melling Halls, Black Box Theatre, Old Dining Room and the Long Corridor and erection of a 4 storey Extra Care residential building (use class C3), partial demolition, conversion and change of use of the Art Studio from education facility (use class D1) to ancillary space associated with the Extra Care residential building and change of use and conversion of Barbon Hall and Hornby Hall from education facility (use class D1) to provide affordable residential apartments (use class C3) with associated landscaping, parking, access and service infrastructure	Decision pending
20/00550/FUL	Demolition of buildings including William Thompson Tower, William Thompson Offices, Primary Curriculum Building, Estates & Secondary Centre buildings and erection of an 8, 9 and 10 storey building comprising residential student accommodation in cluster flat arrangements with ancillary laundry room, cycle store, refuse store, management office and reception, plant room and associated landscaping, access and service infrastructure	Decision pending
20/00425/EIR	Screening request for a replacement student residential block in area A following the demolition of the existing 10 storey William Thompson Tower and surrounding buildings	ES not required
18/01225/PLDC	Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a fence and gates	Granted
18/01220/PREMTG	Demolition of existing teaching and accommodation blocks, conversion of 2 barrack buildings to 17 2-bed apartments, erection of 23 4-bed 3 storey townhouses and 2 4-storey student accommodation buildings comprising a total of 30 5-bed cluster flats	Closed
18/00399/PRETWO	Demolition of existing teaching and accommodation blocks, conversion of 2 barrack buildings to 17 2-bed apartments, erection of 23 4-bed 3 storey townhouses and 2 4-storey student accommodation buildings comprising a total of 30 5-bed cluster flats	Advice provided
15/01007/PAD	Prior Approval for the Demolition of part of the Askwith Building, The Range and the nursery building	Granted
15/00913/FUL	Partial demolition of the Askwith Building and erection of a new three storey teaching block with associated landscaping and replacement car parking and the erection of a single storey extension and installation of new windows to the retained part of the Askwith Building	Permitted
06/01202/FUL	Erection of a new 4 storey Gateway building, incorporating a One stop shop for student contact, catering facilities and offices	Permitted
04/00346/FUL	Demolition of principals house, construct art, design and	Permitted

	technology building, including extensions and alterations to Martinaue building and links to new teaching block (approved on application 03/00131/FUL)	
97/00324/FUL	Removal of Condition No 11 on Permission No 96/00525/CU to allow use of tennis courts for netball during winter months	Refused
96/00525/CU	Formation of new car park from existing tennis court to provide 56 parking spaces together with creation of three new tennis courts	Permitted

4.0 Consultation Responses

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

Consultee	Response
County Highways	No objection subject to use being supported living only, upgrade of bus stops on Wyresdale Road and provision of cycle store
Environmental Health	Require conditions relating to minimisation of dust and provision of electric vehicle charging points
Police	Security advice provided
Fire	Standard advice provided
Contaminated Land Officer	Standard conditions required
Civic Society	Supports development of the unused site; building is of pleasing design although concerned about its height; will cause extra traffic on already congested Anderson Close
County Heritage	Request condition securing a programme of archaeological works
Conservation Team	No comments
Arboricultural Officer	No objection to the revised scheme
Strategic Housing	Supports provision of a specialised housing need
LLFA	The revised drainage strategy proposes to discharge at the minimum greenfield rate with excess volume stored on site. No infiltration testing has been carried out which is the first level of drainage hierarchy and the potential for this needs to be confirmed at detailed design stage. The LLFA has no objection subject to conditions including requiring pre-commencement approval of the detailed drainage system.
Natural England	No objections subject to condition securing mitigation through resident's pack and notice board
United Utilities	No objection subject to conditions requiring pre-commencement approval of the detailed drainage system and investigations to locate and measures to protect the pressurised water mains laid within the site. This will enable all parties the opportunity to work together to reach a suitable outcome.
Public Realm	Acknowledges that there is a year round undersupply of playable community courts, but it is recognised that this site is not suitable to meet that need.

4.2 A total of 70 neighbour responses have been received. Of these all were objections apart from one making comments. The objections can be summarised as:

- Increase in traffic in area and on Anderson Close
- Worsened parking in area and on Anderson Close
- Access along Anderson Close poor (appeal for use of Clougha Avenue was dismissed)
- Transport survey carried out outside term time
- Loss of access to university grounds for recreation
- Loss of tennis court facility
- Existing student noise problems at night
- Light nuisance
- Bats forage across the site
- Overlooking/loss of privacy
- Loss of view

- Potential pre-historic features in adjacent field
- Overshadowing/loss of light
- Houses at lower ground level
- Loss of green space
- Noise, traffic and damage during construction
- Design out of character
- Loss of trees on and off site and hedge which screens floodlights
- Air pollution
- Worsening of existing garden and road flooding
- Bin store location
- Neighbours' extensions not shown on plans
- Will there be a different generation of residents and curfew imposed
- Loss of privacy
- Over shadowing
- Loss of trees
- Loss of habitat
- Unacceptable access
- Design out of character
- Over development
- Loss of amenity
- Loss of green space
- Contrary to policy
- Prevention of access from garden onto the site
- Effect on window in kitchen extension in boundary with site
- Noise disturbance
- Effect on traffic safety, parking and congestion
- Worsening of existing flooding
- Loss of tennis courts
- Use of the courts was changed from student use to public use
- Amended plans have not overcome objections
- Lack of proper consultation with neighbours by UoC
- Alternative sites are available on the campus
- Effect of sports ground use and floodlights on proposed residents
- A 2m right of way should be maintained at the rear of Clougha Avenue properties
- Nuisance from 24 hour a day business being operated
- Loss of public right of way across campus
- Lack of engagement by the University
- Residents are interested in purchasing the site for a community project
- No sunlight/daylight assessment has been carried out

One comment supports the provision of a pedestrian crossing.

5.0 Analysis

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

- Principle of development
- Design and visual impact
- Effect on neighbours
- Traffic and parking
- Other material considerations

5.2 Principle of Development SPLA DPD Policies SP1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development, SP2: Lancaster District Settlement Hierarchy; SC3: Open Space, Recreation and Leisure; EN5: Key Urban Landscape; DPD Policies DM8: Accommodation for Older People and Vulnerable Communities; DM27: Open Space, Sports and Recreational Facilities; DM46: Development and Landscape Impact and National Planning Policy Framework Sections 2, 5, 8, 9,

11, 12, 15 and 16.

- 5.2.1 The site is identified as an open space, recreation and leisure facility and therefore the presumption in SPLA policy SC3 is for its protection from development. DMDPD policy DM27 does not permit the loss of such facilities unless an assessment is undertaken which demonstrates it is surplus to requirements, no longer has an economic, environmental or community value, the loss would be replaced by a better or equivalent facility or the development is for alternative recreation provision. This reflects the requirements of paragraph 97 of the NPPF. Such an assessment has been submitted by the applicant, the summary of which is set out in paragraphs 5.2.2 to 5.2.7 below.
- 5.2.2 Recent background papers which were prepared to inform the DMDPD are the Open Space Assessment Report (OSA), Open Space Study Standard Paper (OSSSP) and Playing Pitch Strategy and Outdoor Sports (PPSOS). The OSA includes the campus in the amenity green space category as a site “offering opportunities for informal activities close to home or work or enhancement of the appearance of residential or other areas”. The campus was not assessed in the OSA for quality or value and only considered against the category of its given primary purpose as amenity greenspace. Although the campus offers more formal recreation facilities such as the MUGA it was not assessed within the provision for children and young people category in the OSA. This category has good provision within the area and therefore had the campus been included within this category it would have scored more highly. The OSSSP follows the OSA and identifies deficiencies and surpluses in existing and future open space provision throughout the district.
- 5.2.3 The PPSOS is a supply and demand assessment of playing pitch facilities in accordance with Sport England’s Playing Pitch Strategy. The PPSOS states that at the time of assessment there were ‘a total of 80 tennis courts identified in Lancaster located across 21 sites including sports clubs, parks and schools. This did not include the application site. The assessment describes the tennis courts as “disused”, defined as sites that are not in use or available for community hire and, once disused for 5 years or more, will be categorised as “lapsed sites”. It says they were last used in 2016 although the university was not consulted on this. However, specifically for tennis the PPSOS does not include these courts in its assessment of provision but says they are disused due to their proximity to residential properties and restrictions as a result. The study concludes that courts in the City not used by clubs have spare capacity for growth in demand and that club courts are sufficient in number to accommodate current and future levels of demand.
- 5.2.4 The follow up Playing Pitch and Outdoor Sports Strategy – Strategy and Action Plan summarises that ‘there are sufficient club courts in Lancaster District to accommodate current and future levels of demand’. It indicates that although demand can be met by existing supply there is an undersupply of courts available for use throughout the year due primarily to the nature of the court surfacing and lack of floodlighting. The assessment suggests that the University should ‘Explore options to reinstate use, subject to presence of demand’. Being so close to housing and subject to previous complaints regarding noise and disturbance from its use it is not possible to reinstate the use as a tennis court and it is also not considered suitable for alternative playing pitch uses for the same reason of conflict with residential amenity.
- 5.2.5 In terms of the environmental value, it is an unused overgrown hard surfaced area enclosed by 3m high chain link fencing. It does not provide any opportunity for informal activity or enhance the appearance of a residential or other area. It is not considered to add any quality or value to the wider amenity space. Being so close to housing and subject to previous complaints regarding noise and disturbance from its use it is not suitable for alternative playing pitch uses.
- 5.2.6 In assessing its economic value, it is a fact the courts have not been used since at least 2012 (evidence provided from UoC) and provide no economic value to the owner or community. Their use resulted in complaints from residents due to noise and disturbance. To address this, restricted hours were imposed but bookings and use reduced and complaints continued so the courts were closed. Only use during popular times for tennis or alternative sports would render the courts viable but this would cause further problems for neighbours.
- 5.2.7 In terms of community value, the courts have been closed for longer than stated in the PPSOS and ought to be referred to as lapsed. Notwithstanding this, the assessment did not consider the courts to be available for community use and they were not taken into account when calculating that demand can be met by existing supply. The deficiency in facilities able to be used all year will not be

able to be met here due to incompatibility with the surrounding houses.

- 5.2.8 The submitted assessment is reasonable. The DMDPD background assessments are up to date and confirm there is sufficient existing and future provision of amenity greenspace (which this site forms part of through the larger provision by the wider campus). Furthermore, overall provision would not be prejudiced by the loss of the site due to its size and it has no value as amenity green space in its own right.
- 5.2.9 With regards tennis, these courts did not form part of the background assessment and there is sufficient existing and future provision without them. There is a deficiency in courts available for year round use but loss of these courts will not increase that deficiency. Therefore, there is no justification for securing a financial contribution towards alternative or improved provision elsewhere.
- 5.2.10 The Key Urban Landscape (KUL) designation is conferred through SPLA policy EN5 and development within it is controlled by DMDPD policy DM46. It covers the UoC campus outside the identified developable area from Wyresdale Road to the north east to Bowerham Road to the south west. KUL areas will be conserved and important natural features safeguarded. Development will only be permitted where they preserve the open nature of the area and character and appearance of its surroundings.
- 5.2.11 The site forms a small part of the wider designation. The application includes a Townscape Appraisal which compares the site to the wider KUL using the evaluation criteria which was used in designating the original KUL. The appraisal describes the site as a discrete enclave of land on the fringe of the campus, surrounded on three sides by existing built form. It is considered to have a very limited visual relationship with the rest of the KUL or the wider City region. The courts are disused, in disrepair and inaccessible to the public. The site contains no notable mature trees and any vegetation can be retained with the development. The appraisal does not consider it in keeping with the rest of the campus wide KUL and says it detracts from the character of the area.
- 5.2.12 The 2 stage appraisal carried out in 2012 which informed the KUL designation scored the whole designation as 29 out of a maximum of 45 using the published evaluation criteria. The same exercise has been completed in the submitted appraisal relating to the site itself. This scores the site at 15 out of a possible 45. There is no reason or evidence to dispute this result. Assessing a small part of a wider designation would not always result in a lesser score and this demonstrates what the site feels like on the ground; that it can be viewed differently from the rest of the KUL due to its somewhat isolated relationship, being effectively fenced off and tight knit surrounding development.
- 5.2.13 It is accepted the site does not contribute positively to the KUL designation and its development would not diminish the inherent characteristic or significance of the rest of the KUL. Neither would its development necessarily justify development of other parts of the KUL. Therefore, the development is not considered to substantially reduce the open nature, character or appearance of the wider KUL and is not contrary to policies EN5 or DM46.
- 5.2.14 The proposal is to provide supported living accommodation for young adults with disabilities, giving them 24/7 shared background support depending on their individual needs. Support would focus on helping residents engage in social activities and interaction to promote independence whilst ensuring access to personalised care was available.
- 5.2.15 Lancashire County Council's Care and Support Strategy 2018– 2025, and recently approved Vision document, "Care, Support and Wellbeing of Adults in Lancashire" seeks to develop a range of quality housing to better meet people's care and support needs to promote health, wellbeing and independence for young and older adults. The Strategy aims to provide smaller scale flat schemes rather than the current model of shared households. The Council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment similarly identifies the need for accommodation for young adults with disabilities.
- 5.2.16 The Council's Housing Strategy Team states: *"...the Commissioning Lead for People with Learning Disabilities and Autism has also been directly consulted and has provided a supporting statement confirming that the proposed apartment scheme will make a significant contribution to increasing the supply of much needed self-contained supported living accommodation with round the clock support for this vulnerable group, in a very sustainable and appropriate location. The target identified in the Homes Strategy is to provide 50 new supported living apartments in Lancaster district over the next*

five year period". Housing Strategy Team supports this proposal which aligns to the council's Homes Strategy 2020-25 by increasing the specialist housing required in Lancaster district.

5.2.17 Policy DM8 supports proposals for accommodation of vulnerable groups that meets a number of criteria. The scheme will be a commissioned service whereby Lancashire County Council will select the most suitable care provider. The premises will be run by Progress Housing Association who will provide an intensive landlord and housing management service. Accommodation will be allocated to individuals who have eligible assessed care needs requiring a high level of care and support at the outset. Lancashire County Council and Progress Housing Group will jointly agree the proposed lettings for the units taking account the specific needs and requirements for each individual. All residents are assumed to qualify for full housing benefit payments. County will have determined that each proposed resident fulfils the threshold for eligible assessed care needs with an agreed care plan in place, and Progress as the landlord will undertake a further needs and risk assessment to ensure the accommodation is suitable and appropriate for each nomination received. The supported living apartments are expected to meet a longer term need and will offer settled accommodation rather than other forms of short term shared accommodation services. If for whatever reason, a need is identified to move an existing resident, the lead organisation would be Lancashire County Council and whilst working with partners, they will decide on the most appropriate solution in this instance. The proposal therefore complies with policy DM8.

5.2.18 In conclusion regarding the principle of the development, it has been assessed against policies designating the site as key urban landscape and open space, sports and recreation use. It is unfortunate that the development will result in the loss of a part of the KUL and a former sporting facility. However, it is accepted that although attached to the KUL it is perceived as a remote part being bounded on three sides by housing and containing a 3m chain link fence that in effect separates it from the rest of the open space. Its loss will not diminish the overall value of the remaining KUL. In terms of sports use, the courts have not been used since 2012 and they have not been included as part of the supply of tennis courts. Alternative sporting uses are likely to cause the same neighbour amenity problems as when the courts were in use. The proposed use provides a specialist housing need in much demand in the district and is supported by policy DM8. On balance, the principle of the development is accepted.

5.3 **Design and Visual Impact** DMDPD DM2: Housing Standards; DM29: Key design principles; DM30: sustainable design; Policy DM46: Development and Landscape Impact; NPPF section 12

5.3.1 The proposal has a modern design comprising two storeys under inverted pitched roofs i.e. the highest part of the roof is above the external walls with the slope falling inwards to areas of flat roof. Proposed materials are grey facing brick with grey feature brickwork, bronze cladding to the vertical roof parts and dark grey to the roof slopes, bronze relief panels around some window arrangements and bronze aluminium fenestration. The detail of boundary and internal fencing can be conditioned to ensure it is appropriate to the setting of the key urban landscape and neighbouring properties.

5.3.2 The building will be on higher ground than the rest of the surrounding campus and therefore visible from longer views. It will be seen in the context of the adjacent housing and other UoC buildings. Unrestricted public access to the campus will be maintained along the proposed re-aligned footpath from Anderson Close from which the building and grounds will be visible from close quarters. The footpath will be on the campus side of the development and distant views across the campus grounds and beyond will not be affected. The modern design of the building and proposed landscaping is acceptable in the context of its setting and will not give rise to any undue visual impact.

5.3.3 11 of the apartments will be Part M4(3) wheelchair user compliant and two apartments (including the staff unit) will be NDSS compliant in compliance with policy.

5.4 **Effect on Neighbours** DMDPD Policy DM 29: Key Design Principles

5.4.1 The siting of the building has been amended to ensure all interface distances with adjoining houses are met. The houses on Anderson Close back onto the site and their closest windows will be located at least 19m from the nearest wall which does not contain windows (well in excess of the required 12m). The only windows facing these properties are in the furthest wing almost 40m away. Houses to the rear on Coulston Road are approximately 1.5m lower with rear facing ground floor windows

and a conservatory. The required interface distance is therefore 24m which the amended layout achieves to the closest of those neighbouring windows. Other windows are further away due to the diverging alignment between the proposed and existing houses. This distance adequately mitigates the effects of the building in terms of any overbearing position above these properties and their gardens. Two trees on this boundary originally proposed to be removed are to be retained which will provide some softening effect.

5.4.2 Housing on Clougha Avenue has much shorter rear gardens at approximately 6.5m in length. The long facing elevation of the development will extend across the full width of the garden of no 9. The proposed wall will have no clear glazed principal windows and be located at least 12m from the rear facing principal habitable room windows to these properties which complies with standards. The rear wall of the proposal will contain an inset mainly behind no 9 and partly to the rear of no 11. This inset takes a 4.5m section of the wall a further 1m away from the houses and provides some relief to the mass of the elevation, especially no. 9.

5.4.3 Undoubtedly, the outlook from all neighbouring properties will be markedly different due to there being no development to the rear at present. This will be particularly apparent from nos. 7, 9 and 11 Clougha Avenue. The impact will be greater than if the development was of traditional house gable ends due to the additional length of this elevation. However, the building will be two storeys in height with a sympathetic roof arrangement whereby the closest part of the roof ridge is located end on to these properties at the eastern end which minimises bulk and massing close to Clougha Avenue. Other parts of the roof slope down to a flat roof on the side of the building closest to Clougha Avenue. Given this and the adequate separation, the adverse effect on no 9 and to a lesser extent 7 and 11 Clougha Avenue is insufficient to justify refusal of the application.

5.5 **Traffic and Parking SPLA EC6: University of Cumbria Campus; DMDPD DM60: Enhancing Accessibility and Transport Linkages; DM61: Walking and Cycling; DM62: Vehicle Parking Provision; NPPF section 9**

5.5.1 Vehicular access is proposed from Anderson Close, a cul-de-sac serving part of the UoC campus, 8 houses on Anderson Close and rear parking for 6 houses on Coulston Road. A car park for 11 spaces, including 2 disabled bays is proposed.

5.5.2 The site is well served by public transport. The nearest bus stops on Wyresdale Road require upgrading to provide DDA compliant kerbing which will be secured by condition. County Highways consider the vehicle movements generated will not have a severe impact on highway safety due to the relatively low car ownership by residents. A condition is proposed to limit use of the proposal to supported living to ensure car ownership is kept low.

5.5.3 Concerns expressed by County Highways to the original scheme have been addressed. Swept path analysis shows delivery and refuse vehicles can turn into the site without the need to widen Anderson Close, the internal turning head is now acceptable and the traffic survey was carried out during term time and in accordance with DfT guidance.

5.6 **Other Material Considerations**

5.6.1 **Drainage and flood risk** - Current drainage is through a combined system discharging to an off-site combined public sewer. Infiltration tests are not currently available so it is proposed to limit discharge to greenfield rates for all rainfall events up to the 100-year plus 40% climate change. Water runoff from hard surfaces will flow into a below ground attenuation tank adjacent to and partly under the access road from where the outflow will be controlled to the greenfield rate into the existing campus system. Infiltration may be possible, subject to testing, which will be carried out at the detailed design stage. Infiltration is the first aim in the drainage hierarchy and this must be investigated. Conditions proposed by the LLFA and United Utilities require this to be done and the final detailed drainage design agreed prior to commencement of any operations on site. Foul water will be gravity fed to the combined public sewer separately from the surface water while on site. Flood risk at the site is low. The proposed conditions can be imposed based on the revised drainage strategy, and further work to locate the water mains, and overcome the previous concerns of the LLFA and United Utilities, meeting the requirements of policies DM33 and DM34.

5.6.2 **Heritage** – There are no heritage assets close to the site and all are separated from the development

site by distance and intervening buildings. Archaeological finds have been made in the immediate vicinity. A scheme for the investigation and recording of archaeology will be secured by condition and this aligns with the advice of the County.

- 5.6.3 Ecology and trees – There are no priority habitats on site and the nearest designated site is 600m away (Lancaster Moor Hospital Grassland BHS) with no connectivity to the development site. An initial Preliminary Ecological Appraisal identified the potential for three trees and an ivy covered wall to have bat roost potential. These were inspected and were found to have negligible potential. In accordance with bat survey guidance, roosts with negligible potential do not require further survey. However, these features will be surveyed again if the development commences in late 2021 or beyond.
- 5.6.4 In terms of bat foraging, it is expected that bats will use the trees and adjacent gardens as stated by neighbours. The development will retain these trees and the proposed planting around the scheme has been designed to improve the foraging habitat. Overall, the development is considered very unlikely to significantly impact the favourable conservation status of bats in the locality which will continue to forage around the periphery of the site.
- 5.6.5 Two trees are proposed to be removed: a white willow and a Norway Maple to create the access. Neither are good specimens. Following negotiations two sycamore trees on the east boundary and the existing hedge on the boundary with no.1 Anderson Close are now to be retained.
- 5.6.6 The site is within the Morecambe Bay buffer zone and a Habitat Regulation Appropriate Assessment has been completed which concludes the recreational pressures from the development on the designated areas can be mitigated by suitable packs distributed to all resident students. The scheme is compliant with policies DM44 and 45.
- 5.6.7 Air Quality – A qualitative air quality assessment for the construction and operational phases has been submitted. This concludes there is a not significant risk if standard mitigation measures are used. The development therefore complies with Policy DM31 of the DM DPD.
- 5.6.8 Sustainability – An energy statement has been submitted which confirms the development has the potential to achieve a 24% reduction from Part L Building Regulations emission requirements through measures including enhanced thermal building fabric, recovery of waste heat, controllable lighting, air source heat pumps and solar panels. This complies with the requirements of policy DM30 and can be conditioned as such.
- 5.6.9 Affordable Housing – The accommodation will be purely supported living and not open market housing. Therefore, a condition is proposed limiting occupation to people requiring supported living care. Affordable housing is not required to be provided because the development is of apartments which is exempt under policy DM3.

6.0 Conclusion and Planning Balance

- 6.1 The impacts of the development proposal on the loss of key urban landscape and supply of tennis and other recreation facilities and the development's impact on neighbours, ecology, highway conditions and visual appearance have been carefully assessed. The site is a distinct part of the KUL, scoring much lower in value than the KUL as a whole. Its loss will not diminish the significance or value of the remaining KUL. The courts were not considered a possibly available resource when the playing pitch study was undertaken, and without them there is adequate provision locally. The only deficiency is in year-round use availability but this would not be possible to provide here, due to the conflict with the amenities of neighbours, as experienced previously. The main negative impact is the potential effect of the long elevation facing rear of properties on Clougha Avenue. However, adopted spacing standards are met. Provision of supported living for a vulnerable sector of the community is a positive consideration of this application and something which officers support wholeheartedly. There are not considered to be any material considerations that would justify refusal and, on balance, the benefits are considered to outweigh the negatives. With this it is recommended to councillors to support the development subject to conditions.
- 6.2 Since receipt of the revised drainage strategy further consultation has been carried out. This will expire after the Committee meeting, so it is proposed to delegate the final decision to the Head of

Planning and Place subject to not receiving any comments that relate to material planning considerations that have not previously been considered.

Recommendation

That Planning Permission **BE GRANTED** in principle subject to the following conditions, but the application be delegated back to the Head of Planning and Place to allow the consultation period to expire:

Condition no.	Description	Type
1	Time limit	Standard
2	Approved plans	Standard
3	Final Sustainable Drainage Strategy	Pre-commencement
4	Construction phase surface water management plan	Pre-commencement
5	Foul water drainage	Pre-commencement
6	Water Main Investigations and protection	Pre-commencement
7	Off site highway works	Pre-commencement
8	Employment Skills Plan	Pre-commencement
9	Contaminated land	Pre-commencement
10	Written scheme of archaeology	Pre-commencement
11	Finished floor and site levels	Pre-commencement
12	Boundary and fencing details	Pre-commencement
13	Access construction details	Pre-commencement
14	Materials samples	Above ground
15	Homeowner packs	Above Ground
16	Drainage Operation and Maintenance Plan and Verification Report	Prior to Occupation
17	Travel Plan	Prior to occupation
18	Security details	Prior to Occupation
19	Car parking management strategy, layout and EV charging points	Prior to Occupation
20	Cycle Store	Prior to Occupation
21	Approved tree works	Ongoing
22	Ecological mitigation measures	Ongoing
23	Hours of construction	Ongoing
24	Landscaping Implementation	Planting season
25	Nesting birds	Specific time
26	Separate drainage	Control
27	Sustainable construction and energy efficiency	Control
28	Nationally described space standards and M4(2) and M4(3) standards	Control
29	Supported Living within C3 Only	Control
30	Obscure glazing in rear elevation	Control

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

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

Background Papers

None.

Agenda Item	A7
Application Number	20/01020/FUL
Proposal	Erection of an agricultural building for livestock/storage and creation of an area of hardstanding
Application site	Telegraph Field Pump House, School Lane, Wray, Lancashire
Applicant	Mr John Staveley
Agent	Mrs Melanie Lawrenson
Case Officer	Mr Sam Robinson
Departure	No
Summary of Recommendation	Refusal

(i) **Procedural Matters**

This form of development would normally be dealt with under the Scheme of Delegation. However, the applicant is related to an elected member and as such must be determined by the Planning Regulatory Committee.

1.0 Application Site and Setting

1.1 The application site is an open agricultural field located at the end of an access track off School Lane in Wray which is surrounded by dry stone walls. There are no existing buildings on site. The site forms an area of land forming part of the Hoskins Farm holding which is located on Main Street in Wray. The site remains relatively well screened but remains visible from certain viewpoints along School Lane.

1.2 The site and surrounding area forms part of the Caton Moor landscape which is largely characterised by its undulating form, intricate pattern of stone walls and sense of remoteness. The field is surrounded by other open agricultural open fields with a single residential dwelling to the west approximately 175m away. 50m to the east lies Roeburndale Wood which is designated as an ancient woodland. It provides a tree lined backdrop when approaching the site from the west.

1.3 The site is designated as open countryside and is also located within the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB).

2.0 Proposal

2.1 This application seeks consent for the erection of an agricultural storage/livestock building. The building measures approximately 22.8m by 13.7m and features a dual pitched roof with an eaves height of 4.5m and a ridge height of 6.5m and is finished in concrete and timber boarding to the exterior walls with brown fibre cement roof sheets to the roof. The building features an open gated frontage and features an area of compacted hardcore hardstanding to the front measuring a

maximum of 9m in depth from the building to the track and matches the 22m width of the building at its widest point.

2.2 Access to the site will be via the existing track and gate to the field. The application does not include any new boundary treatments but does require a small cut and infill into the land in order to create a flat site for construction.

3.0 Site History

3.1 A single relevant application relating to this site has previously been received by the Local Planning Authority. The details are as follows:

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
20/00560/AD	Agricultural Determination for the erection of a storage building	Refused

4.0 Consultation Responses

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

Consultee	Response
County Highways	No objection
Environmental Health	No objection
Natural England	No objection
Parish Council	No response
AONB Officer	No response

4.2 No representations have been received from members of the public.

5.0 Analysis

The key considerations in the assessment of this application are:

- EIA Screening
- Principle of development in rural areas
- Design and impact upon the landscape
- Impacts upon residential amenity
- Impacts on protected species
- Drainage

5.1 EIA Screening

In terms of screening under Environmental Impact Assessment, the scale of the development proposed clearly falls below the thresholds for Schedule 2 development defined by the Regulations. Although located within a designated sensitive area, the development is a relatively small-scale proposal when considered against the thresholds, and there would be no likely significant impacts in terms of arboriculture, heritage, archaeology, noise or complex construction. As will be discussed in the following paragraphs, given the nature, scale and location of the proposed development, the proposal would have impacts upon the landscape, ecology, flooding and contamination, though neither individually nor cumulatively is it likely to result in a significant environmental impact. Therefore, an Environmental Statement is not required.

5.2 Principle of development in rural areas (NPPF paragraphs 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 83 & 84, Policy SP1 of the Strategic Polices and Land Allocations DPD (2020), Policy DM47 of the Development Management DPD (2020) and Policy RE1 the Wray with Botton Neighbourhood Development Plan (2019))

5.2.1 Policy DM47 of the Development Management DPD states that development proposals on greenfield sites within the open countryside will only be supported where it is clearly demonstrated

through a robust assessment that no alternative suitable locations exist within local settlement areas. The Policy will support essential operations for agriculture where there is a proven and justified need. This is also reinforced by Policy RE1 of the Wray with Botton Neighbourhood Plan.

- 5.2.2 In terms of the principle of development, Hoskins Farm currently operates under an agricultural use which is primarily based in the centre of Wray about 900m to the north away from the application site. The proposed building will allow for the storage of machinery, equipment and hay and other requirements of sheep husbandry and maintenance of the land and is a reasonable agricultural use in this area.
- 5.2.3 However, the proposed building remains detached from other buildings and forms of development. The nearest dwellings are approximately 175m and 225m away to the east and south east and as such, the building is not seen within the context of an existing group of buildings. While the part of Policy DM47 relating to alternative locations within local settlement areas may not be completely relevant to agricultural buildings as many of these are sited in the countryside away from settlements, to avoid the proliferation of buildings in open areas, they should be sited near existing buildings or clusters. This is considered even more pertinent given the site is located within a protected landscape.
- 5.2.4 The Design & Access Statement submitted with the application states that the existing farm within Wray cannot accommodate any further development and that the purpose of the building will prevent the requirement for the applicant having to travel to and from the site with feed and machinery. No information has been provided as to where the machinery, equipment and hay are currently stored but this is presumed to be on the main farm. While the proposed building may provide improvements for the day to day running of the farm holding, there is little justification for the building to be sited in such an isolated position. Furthermore, the applicant provided a map indicating the extent of the agricultural holding associated with Hoskins Farm which shows a relatively large area of land. Apart from referencing two pre-application submissions which relate to the main farm, little information has been included to show if any other more suitable sites (i.e. closer to buildings, settlements, less sensitive locations) have been explored.
- 5.2.5 The agent provided further reasoning for the building stating that the applicant is intending to downsize their farming operations and that Hoskins Farm has been allocated for housing in the Wray with Botton Neighbourhood Plan. Unfortunately, this cannot be considered as part of this application as this proposal and the future of the main farm remain two separate issues and there would be no requirement for the applicant to relinquish ownership of the farm following the outcome of this application. Furthermore, this also raises the question on future pressures/needs for buildings in and around the application site in the future.
- 5.2.6 Given the proposal remains divorced from any other agricultural buildings and the sensitive nature of the landscape, the proposal lacks significant justification for its siting in such an isolated position. Consequently, the proposal is considered contrary to the requirements of Policy DM47.
- 5.3 **Design and impact upon the landscape** (NPPF paragraphs 124, 127, 130, 170 & 172 Policies EN2 & EN3 of the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD (2020), Policies DM29 & DM46 of the Development Management DPD (2020) and Policies OS2 and BE1 of the Wray with Botton Neighbourhood Development Plan (2019))
- 5.3.1 As stated above, the site that is subject of the application forms part of the Forest of Bowland AONB and is designated as 'Open Countryside' in the Local Plan. In accordance with the policies listed above, any development should make a positive contribution to the surrounding landscape and the Council will attach great weight to conserving and enhancing the landscape and scenic beauty in the AONB which has the highest status of protection in relation to these issues.
- 5.3.2 The application site is absent of any development with the existing open field contributing to the pastoral and rural landscape of the area. The Forest of Bowland Landscape Character Assessment classifies the site as 'Enclosed Moorland Hills' with the key characteristics defined by its open and exposed character, strong sense of elevation with vast, expansive skies and uninterrupted views.
- 5.3.3 The proposal will introduce a large agricultural building with associated hardstanding separated by approximately 175m in distance to the nearest buildings. As a result, the building would appear

completely detached from other existing developments and would contribute to the proliferation of buildings in the AONB. This sense of detachment from any other development, would only serve to highlight the obtrusive nature of the building in a landscape characterised by its openness. In addition, the utilitarian design and scale of the development would only add to the visual harm, further reinforcing that the proposal having failed to complement and integrate itself into the surrounding landscape. Given that this is a landscape which is highly sensitive to such visual changes, the impact of such a development would be significant. While isolated buildings can be found across the moorland hills, these tend to be historic focal points within the landscape, are significantly smaller and reflect the vernacular of the area through the use of stone and slate. As such, the resemblance between the two is considered negligible.

5.3.4 It is noted that visibility of the site from both the north west and south west along School Lane is limited but this should not be used as justification to approve unsuitable development within the AONB. Nevertheless, it is considered that views of the site will still be afforded along School Lane and consequently, the proposal would cause visual harm to the landscape.

5.3.5 For the reasons outlined above, it is considered that the proposal would cause visual harm to the AONB landscape. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policies EN2 & EN3 of the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD, Policies DM29 & DM46 of the Development Management DPD and Policies OS2 and BE1 of the Wray with Botton Neighbourhood Development Plan.

5.4 **Impacts upon residential amenity (NPPF paragraphs 124, 127 & 130 and Policy DM29 of the Development Management DPD (2020))**

5.4.1 Policy DM29 seeks to ensure that with all new development, there is no significant detrimental impact to amenity in relation to overshadowing, visual amenity, privacy, overlooking, massing and pollution.

5.4.2 As stated above, the proposal is located approximately 175m away from the nearest residential property and as such, there will be no detrimental impacts in terms of overbearingness or loss of light. The building is to be used for storing machinery and equipment ancillary to the hay making and sheep husbandry in this location. Given the use of the building and that it is located within an existing farming field, it is unlikely to have any serious implications for noise or odour in the vicinity.

5.4.3 Environmental Health raised no objection to the scheme nor requested any conditions relating to the development. For these reasons, it is considered that the proposal will not have any undue impacts on residential amenity for the occupiers at Hillcrest.

5.5 **Impacts on protected species (NPPF paragraphs 175 and Policy DM44 of the Development Management DPD (2020))**

5.5.1 In accordance with Policy DM44, development proposals should protect and enhance biodiversity, to minimise both direct and indirect impacts.

5.5.2 As mentioned previously, the proposed building is located in an existing agricultural field and offers little in the way of trees or any hedgerows. Roeburndale Woods lies approximately 50m to the east at its nearest point. Given the distance and intervening field and stone wall, the site is sufficiently separated so as not to impact upon the habitat of these woods. The River Roeburn lies about 300m further away. Given this distance, it is unlikely that any contamination arising from the proposed use, such as fuel, oil or dung, would pollute the watercourse.

5.5.3 As such, the Local Planning Authority can be reasonably satisfied that the proposal will not have any adverse effects on the upon the protected habitat of Roeburndale Woods or protected species and consequently is seen to comply with Policy DM44.

5.6 **Drainage (NPPF paragraph 163 and Policies DM34 & DM36 of the Development Management DPD)**

5.6.1 Policy DM34 and DM36 require the applicant to include details as to how surface water will be discharged and demonstrate that the water quality on the watercourse will not be adversely affected by the development.

- 5.6.2 The site is located relatively close to an existing watercourse with the existing surface water collecting on the shallow of the field and towards a gill to the east which connects to the River Roeburn.
- 5.6.3 The application form indicates that any additional surface water generated by the proposal would be discharged into the watercourse but that is the extent of the information. No drainage information has been submitted with the application that considers the SuDS hierarchy or rate of discharge nor does it contain any information which considers any potential impact on the watercourse. However, it should be noted that these details could be conditioned.

6.0 Conclusion and Planning Balance

- 6.1 For the reasons outlined above, given the isolated nature of the proposal, which is located within a protected landscape, combined with the scale, form, design and appearance, it is considered that the proposal would have a significant adverse impact on the visual amenity of the landscape. While the case put forward by the applicant and agent that the proposal would allow the main farm in Wray to be freed up for development, this cannot be considered as a material consideration as part of this application. Therefore, with no other materials considerations to outweigh the visual harm on the AONB that has been identified, the application is recommended for refusal.

Recommendation

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

1. The proposal by reason of its siting, scale, form and appearance, would appear as an obtrusive addition to the area causing significant visual harm to this nationally important designated landscape. Therefore, the proposed development is contrary to Policies EN2 & EN3 of the Strategic Polices and Land Allocations Development Plan Document, Policies DM29, DM46 & DM47 of the Development Management Development Plan Document, Polices OS2 and BE1 of the Wray with Botton Neighbourhood Development Plan and Section 12 & 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

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

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

Background Papers

None

LANCASTER CITY COUNCIL

APPLICATION NO	DETAILS	DECISION
18/00041/DIS	88 St Leonards Gate, Lancaster, Lancashire Discharge of conditions 3 and 4 on approved application 17/00571/CU for Mr Gulam Hassan (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision
20/00075/DIS	Site Of Former Warton Grange Farm, Farleton Close, Warton Discharge of conditions 7 and 15 on approved application 15/00847/OUT for Bleasdale (Warton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00095/DIS	20 China Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 19/00611/FUL for Mr Ruks Abrol (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn
20/00127/DIS	2 Grosvenor Road, Carnforth, Lancashire Discharge of conditions 3 and 4 on approved application 18/00190/FUL for Mr J Noye (Carnforth And Millhead Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00128/DIS	Ravens Close Farm, Ravens Close Road, Wennington Discharge of part of condition 3 on approved application 18/01186/PAA (Barn A) for Mrs Vicky Havard (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00146/DIS	Woodside, Ashton Road, Ashton With Stodday Discharge of conditions 5 and 6 on approved application 17/00363/OUT for Mr Michael Harrison (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision
20/00153/DIS	Land Rear Of Launds Field, Stoney Lane, Galgate Discharge of condition 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 on approved application 20/00213/FUL for Mr Lee Norman (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision
20/00155/DIS	D.A. FRANCE MOTOR SERVICES, Laund Garage, Stoney Lane Discharge of conditions 3, 5, 6 and 7 on approved application 19/00215/FUL for Mr David France (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision
20/00228/FUL	Land Adjacent Lower Barn, Aughton Brow, Aughton Temporary siting of a caravan for residential occupation for an agricultural worker for a period of 3 years and the installation of a package treatment plant for Mr Andrew Talbot (Halton-with-Aughton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
20/00302/FUL	Lower Barn, Aughton Brow, Aughton Erection of an agricultural building for livestock and storage for Mr Andrew Talbot (Halton-with-Aughton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
20/00735/FUL	Field No 7989, Becksides Mews, Borwick Erection of an agricultural building for machinery and animal feed for Mr John Beaumont (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

20/00873/FUL	The Nib, 9 West View, Mill Lane Change of use of public house (A4) to mixed use unit comprising bar (A4) at ground floor and holiday accommodation (C3) at first and second floors with associated parking for Mr. D. White (Carnforth And Millhead Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00925/LB	Old Hall, Kirkby Lonsdale Road, Over Kellet Listed Building application to install a cavity drainage system and sump pump to cellar for Mrs Sam Pickett (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00936/FUL	3 Bailey Lane, Heysham, Morecambe Demolition of existing garage and conservatory, erection of a single storey rear and side extension and a single storey side extension for Mr Scott Bowker (Heysham Central Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00987/FUL	Cantsfield Grange, Cantsfield Road, Cantsfield Construction of a manège for Mr Adrian Cresswell (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
20/00996/PLDC	Land At Daisy Bank, Middleton Road, Heysham Proposed lawful development certificate for a mobile wooden field shelter for Mrs Rebecca Irvine (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
20/00997/FUL	St Josephs Catholic Primary School, Aldrens Lane, Lancaster Construction of a ramped access to the main entrance for Board of Governors at St Joseph's Catholic Primary School (Skerton East Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01066/FUL	22 Carr Lane, Middleton, Morecambe Erection of a single storey side and rear link extension to existing store with construction of a raised replacement roof for Miss G. McMurray (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01083/VCN	West Penwyth, Kirkby Lonsdale Road, Over Kellet Demolition of existing dwelling (C3) and erection of a replacement dwelling (C3) (pursuant to the variation of conditions 2, 4, 5 and 7 on planning permission 20/00490/VCN to amend plans, to raise the boundary wall to 1.8m, agree colour of window frame and garage door, change of wording to the landscaping condition and confirmation of foul drainage) for Mr and Mrs Oliver Whiley (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01108/PLDC	7 Prospect Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation and change of use from a 2-bed dwellinghouse (C3) to a 3-bed HMO (C4) for Mr Jack Baldwin (John O'Gaunt Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
20/01110/FUL	Whitley Bank, Bay Horse Road, Ellel Construction of a raised terrace area to the side and erection of a replacement outbuilding for Mr & Mrs C Pope (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01124/FUL	Bank Well, 6 The Row, Silverdale Demolition of the existing garage and erection of a replacement garage and erection of new boundary wall to the side for Mr and Mrs Robinson (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

20/01126/VCN	East Gate Lodge, Keer Holme Lane, Borwick Change of use of existing bungalow (C3) to a residential care home for children (C2), demolition of existing extensions, erection of a single storey side extension and part single part two storey rear extension with a raised terrace and creation of a new access and parking facilities (Pursuant to the variation of condition 2 and 4 on planning permission 18/00169/FUL to amend the boundary treatments to the site and landscape regime and install access gates) for Mr M Horner (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01131/FUL	The Sidings, 81 Sand Lane, Warton Erection of single storey rear extension with balcony above and to the SW side elevation for Mr. & Mrs. Paul Duckett (Warton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01138/VCN	Sainsburys, Cable Street, Lancaster Variation of Condition 2 on application 09/00147/FUL to amend the design and layout of the approved extension (pursuant to the variation of condition 9 and 12 of 11/00704/VCN to revise the Car Park Management Strategy and Delivery & Service Yard Management Plan to amend the delivery times and number of deliveries for Sunday) for Sainsbury's Supermarkets Limited (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01162/FUL	Promenade Music, 404 Marine Road East, Morecambe Construction of an entrance canopy with first floor balcony and patio doors above to front elevation for Mr David Wood (Poulton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
20/01170/FUL	Bracken Bottom, Craggs Lane, Tatham Retrospective application for the demolition of an agricultural building, erection of an agricultural building for livestock and creation of access track for Mr Andrew Staveley (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01172/FUL	University Hospitals Of Morecambe Bay NHS Foundation Trust, Royal Lancaster Infirmary, Ashton Road Construction of a hip to gable and dormer extension to the second floor plantroom for Ian Ferguson (Scotforth West Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01196/FUL	20 Hope Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Demolition of existing garage and erection of a two storey rear extension for Mr. C. Nicholas (John O'Gaunt Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01215/ADV	Promenade Music, 404 Marine Road East, Morecambe Advertisement application for the display of 3 non-illuminated fascia signs for Mr David Wood (Poulton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
20/01245/FUL	Neville House, Moorside Road, Brookhouse Demolition of existing conservatory, erection of a single storey rear extension and creation of terrace above, construction of a canopy to side elevation and relocation of external steps for Mr Kevin Burwood (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

20/01248/FUL	24 Hest Bank Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Construction of a canopy to the front and creation of an enlarged driveway and an additional vehicular access point for Mr & Mrs P McCamley (Bare Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01261/FUL	Swiss Cottage, Long Lane, Quernmore Demolition of existing rear extension, erection of two single storey rear extensions and installation of a juliet balcony to the rear elevation for Mr and Mrs Townley (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01272/FUL	Udale, Wyresdale Road, Quernmore Construction of dormer extensions to the front and rear elevations for Rachel Greaves (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01281/FUL	11 Church Park, Overton, Morecambe Installation of replacement roof to existing conservatory for Mr. G. Tyson (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01292/FUL	43 Berwick Way, Heysham, Morecambe Demolition of detached garage and erection of two storey side extension for Mr G Bosdet & Ms C Jones (Heysham South Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01306/FUL	The Old Police House, Kirkby Lonsdale Road, Arkholme Erection of a garden shed for Mr Paul Case (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01317/FUL	2 Prospect Drive, Hest Bank, Lancaster Erection of a first floor extension over existing double garage and part conversion of double garage to create additional living accommodation in association with 2 Prospect Drive for Mr And Mrs Bains (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01327/FUL	Spens Farm, Furnessford Road, Tatham Erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr and Mrs Kevin Hughes (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01341/FUL	10 Knowlys Drive, Heysham, Morecambe Erection of a single storey rear and side extension for Mr. K. Bishop (Heysham Central Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01347/CU	238 Heysham Road, Heysham, Lancashire Change of use of three flats into one dwelling (C3) for Mr and Mrs Dimond Haynes (Heysham Central Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01356/PAD	Old Port Office Building At The West End Of, South Quay, Heysham Harbour Prior approval for demolition of Office building for Mr Mark Patterson (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Granted
20/01357/PAD	Canteen Building On , South Quay, Heysham Harbour Prior approval for demolition of Canteen building for Mr Mark Patterson (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Granted
20/01358/PAD	Engineering Shed, South Quay, Heysham Harbour Prior approval for demolition of Engineering Shed for Mr Mark Patterson (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Granted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

20/01359/PAD	South Shed Gable, South Quay, Heysham Harbour Prior approval for demolition of South Shed gable for Mr Mark Patterson (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Refused
20/01366/FUL	Hazel Grove Cottage & Hazel Grove Farm, Milnthorpe Road, Yealand Redmayne Demolition of existing store and part of double garage, erection of a single storey rear extension with balcony above, erection of a first floor extension and replacement of existing balustrade for Davina Hindley (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01376/FUL	100 Gressingham Drive, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a single storey side extension for Mrs Elizabeth Packham (Scotforth East Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01426/FUL	68 Morecambe Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of a single storey rear and side extension for Mr Tony Whalley (Skerton West Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01427/FUL	Scale Hall Plaice, 55 Torrisholme Road, Lancaster Installation of a flue to the rear elevation and installation of extractor fan for Mrs Kevina Bagis (Skerton West Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01432/FUL	26 Barton Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Demolition of existing conservatory, erection of a single storey rear extension and erection of a first floor rear extension for H Madeley (Scotforth East Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01447/FUL	13 The Shore, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Alterations to roof and gable walls on the existing garage to facilitate installation of solar panels for Mr And Mrs Craddock (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01450/FUL	68 Windermere Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a single storey rear extension, construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation and construction of decking to the rear. for Mr. James Fraser (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00001/DIS	Field Barn , Adjacent To Thwaite Lodge, 25 Crag Bank Crescent Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 19/00872/PAA for Mrs Adelaide Ireland And Sandra Robinson (Carnforth And Millhead Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
21/00001/FUL	77 Africa Drive, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a rear conservatory for Mrs Taylor (Marsh Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00005/DIS	Royal Lancaster Infirmary, Ashton Road, Lancaster Discharge of conditions 7 and 8 on approved application 20/01010/FUL for Mr M Hampton (Scotforth West Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00009/FUL	2 Maryland Close, Silverdale, Carnforth Demolition of existing single storey rear extension and erection of a replacement single storey rear extension for Mr D Hardy (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

21/00012/DIS	Land Off Bye Pass Road And , Land Rear Of 18 To 24 Monkswell Avenue, Bolton Le Sands Part discharge of condition 6 on approved application 18/01493/FUL for Mr J. Grafton (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00013/FUL	4 Woodlands Close, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a single storey side extension for Mr Jason Dring (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00015/FUL	19 Woodlands Close, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr Chris Redman (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00016/DIS	Cohousing Site, Land Adjacent, Forge Lane Discharge of conditions 5,6,7,8, and 14 on approved application 20/00613/FUL for Mr Charles Ainger (Halton-with-Aughton Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision
21/00020/FUL	55 Main Street, Cockerham, Lancaster Erection of an attached garage to side elevation for Mr Stuart Thomas (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00027/FUL	19 The Spinney, Heysham, Morecambe Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of a replacement single storey rear extension for Mr.&Mrs. B. Robertson (Heysham South Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00028/FUL	10 Kempton Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr.&Mrs. S. Morris (Scotforth East Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00035/FUL	176 Bare Lane, Morecambe, Lancashire Construction of a hip to gable extension, construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation for Mr and Mrs Hirst (Torrisholme Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00056/FUL	62 Torrisholme Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Demolition of existing rear conservatory and garage and erection of a replacement single storey extension with alterations to the existing front porch for Mr & Mrs R Patterson (Skerton East Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00057/FUL	24 Coleman Drive, Lancaster, Lancashire Conversion of existing garage to create ancillary accommodation for Dr Jayaprakash Rajaram (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00073/FUL	3 Wallings Lane, Silverdale, Carnforth Removal of existing septic tank and installation of sewage treatment plant for Mr & Mrs Watts (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00078/NMA	Land At Grid Reference 350819 464830, Low Road, Halton Non material amendment to planning permission 18/01117/REM to change the material of Plot 15 garage from render to coursed stone for Siobhan Sweeney (Halton-with-Aughton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00080/AD	Sandbeds Farm, Sandbeds Lane, Gressingham Agricultural determination for erection of dairy cattle building for Mr Condor (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Is Required

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

21/00102/AD	Curwen Hill Farm, Hornby Road, Wray Agricultural determination for erection of building over existing open silage clamp for Mr Frank Towers (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Not Required
21/00103/PAD	A1 Supaskips, Unit 37, Paragon Way Prior approval for demolition of mill chimney for Mr Mel Welsh (Marsh Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Granted
21/00108/NMA	Brooklands Buildings, Addington Road, Halton Non-material amendment to planning permission 20/00246/FUL to enclose the car port on Plot 2 to form garage for Mr Peter Gott (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00128/AD	Swarthdale Cottage, Swarthdale Road, Over Kellet Agricultural determination for excavation works to create 4 ponds for Miss Kate Jackson (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Refused
21/00129/AD	Swarthdale Cottage, Swarthdale Road, Over Kellet Agricultural determination to change 2 mono-pitch buildings to one dual pitch building for Miss Kate Jackson (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Refused
21/00134/EIO	Haweswater Aqueduct, Helks Brow, Wray EIA Scoping request for the installation of tunnelled pipework at the Bowland Section of the Haweswater Aqueduct and associated works for Ton Rimmer (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Closed
21/00141/PAH	46 Slaidburn Drive, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a 6.00 metre deep, single storey rear extension with a maximum roof height of 4.00 metres and a maximum eaves height of 3.00 metres for Z Mister (Scotforth East Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Refused
21/00170/AD	Land Off, Middleton Road, Overton Agricultural determination for erection of storage building and hardstanding for Mr Colin Hargreaves (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Not Required
21/00200/AD	Docker Hall, Keerside, Arkholme Agricultural determination for erection of roof above existing yard for Mr Ian Close (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Not Required
21/00209/PAH	Rock Point, Abbeystead Road, Dolphinholme Erection of a 4.50 metre deep, single storey rear extension with a maximum roof height of 3.60 metres and a maximum eaves height of 2.75 metres for Mrs Sue Haworth (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Not Required
21/00219/NMA	22 Church Brow, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Non material amendment to planning permission 19/01513/FUL to remove door and window to rear and replace with grey bi-fold door for Mr Wayne Booth (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted