



Committee: PLANNING REGULATORY COMMITTEE

Date: MONDAY, 9 JANUARY 2023

Venue: MORECAMBE TOWN HALL

Time: 10.30 A.M.

A G E N D A

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

1 Apologies for Absence

2 Minutes

Minutes of meeting held on 5th December 2022 (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 21/00792/FUL | Haweswater Aqueduct, Helks
Brow, Wray, Lancashire | Lower
Lune Valley
Ward | (Pages 4 -
19) |
| Proposed works for and use of replacement section of aqueduct, including earthworks and ancillary infrastructure including: a new valve house building within fenced compound with permanent vehicular access provision and an area of proposed ground raising for landscaping, with the installation of a tunnel shaft and an open cut connection area within a temporary construction compound, to include site accesses, storage areas, plant and machinery, and drainage infrastructure. In addition, a temporary satellite park and ride facility with vehicle marshalling area, a temporary residents' parking area; and a series of local highway works. | | | | |
| 6 | A6 22/01071/FUL | Land West Of Sea View Drive Hest
Bank Lancashire | Bolton and
Slyne | (Pages 20 -
36) |
| Erection of 27 specialist bungalows for older people, with detached garage and associated access, internal roads, infrastructure, open space, landscaping and parking. | | | | |

7	A7 22/01291/FUL	Land Adjacent 1 Southgate White Lund Industrial Estate Morecambe Lancashire	Westgate Ward	(Pages 37 - 41)
---	---------------------------------	--	--------------------------	----------------------------

Siting of 5 portable buildings to provide temporary office space and creation of associated car parking.

8 Delegated List (Pages 42 - 49)

ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

(i) Membership

Councillors Sandra Thornberry (Chair), Keith Budden (Vice-Chair), Victoria Boyd-Power, Dave Brookes, Abbott Bryning, Roger Cleet, Roger Dennison, Kevin Frea, June Greenwell, Mel Guilding, Mandy King, Jack Lenox, Robert Redfern, Malcolm Thomas and Sue Tyldesley

(ii) Substitute Membership

Councillors Mandy Bannon (Substitute), Alan Biddulph (Substitute), Jake Goodwin (Substitute), Tim Hamilton-Cox (Substitute), Colin Hartley (Substitute), Debbie Jenkins (Substitute), Geoff Knight (Substitute), Sally Maddocks (Substitute), Joyce Pritchard (Substitute) and Peter Yates (Substitute)

(iii) Queries regarding this Agenda

Please contact Eric Marsden - Democratic Services: email emarsden@lancaster.gov.uk.

(iv) Changes to Membership, substitutions or apologies

Please contact Democratic Support, telephone 582000, or alternatively email democracy@lancaster.gov.uk.

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

Published on 21st December 2022.

Agenda Item	A5
Application Number	21/00792/FUL
Proposal	Proposed works for and use of replacement section of aqueduct, including earthworks and ancillary infrastructure including: a new valve house building within fenced compound with permanent vehicular access provision and an area of proposed ground raising for landscaping, with the installation of a tunnel shaft and an open cut connection area within a temporary construction compound, to include site accesses, storage areas, plant and machinery, and drainage infrastructure. In addition, a temporary satellite park and ride facility with vehicle marshalling area, a temporary residents' parking area; and a series of local highway works.
Application site	Haweswater Aqueduct, Helks Brow, Wray, Lancashire
Applicant	United Utilities Water Limited
Agent	Mr James Cullen
Case Officer	Mr Steve Ingram
Departure	No
Summary of Recommendation	Approval, subject to the satisfactory resolution with County Council Highways and a Section 106 Agreement and conditions.

1.0 Application Site and Setting

- 1.1 This application has been submitted in relation to the enhancement of the district's strategic regional water supply infrastructure as part of the Haweswater Aqueduct Resilience Programme (HARP).
- 1.2 The existing Haweswater Aqueduct currently supplies drinking water to Greater Manchester and much of the North-West of England (with it directly supplying treated drinking water to approximately 2.5 million people across the region). The HARP Project, as a whole, incorporates multiple development proposals which are located within several Local Planning Authorities, as the route of the existing/proposed aqueduct cuts through the region, in order to enhance that established water supply.
- 1.3 The HARP programme has required planning applications to be submitted to 7 different Local Planning Authorities all along the existing/intended route. For the Bowland Section of the scheme that has required related planning applications to be submitted to both Lancaster City Council and to Ribble Valley Borough Council infrastructure.

2.0 Proposal

- 2.1 These particular planning proposals are somewhat unusual in that the submitted redlined application site area actually encompasses all of the route of the proposed new underground aqueduct from the existing Lower Houses aqueduct pumping station, which is located some 4km to the south-east of Wray village, underneath Croasdale Fell and through the heart of the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) southwards to the district boundary with Ribble Valley Borough.

- 2.2 The proposed Bowland Section of the HARP Project would involve driving a new aqueduct tunnel alignment from the south, from a major temporary working compound which would be located near Newton-In-Bowland within Ribble Valley Borough, to its intended reception site at Lower Houses (within another temporary construction compound). The working areas covered by this application approximately follow the route of the existing Haweswater Aqueduct with the redline application boundary being drawn wide enough (at approximately 25 metres wide) in order to contain/allow for any subsequent minor variations in the exact alignment of the proposed new upgraded tunnels. This particular Lancaster section of the scheme proposes the replacement of some 16.7km of the existing aqueduct with a newly constructed section of new aqueduct and because of the area's obviously challenging topography it is intended that the maximum depth of the new tunnel section would be approximately 380m underground. It is intended that this new constructed section of aqueduct would then connect with the existing multi-line siphon elements of the existing aqueduct at Lower Houses.
- 2.3 The temporary construction compound at Lower Houses is required in order to facilitate the necessary aqueduct construction works and it is anticipated that these temporary works will be ongoing for a total time period of approximately 5 years (which is currently anticipated to be from 2024 until 2029) in order that the site would be ready to await the arrival and subsequent removal of the tunnel boring machine. The related local road access improvements would obviously need to be delivered in advance of works commencing at Lower Houses. During those five years it is anticipated that there would be both periods of activity and relative inactivity on the Lower Houses site with around two and a half years of overall construction related activity in total being necessary. Once the construction works have been completed the temporary working areas will be subject to an agreed landscape and habitat restoration schemes with only a small permanent new vernacular style pump house being required to be constructed at Lower Houses in order to support the future on-going operation of the upgraded aqueduct.
- 2.4 In order to reduce the need for additional associated HGV movements the applicants are proposing that the below ground materials to be extracted, in order to create the required tunnel reception facility at the Lower Houses Compound, would be appropriately reused within the proposed landscape restoration scheme at that location. This would require the depositing of approximately 4,500 cubic metres of excavated rock and earth within/across the restored former construction compound area.
- 2.5 It should also be noted that part of the intended vehicle routing arrangements, which are intended to allow construction vehicles to access as safely as possible the proposed Lower Houses temporary working area, potentially involves utilising some of the minor local roads within the adjoining local authority areas (which are administered by Craven District Council and North Yorkshire County Council).
- 2.6 Notwithstanding those issues it is important to note that all the intended major tunnelling operations would be undertaken from the southern end of this section of the new aqueduct from the proposed major Newton in Bowland temporary construction compound located in Ribble Valley. Accordingly, it is proposed that all the tunnel arisings (those being all the waste materials created by the tunnelling operation) would be removed from that southern end of the new tunnel before being transferred to a nearby former quarry for use within a revised restoration scheme (subject to a separate planning approval and appropriate obligations).
- 2.7 The aqueduct route and the proposed temporary working at Lower Houses, and large tracts of the related access routes, are all located within the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and as such due to the scale and nature of these planning proposals, and the inherent acknowledged sensitivity of the proposed working locations, these proposals have been necessarily subject to environmental assessment in accordance with the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017. The associated Environmental Statement, and its subsequent related updated information and addenda, therefore outlines the anticipated impacts of the proposed development and also identifies the related proposed mitigation measures.
- 2.8 Further to the initial submission the applicants have made some environmental and access related updates to the application in response to issues raised by both residents and other consultees. These amendments primarily focus upon providing updated environmental information to the AONB and Natural England and providing requested revisions to the proposed construction traffic

management plan. The access proposals are now based upon the intended use of marshalled 'convoys' of up to 4 vehicles travelling from the Wray satellite compound, transiting via Wennington and Low Bentham, to a further new holding area at Spen Brow and then in a controlled manner through the immediate local lanes network onto the Lower Houses Compound. To facilitate this, 8 additional road widening improvements would be required along the Eskew Lane, Long Lane and Fairheath sections of the route (although 3 previously proposed road improvement areas nearer Wray would now no longer be required).

2.9 To incorporate these revisions the package of application information has been appropriately updated with addenda being provided for both the Habitats Regulations Assessment, the SSSI Assessment and the SEI report. In that regard it should be noted that Section 4 of that updated SEI Report specifically addresses in further detail the established constraints upon the location of the proposed aqueduct works and the potential impacts upon the AONB of other potential/possible alternative construction locations and methods.

3.0 Site History

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

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
19/01371/EIO	A request for a Screening Opinion in accordance with Regulation 15 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 was submitted in 2019, and the related decision was issued in March 2020, with the proposed approach to managing the anticipated environmental impacts being considered appropriate.	Approach considered to be appropriate
21/00134/EIO	An Addenda to that Screening Opinion in accordance with Regulation 15 of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 was subsequently submitted in February 2021, and a further related decision was issued in March 2021, with the proposed approach to managing the anticipated environmental impacts again being considered appropriate.	Approach considered to be appropriate

4.0 Consultation Responses

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

Consultee	Response
DLUHC (Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities)	No comments to make on the Environmental Statement.
Lancashire County Council (LCC) Highways	Has extensively considered the highway and traffic management issues associated with securing safe access to the proposed working areas. LCC have been extensively involved in both pre-application and subsequent negotiations regarding these proposals and whilst their views have extensively shaped the intended traffic management responses they have not yet submitted their finalised comments. An update to Members shall be given at Committee regarding their position.
LCC Lead Local Flood Authority	No Objection subject to the imposition of appropriate flood management conditions.
LCC Public Rights of Way	The PROW Officer considered that there were some outstanding issues regarding the potential interactions of the established public footpath network in the vicinity of the proposed Lower Houses Compound that need to be clarified. Further details have

	been provided and it is considered that these issues can be addressed via the proposed planning conditions.
LCC Landscape Officers (inc. AONB)	(See Forest of Bowland AONB Advisors)
LCC Minerals Safeguarding	No comments received.
LCC Archaeology	Consider that the mitigation measures outlined in the ES are appropriate subject to the imposition of a condition to secure a scheme of archaeological work.
Craven District Council	The Council have no objection to the proposal, but they do stress that any land affected is re-instated to the level prior to the works commencing and that the management of traffic is in accordance with the details provided. Craven also confirmed that they have no comments regarding the updated Regulation 25 information.
Ribble Valley Borough Council	Recognise the public benefits that will arise from the necessary repair to this infrastructure and therefore raise no objection subject to appropriate conditions and obligations to mitigate any potential harm arising from the development. Consulted regarding the additional plans but they have no further comments.
North Yorkshire County Council Highways	No Objection subject to an appropriate condition regarding construction traffic management.
Wray with Botton Parish Council	Concerns. The Parish Council were consulted in respect of both the original application and the revised traffic management proposals. The Parish Council notes that, whilst the proposed revisions to the construction traffic routing proposals do seek to address some of the concerns raised, local residents are still concerned regarding the adequacy of the traffic management proposals. The Council is also concerned about the adequacy of the proposed temporary resident's alternative parking arrangements within Wray and the related potential for damage to vehicles and properties. The Council also wants to see proactive environmental reinstatements and especially measures to ensure that construction traffic will not conflict with village school pick-ups and drop-offs.
Hornby with Farleton Parish Council	The Parish Council acknowledge the importance of the proposed works but feel that the current proposals do not sufficiently address their stated concerns regarding road safety and disturbance to residents. After being consulted regarding the amended traffic management proposals the Council is still concerned and objects because of what they consider to be unresolved highway issues. The Parish Council have also now (November 2022) considered the updated information and reiterated their concerns regarding highway safety matters and the need for further related highway improvements.
Wennington Parish Council	The Parish Council acknowledges the necessity of the scheme but objects to the application on the basis of their concerns regarding road safety, environmental impact, health and safety and damage to the built environment. The Parish Council were re-consulted with regard to the amended traffic management proposals and state that they continue to have serious concerns regarding the impacts of the potential construction traffic using Route 2.
Tatham Parish Council	The Parish Council recognises the necessity of these works but requires clarifications regarding the nature of the proposed traffic management arrangements and the participation of the PC in the proposed Stakeholder Group.
Roeburndale Parish Council	No comments received.
Bentham Town Council	Ask to be kept updated regarding the programme and that Bentham residents are not disadvantaged by the associated road works.

<p>Forest of Bowland AONB Advisors</p>	<p>The AONB Landscape Advisor raised questions regarding the completeness of the applicable environmental information (as per the Regulation 25 issued by the Local Planning Authority (LPA). With regard to the additional information submitted in response to the Regulation 25 the extent of the landscape impacts have been clarified and the AONB Advisors now consider that the updated landscape impact assessments is sufficient in order to allow the LPA to reasonably determine this application subject to the imposition of specific conditions.</p> <p>The AONB Ecological Advisor raised other questions regarding the completeness of the applicable environmental information (as per the Regulation 25 issued by the LPA). With regard to the additional information submitted in response to the Regulation 25 the AONB Advisors now consider that the submitted package of initial and additional ecological information is sufficient in order for the LPA to appropriately discharge its requirements in respect of the Habitats Regulations. The additional submitted information has clarified the limited extent of potential disturbance to protected species and the AONB Advisors now consider that the updated ecological assessments are sufficient in order to allow the LPA to reasonably determine this application subject to the imposition of specific conditions.</p>
<p>Greater Manchester Ecology Unit (GMEU)</p>	<p>The GMEU consider that the survey work undertaken has been comprehensive and that the assessment of ecological impacts as presented is acceptable and that no further surveys need to be carried out before determination of the application. The works in the Lancaster section will not affect any sites and therefore the LPA could adopt the HRA in order to fulfil its duties under the terms of the Habitats and Species Regulations. There will be no impacts upon any SSSI's. The proposed mitigation measures in respect of water pollution should safeguard the nearby County Wildlife Sites. Impacts upon notable habitats and species will be very limited and satisfactory mitigation and compensation proposals are proposed. Appropriate conditions and obligations would need to be imposed upon any permission.</p>
<p>Natural England (NE)</p>	<p>Designated Landscape – NE initially queried the proposed Lower Houses and Wray satellite compound locations and raised other questions regarding the completeness of the applicable environmental information (as per the Regulation 25 issued by the LPA). With regard to the additional information submitted in response to the Regulation 25 NE have considered the additional information that have been submitted and as such they now have No Objection subject to appropriate conditions being imposed.</p> <p>Habitats Regulation Assessment – No Objection (Considers that the updated appropriate assessment would not result in adverse effects upon the integrity of any of the relevant designated sites and that LCC will need to adopt the HRA in order to fulfil its duty as competent authority).</p> <p>SSSI Assessment – No Objection (Considers that the SSSI updated assessment correctly concludes that there would not be any adverse impacts on any of the relevant SSSI's).</p>
<p>Environment Agency</p>	<p>No Objections subject to the imposition of appropriate recommended planning conditions/obligations in respect of materials/waste management, management of surface water, the safeguarding of private water supplies and the delivery of compensatory habitats.</p>
<p>Lune River Trust</p>	<p>No comments received.</p>
<p>RSPB</p>	<p>No comments received.</p>
<p>Wildlife Trust for Lancashire</p>	<p>No comments received.</p>
<p>The Ramblers</p>	<p>No comments received.</p>

Association	
National Highways	No objection.
The Coal Authority	No objection – the only areas potentially affected would be in relation to the highway modification enabling works.
Electricity North West	Have supplied information regarding the approximate position of their apparatus known to be in the vicinity of the sites.
Lancaster City Council (LaCC) – Environmental Health	Has reviewed the detailed proposed management plans and is satisfied that sufficient mitigation has been planned into the application (and that these mitigation methods should be appropriately conditioned).
LaCC Tree Protection	Has reviewed the Environment Statement and considered the potential impact of the proposed development with 38 features (trees, groups and hedgerows) at risk of removal and 44 features at risk of partial removal. But taking into account the need for the development he has No Objection subject to the provision of detailed Arboricultural Method Statements, Tree Protection Plans and appropriate net gain proposals which will enable the extent of removal to be kept to an absolute minimum.

4.2 The following responses have been received from members of the public:

14 representations have been received in respect of this application.

- Significantly none of those representations relate to the principle of the development – rather they all relate to concerns regarding the impacts of the related construction works.
- 10 of the representations relate to the impacts of the proposed construction traffic on road safety in respect of Hornby and Wennington.
- 1 representation raises concerns regarding the impact the development works would have upon the character and amenity of Wray.
- 1 representation from residents close to Lower Houses regarding potential impacts upon their amenity and business.
- 2 representations from local agricultural businesses expressing their concerns regarding the originally proposed traffic management arrangements.

5.0 Analysis

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

- The **Need for the Development** and
- The **Mechanisms proposed in order to manage the impacts of the temporary construction works.**

5.2 Consideration 1 (The Relevant National and Local Planning Framework)

- 5.2.1 National Planning Policy Framework – as revised in July 2021 and specifically Sections 2 Achieving Sustainable Development, 4 Decision-Making, 8 Promoting Healthy and Safe Communities, 9 Promoting Sustainable Transport, 15 Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment (particularly Paragraphs 176 and 177), and 16 Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment.
- 5.2.2 National Planning Practice Guidance – with regard to the applicable guidance in respect of Determining a Planning Application, Environmental Impact Assessment, Healthy and Safe Communities, the Historic Environment, Light Pollution, the Natural Environment, Noise, Planning Obligations, and the Use of Planning Conditions.
- 5.2.3 The Development Plan – currently comprises the Lancaster District Local Plan 2020 (Parts One and Two) and the applicable adopted Neighbourhood Plans. Of particular relevance are Policies SP1 the Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development, SP7 Maintaining Lancaster District’s Unique Heritage, SP8 Protecting the Natural Environment, SP9 Maintaining Strong and Vibrant Communities, EN2 Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, EN7 Environmentally Important Areas, and SC1 Neighbourhood Planning Areas.
- 5.2.4 The AONB Management Plan 2019-2024 outlines the special characteristics of the area and sets out the related themes and supporting actions that will sustain the wellbeing of the AONB. Relevant themes include 1 An Outstanding Landscape of Natural and Cultural Heritage, and 2 Resilient and Sustainable Communities.
- 5.2.5 Relevant Neighbourhood Plans
- Wray-with-Botton Neighbourhood Plan 2019 – the Adopted Plan recognises the Parish’s location within the Forest of Bowland AONB and thereby seeks to meet the needs of the community whilst safeguarding the special characteristics of the area. Relevant Neighbourhood Plan policies include Policies OS1 Delivering Sustainable Development, OS2 Landscape, BE1 Design, NE1 Protection and Enhancement of Trees, Woodland and Hedgerows, NE3 Historic Environment, and TRA1 Infrastructure for New Development.
 - Wennington Neighbourhood Plan 2019 – the Adopted Plan looks to safeguard the established character of the area. Relevant Neighbourhood Plan policies include Policies WEN1 Protecting and Enhancing Local Wildlife, WEN2 Protecting and Enhancing Local Landscape Character, and WEN6 Transport and Accessibility.

5.3 Consideration 2 (The Environmental Assessment Process)

- 5.3.1 Because of the nature of the intended works and the related acknowledged sensitivities of the proposed working areas these planning proposals have been appropriately subject to statutory Environmental Impact Assessment.
- 5.3.2 United Utilities have recognised those sensitivities from the outset and prior to commencing this application process they submitted applicable Environmental Statement Scoping requests in 2020 and 2021 and the LPA, after consulting with all of the relevant statutory bodies and other interested parties, subsequently issued appropriate responses.
- 5.3.3 Within their applicable responses both the AONB Advisors and Natural England considered that additional updated environmental information was required in order to enable the Local Planning Authority to reach a reasoned conclusion regarding the likely impacts of the proposed development. Accordingly in June 2022 Lancaster City Council acting in respect of its role as the LPA formally issued a Regulation 25 letter requiring the submission of additional relevant information. The applicants formally responded to that request in September 2022 via the submission of clarifying information and the Council then re-

consulted with all of the applicable statutory and other consultees.

5.3.4 Having regard to all the environmental information that has now been submitted, and after taking into account the views of the relevant expert consultees, it is considered that the Environmental Impact Assessment that has been undertaken is appropriately extensive with the submitted information identifying all of the potentially applicable environmental issues and the related necessary mitigations. Accordingly it is considered that, subject to mechanisms being put in place in order to satisfactorily delivery of all of the proposed related mitigations, these planning proposals can now be reasonably determined on their planning merits.

5.4 Consideration 3 (The Need for the Development)

5.4.1 The NPPF in Paragraph 172 affords AONB's the highest status of protection within the planning process and as such great weight should be given to preserving and enhancing both their landscape and scenic beauty. Therefore applications for major development in such areas must be considered within that policy context and therefore they are subject to a specific test of appropriateness – that being the Major Development Test.

5.4.2 The applicable Major Development Test requires the planning decision maker to specifically consider;

- the need for the development, including in terms of any national considerations, and the impact of permitting it, or refusing it, upon the local economy;
- the cost of, and scope for, development elsewhere outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way; and
- any detrimental effect on the environment, the landscape and recreational opportunities, and the extent to which that could be moderated.

5.4.3 In considering the requirements of that test it has to be accepted that it is essential for there to be a continuity of safe drinking water supply to the region. United Utilities have considered a range of options in order to fulfil their water supply responsibilities but these have not been deemed feasible because of the need to integrate with the established infrastructure. Fundamentally, the HARP project looks to integrate with, connect to and enhance the existing water supply infrastructure, all of which of course is already established and located in situ within the AONB, therefore in this instance there is an obvious fixed locational imperative. The proposed aqueduct construction works obviously mean that there will be some temporary impacts upon the character and appearance of the AONB but in the planning judgement these will only be short term in their nature and it is intended that these will be mitigated as far as possible by the imposition of the suggested planning conditions and the related planning obligations (especially in terms of the required landscape and habitat restorations and proposed enhancements).

5.4.4 To conclude regarding the need for the development it is considered that therefore there is an essential need for this proposed development to take place within the AONB. The development is acknowledged to be in the wider public interest and whilst there will be some limited short term environmental and visual impacts upon the character and appearance of the AONB these will be only temporary rather than permanent in their nature.

5.5 Consideration 4 (The Localised Impacts upon the AONB)

5.5.1 The associated Environmental Statement outlines that there will be some noticeable temporary environmental and visual impacts upon the character and appearance of the AONB mainly due to the establishment of the tunnel reception compound at Lower Houses,

and the other related other temporary compounds and working areas, and the associated road enhancements that are required in order to allow for safe access to that construction site.

5.5.2 The AONB's Advisors and Natural England have been closely involved in the formulation of these proposals and they have requested further information regarding the potential landscape and visual factors in relation to the locational constraints placed upon this development. The proposed Lower Houses Compound would be sited in an area of fringe farmland located 'above' the existing aqueduct and adjacent to the existing United Utilities valve house building. Obviously there would be localised landscape and visual impacts associated with the use of the Lower Houses compound but it is considered that careful control over the form and nature of the compound and in the way that it operates will help to minimise those temporary impacts. Similarly the proposed Wray satellite compound needs to be located adjacent to the B6480 in order to facilitate the necessary safe access and egress of vehicles and again it is considered that appropriate controls over the form and use of that compound will help to mitigate its impacts.

5.5.3 The potential ecological impacts have been thoroughly assessed, with the AONB and NE applying an appropriate precautionary approach, and it has been concluded, that with the addition of the updated bat surveys, that the ecological information is now sufficient in order to allow the LPA to discharge its requirements in respect of protected species and therefore to be able to determine this planning application. The specialist advisors now consider that the updated landscape and ecological assessments are satisfactory and therefore they are content for the local planning authority to determine the planning application subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions.

5.5.4 LCC's Tree Protection Officer has reviewed the Environment Statement and considered the potential impact of the proposed development with 38 features (trees, groups and hedgerows) at risk of removal and 44 other features at risk of partial removal. He concludes that these potential cumulative works will indeed impact upon local landscape character and temporarily fragment the local wildlife corridors but taking into account the need for the essential development he has no objection subject to the provision of detailed Arboricultural Method Statements and Tree Protection Plans to enable the extent of removal to be kept to an absolute minimum that the overall scheme obligations will ensure the delivery of appropriate environmental net gain proposals.

5.5.5 To conclude regarding the impacts of this intended major development upon the AONB it is accepted by all parties that there will be some discernible short term impacts that will be perceived for the duration of the temporary construction works. However the permanent impacts of this development will be minimal and as such there are opportunities for long term enhancements of the AONB via the quality of all the related landscape reinstatements and the associated environmental net gains.

5.6 Consideration 5 (The Phasing of the Proposed Works)

5.6.1 This is a complex application which encompasses a series of preparatory and temporary construction works that would be ongoing for various periods of time primarily at the Lower Houses compound but also in other separate locations. There is also the fact that the proposed preparatory and temporary works may be required to commence at differing time periods over what may be a number of years.

5.6.2 As such it will be necessary to impose a suitably robust 'Grampian Condition' mechanism to ensure that all of the related details for each location are agreed prior to the proposed works commencing at that particular location. In essence that requirement will mean that no works can commence at any temporary working location until the Local Planning Authority has agreed to the proposed temporary working practices, the relevant environmental safeguards

and especially with regard to the related restoration requirements for that location.

5.6.3 There will also potentially be other applicable phasing requirements in relation to the various stages of the proposed related development process including pre-commencement, during the preparatory works and the temporary construction periods and especially in relation to the required subsequent landscape and environmental restorations and reinstatements. These will also be agreed via the phasing condition discharge requirements.

5.6.4 To conclude regarding the phasing of the proposed works the Local Planning Authority obviously needs to be able to agree the principle of the overall scheme and to acknowledge the basis of the related details at this application stage. However this is a complex application and its inherent elements are bound to be subject to review prior to any actual works commencing. Therefore it is proposed that appropriate flexibility be built into the conditions/obligations in order to allow for the specific elements of the permission to be appropriately phased, implemented and reinstated.

5.7 Consideration 6 (The Proposed Environmental Mitigations)

5.7.1 Nearly all of the intended works are located within the designated Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and as such it is essential that the character and appearance of that area is safeguarded as much as possible during the period of the temporary construction works. The associated environmental statement identifies and acknowledges the potential related temporary impacts upon the landscape and environment but the identified mitigations, restorations and reinstatements would seek to ensure that there is no long-term harm.

5.7.2 Because of the very rural nature of this part of the district there are very few residential properties in close proximity to the areas of proposed operations. The properties at Lower House Farm and Lower House Cottage are 300m away from the boundary of the proposed Lower Houses Compound and as such their amenity will need to appropriately monitored and safeguarded during the period of the nearby construction works. More widespread residential properties will be intermittently effected by the anticipated construction traffic and as such that traffic will need to appropriately routed and effectively managed in order to keep that disruption to an acceptable limited level.

5.7.3 In order to appropriately minimise the discernible impacts upon the landscape and ecology of the AONB it will be necessary to ensure that these temporary construction works are carried out in such a way so that the areas of disturbance are minimal in themselves and that each specific working area, including every local access improvement location, is sympathetically reinstated and effectively reintegrated into the local environment. Comprehensive planning conditions and the related obligations will ensure that this happens.

5.7.4 To conclude regarding the proposed environmental outcomes it is accepted that there will be some discernible localised impacts during the construction phase of this infrastructure project. However it is accepted that those impacts are temporary in their nature and subject to the satisfactory delivery of the related mitigations it is considered that there would be no enduring impacts upon the local environment.

5.8 Consideration 7 (The Traffic Management Arrangements)

5.8.1 Lancashire County Council Highways Authority have been consulted on the proposal and have heavily influenced the scheme to date. Final comments have not been received but an update will be given to Members at the Committee. Because of the very rural nature of the intended working areas and the scale and form of the intended construction works it will be necessary for the associated traffic management arrangements to be carefully thought-out

and thereafter sensitively implemented. It is therefore intended that this will be precisely conditioned in the form of the LPA prohibiting specific works at designated sites from commencing until it has appropriately considered and signed off the applicable elements of the applicant's Traffic Management Strategy.

- 5.8.2 In order to allow for the essential 'very heavy' machinery and materials to access the Lower Houses Compound there will be certain periods when local roads, including Main Street in the centre of Wray village, will need to be subject to planned road closures and other related traffic management arrangements. It is anticipated that such extreme measures will only be potentially intermittently required during 18 weeks of the proposed construction programme with an associated enhanced facility for displaced residents parking to be provided off Main Street (at the Bridge House Tea Rooms). The details of the necessary arrangements will need to be submitted to and agreed by the LPA prior to any such actions. In considering the reasonableness of those proposed arrangements the LPA will specifically consider the appropriateness of the proposed local community mitigations.
- 5.8.3 During the anticipated extended construction period it will also be necessary to appropriately manage the day to day 'more normal' construction traffic (modelled at 42 movements each way per day) needing to access the Lower Houses Compound. It is intended that this will involve an agreed routing arrangement involving the creation of a localised one way traffic management regime and this will also need to be agreed by the LPA prior to the commencement of any works. In considering the reasonableness of those proposed traffic management arrangements the LPA will again specifically consider the nature and appropriateness of the proposed local community mitigations.
- 5.8.4 As an aspect of the intended traffic management strategy a temporary satellite compound is also proposed on agricultural land directly off the B6480 between Hornby and Wray. This compound would be used as a facility to appropriately collate and manage construction traffic going on to the Lower Houses Compound and to allow for shared and managed journeys, within 4 vehicle convoys, to be made in order to minimise the number of required vehicular movements.
- 5.8.5 To enable safe use of the local roads and access to the Lower Houses Compound, via all of the intended prescribed routes, it will also be necessary for a series of targeted local road improvements to be made. These improvements will in the majority of cases be retained in situ as local legacy benefits but all will be required to be mitigated by associated high quality landscape reinstatements. It is intended that there would be 22 related local road improvements as outlined below;
- RW1 – Proposed road widening and visibility enhancement on the southern side of the A683/B6480 junction Hornby Road.
 - RW2 – Proposed road widening and visibility enhancements along a section of the B6480 Hornby Road opposite Whitmore.
 - RW3 – Proposed road widening and visibility enhancement at the junction of the B6480 and Back Lane Hornby Road.
 - RW4 – Proposed road widening and visibility enhancements along a 250m long bending section of the B6480 Wennington Road just to the north of Wray (originally proposed but no longer required in respect of the amended access proposals).
 - RW5 – Proposed road widening and visibility enhancements along the eastern side of the B6480 just to the south of The Bridge Inn Tatham.

- RW6 – Proposed road widening and visibility enhancement on the southern side of the B6480 to the east of Wennington.
- RW7 – Proposed road widening and visibility enhancements along a 100m long section of the southern side of the B6480 to the east of Toll Bar House in Craven District.
- RW8 – Proposed road widening and visibility enhancements along the first sections of Eskew Lane in Craven District.
- RW9 – Proposed road widening and visibility enhancement to the western side of Long Lane opposite the entrance to Masons and Sons Farm.
- RW10 – Proposed road widening and visibility enhancement along a 100m long section of the southern side of Long Lane (south of the junction with Cross Road).
- RW11 – Proposed road widening and visibility enhancement to the southern side of Long Lane at the junction with Fairheath Road.
- RW12 – Proposed road widening and visibility enhancement on the bend of the access lane just to the east of Lower Houses Farm.
- RW13 to RW15 - Proposed road widening and visibility enhancements along a 500m section of Helks Brow from the proposed access to the Lower Houses Compound towards Wray.
- RW16 to RW 17 - Proposed road widening and visibility enhancements along a 400m section of Helks Brow from the junction with Park House Lane towards Wray.
- RW18 – Proposed road widening and visibility enhancements along a 100m long section of Helks Brow further towards Wray.
- RW19 to RW 21 - Proposed major sections of road widening and visibility enhancements for 400m to the north and south of Lane House Helks Brow.
- RW22 – Proposed major section of road widening and visibility enhancement on the junction of Helks Brow towards Wray.

These road improvements will all require appropriate related hedgerow, stone wall and railing reinstatements.

There are also related proposals to enhance passing places on the local network in 6 other locations;

- PP01 to PP03 – to be installed on Helks Brow on the improved section of roadway close to the proposed access to the Lower Houses Compound.
- PP04 to PP06 – to be installed on Helks Brow to the east of Wray village (all three were originally proposed but only PP05 is still required in light of the amended access proposals).

These passing place improvements will also all require appropriate related hedgerow, stone wall and railing reinstatements.

5.8.6 A number of local Public Rights of Way would be affected by the proposed works at the

Lower Houses compound and as such appropriate temporary closures and diversions will need to put in place for the period of those works. All the existing routes can be effectively reinstated thereafter.

5.8.7 Subsequent to the consideration of the initial traffic management proposals, and allowing for appropriate reflection regarding the representations received from local residents and businesses, the applicants have submitted additional proposals to amend elements of the intended traffic management arrangements and to further extend the related schedule of proposed minor road works. These amended proposals include a significant variation whereby the previously proposed potentially complex 'local one way' traffic routing would now be replaced by vehicles primarily utilising the proposed routing via Wennington and Eskew Lane to a newly proposed additional holding area at Spen Brow. From that holding area at Spen Brow appropriately marshalled 'convoys' would then be carefully directed and managed along Furnessford Road in order to safely access the Lower Houses Compound.

5.8.8 These amended proposals, in addition to the creation of the proposed Spen Brow holding area, have also given rise to the need for eight additional localised road improvements along Eskew Lane, Long Lane and Fairheath section of the proposed access route.

5.8.9 To conclude regarding the proposed traffic management arrangements it has to be accepted that both the existing aqueduct and especially the proposed Lower Houses Compound are located in highly inaccessible rural areas. The road network serving Lower Houses is predominantly made up of B roads and minor local roads and lanes and as such it is obviously not ideal. However, it is essential that the required construction traffic can access the Lower Houses Compound and as such we are looking at intensive traffic management proposals that would result in the 'least worst' outcomes. In addition it will be absolutely essential that mechanisms are put in place in order to ensure that the established local traffic management arrangements can be kept under constant review and that they are able to be amended in order to address any changed or unforeseen issues that may subsequently arise.

5.9 Consideration 8 (The Other Specific Local Mitigations)

5.9.1 The residential properties located at Lower Houses Farm are in relative close proximity to the proposed Lower Houses construction compound. Accordingly the basis of that relationship will need to be respected and reflected in the embedded local operating practices so as to be in-line with the identified environmental health requirements.

5.10 Consideration 9 (The Operating/Construction Code of Practice)

5.10.1 Because the impacts of this development is primarily going to be experienced during the potentially prolonged construction phase it will be vital that the appointed contractors operate in an appropriate manner. Accordingly it is proposed that the intended construction code of practice i.e. how the contractor looks to operate within the framework of all of the proposed and agreed operating restrictions is carefully considered and controlled by condition.

5.10.2 For example specifically negotiations with Lancashire Highways have resulted in agreement that the construction traffic movements will need to carefully managed in order not to interfere with both the morning and afternoon school runs. Therefore all related construction vehicle movements would be prohibited between 8.45 and 9.30am and between 2.30 and 3.15pm.

5.10.3 To conclude it will essential that the proposed operating and construction codes of practice appropriately manages the ways in which the appointed contractors undertake these works and how they proactively interact and engage with the local community in order to address

any unforeseen issues that may emerge.

6.0 Conclusion and Planning Balance

6.1 Consideration of the Planning Balance

- 6.1.1 It is important for the decision maker to be able to consider both the need for the proposed development and to have the facility to appropriately evaluate both any permanent or temporary harm that may arise from the potential grant of any planning permission.
- 6.1.2 In this instance it is widely accepted that the appropriate upgrading of the Haweswater Aqueduct in order to provide an appropriate source of drinking water for much of the North West is a planning issue of acknowledged regional importance.
- 6.1.3 It is also accepted that the proposed development will give rise to very limited new permanent impacts provided that all of the proposed environmental mitigations, especially in terms of the required landscape and environmental mitigations, are appropriately implemented and thereafter suitably maintained. Indeed the proposals create the opportunities to deliver significant related net gains in terms of both the quality of the required landscape restorations and the proposed related biodiversity net gains.
- 6.1.4 It is accepted that the discernible impacts of these proposals will be during the construction periods (which it should again be noted could be for an extended period of up to 5 years with regard to the proposed construction works at the Lower Houses Compound). Therefore whilst there is a considerable importance placed upon ensuring that those necessary construction works can readily go ahead they need to be carried out in such a manner so as to appropriately mitigate both the identified environmental issues and so as to not unduly impact upon the amenity of nearby residents.
- 6.1.5 In considering the planning balance it is also important to consider how all of the identified and proposed mitigations can and will be appropriately delivered. In this instance the proposed mitigations will be ensured via the imposition of both the requisite planning conditions and via the explicit requirements of the related Section 106 Agreement.

6.2 Conclusions and Recommendation

- 6.2.1 In conclusion it is considered that these proposals are somewhat unusual in that there are no in principle objections to the upgrading of this important piece of regional water supply infrastructure and it is accepted that any discernible impacts will only be temporarily experienced during the potential (albeit extended for a considerable temporary period) construction stage.
- 6.2.2 Accordingly provided that appropriate measures can be put in place in order to manage and mitigate as far as possible those temporary impacts, and to ensure the delivery of the associated long-term regional and community benefits, it is considered that this planning permission can reasonably be granted.
- 6.2.3 With consideration being given to all other matters, it is therefore recommended that Planning Permission **BE GRANTED** subject to the following conditions and satisfactory completion of the related Section 106 Agreement in order to secure the required temporary mitigations and long-term enhancements.

Recommendation

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

Proposed Planning Conditions

The proposed related planning conditions (to be imposed upon this permission) are;

- Time Limit – to allow for the necessary commencement of the scheme.
- Approved Plans and Documents – to ensure effective alignment between the proposed working arrangements and required environmental mitigations.
- Phasing of Works – to allow for the agreement of the LPA to the specific timing/phasing of the proposed works. No works to commence at any specific location until appropriate complete details (including final extent and complete reinstatement proposals) have been submitted to and agreed in writing by the LPA. All works to then accord with those approved details.
- Operating/Construction Code of Practice and Environmental Management Strategies – to tie the proposed ways of working to the agreed method statements and management strategies during the construction phase.
- Agreed Construction Traffic Management Plan – to require and ensure the appointed contractor's strict adherence with the agreed construction traffic management plan (CTMT) and arrangements (including specified access routes/impact mitigation measures and other actions).
- Implementation of Highway Improvements – to ensure that the required highway improvements as required by Lancashire Highways are implemented prior to any construction works commencing at the Lower Houses compound.
- Appropriate Landscape Restoration, Reinstatement and Aftercare – to ensure the implementation of the required/agreed landscape and other reinstatements and for appropriate extended maintenance period.
- Lower Houses and Other Compounds Schemes – to require the temporary working compound to be appropriately screened (including hoardings and other mechanisms), to be sympathetically illuminated and otherwise appropriately marshalled and operated.
- Valve House Materials – to ensure the use of appropriate local building materials.
- Approved Hours of Working – to ensure compliance with specified/agreed local working arrangements/the CTMP.
- Tree/Landscape Safeguarding and Reinstatement Measures – no works to commence until required/agreed tree and landscape protection measures are in place/comprehensive reinstatement plans submitted and thereafter appropriately reinstated.
- Scheme of Archaeological Works – in order to safeguard areas of archaeological importance.
- Footpath Diversions and Reinstatements – in order to appropriately safeguard and reinstate the affected public footpaths.
- AONB Safeguarding Conditions – requiring a Construction Environment Management Plan, Precautionary Working Methods, Habitat Creation Restoration and Management Plans and the appropriate removal of all temporary construction features.

- Drainage/Flood Risk Assessment/Surface Water Sustainable Drainage/surface Water and Private Water Supply Management Plans – to ensure compliance with all the agreed water management solutions.
- Employment and Skills Plan – to ensure compliance with the proposed related local employment opportunities.

Proposed Related Planning Obligations

The proposed related planning obligations will be required to secure the;

- No Implementation until Waddington Fell Quarry Permission Extant
- Delivery of Biodiversity Net Gains/Compensatory habitats
- Provision of the Community Liaison Officer
- Ecological Clerk of Works
- Safeguarding of Existing Residences and Premises
- Traffic Impact Reinstatements
- Traffic Management Contributions
- Delivery of North Yorkshire Traffic Enhancements

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

Lancaster City Council has made the decision 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 decision 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

Application Reference 21/00792/FUL and the associated Environmental Statement

Lancaster City Council – EIA Scoping Opinion – March 2020

Lancaster City Council – Addenda to EIA Scoping Opinion – March 2021

Agenda Item	A6
Application Number	22/01071/FUL
Proposal	Erection of 27 specialist bungalows for older people, with detached garage and associated access, internal roads, infrastructure, open space, landscaping and parking
Application site	Land West Of Sea View Drive Hest Bank Lancashire
Applicant	L Gittins
Agent	Catherine Thomas
Case Officer	Mrs Eleanor Fawcett
Departure	Yes
Summary of Recommendation	Refusal

1.0 Application Site and Setting

- 1.1 The application relates to an agricultural field located adjacent to the built-up area of Hest Bank, between dwellings on Sea View Drive, to the east, and the Lancaster Canal, to the west. The site is located approximately 1 kilometre from the northern edge of Morecambe and is within the North Lancashire Green Belt, on an edge where it abuts Hest Bank. It has an area of approximately 2 hectares and the western boundary is curved, due to the position of the canal, making it narrower at its northern end. The land rises from the canal towards a highest point along the eastern boundary, which is slightly to the north of its mid-point by approximately 4.25 metres. There are hedgerows along most of the eastern and southern boundaries, and the site is mostly open to the canal to the west, with some groups and individual trees and also some low vegetation. There is an existing field access at the north of the site, off Sunningdale Crescent and one to the south that links to Rakes Head Lane, which is a public right of way.
- 1.2 A very small part of the site at the northern end is identified as being at a high risk from surface water flooding (1 in 30) with a slightly larger part in this area identified as a lower risk (1 in 100 and 1 in 1000). There is also a small part towards the southern boundary of the site identified as at risk of surface water flooding (1 in 100). The site is also identified as being susceptible to ground water flooding (50% – 75%). There are two listed canal bridges close to the site. Rakes Head Bridge is Grade II and is approximately 20 metres to the south, and Occupation Bridge is also Grade II and is approximately 250 metres to the north. Slyne-with-Hest Conservation Area lies approximately 700 metres to the east. The west coast main railway line is located approximately 330 metres to the west.
- 1.3 The Lancaster Canal is designated as a Biological Heritage Site and is also identified as a Green Space Network in the Local Plan. Rakes Head Biological Heritage Site is also located approximately 160 metres to the southeast. The site is located approximately 370 metres from Morecambe Bay, which is designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Area (SPA), and Ramsar Site. The site is also within the Open

Countryside, as defined by the Local Plan, and the Neighbourhood Planning Area for Slyne-with-Hest.

2.0 Proposal

2.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of 27 bungalows with access created off Sea View Close, which is towards the northern end of the eastern boundary. The creation of the access will involve the removal of a section of hedgerow. The dwellings are proposed to be specialist bungalows for older people, restricted to households with at least one person aged 55 and over. They are proposed to be built to comply with the standards of Part M4(2) Category 2: 'Accessible and Adaptable Dwellings' of the Building Regulations. A mix of one, two and three bedroom detached and semi-detached dwellings is proposed, which would be faced in brick and render with grey tile roofs and either vertical boarding or tile hanging gable features.

2.2 The main road into the site is proposed to be curved. Roughly following the shape of the eastern boundary with the canal, but set back from this. Dwellings would front onto this road, facing towards the canal, with two cul-de-sacs proposed off this to the west. The area at the north of the site, above the access road, is proposed to be left free of built development and partly planted. A footpath access is proposed to Sunningdale Crescent and would follow the line of the road to the southern boundary where it would stop. The land between the footpath and the canal would accommodate some drainage infrastructure, including a drainage basin at the southwest corner.

3.0 Site History

3.1 No relevant applications relating to this site have previously been received by the Local Planning Authority.

4.0 Consultation Responses

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

Consultee	Response
Slyne-with-Hest Parish Council	<p>Object for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The land is within the North Lancaster Green Belt, and contributes to the wider landscape character, and is therefore not appropriate for development; • The examiner's report makes it clear that the Neighbourhood Plan cannot amend the Green Belt Boundary and that the land west of Sea View Drive should remain in the Green Belt and not built on. • No evidence to suggest that the number and type of homes proposed are required to meet an identified need within Slyne-with-Hest and provide exceptional circumstances; • Increase the number of vehicle movements along Sea View Drive with a consequent impact on residents.
Environmental Health	No comments received.
Arboricultural Officer	<p>Comments. The tree protection measures are appropriate but need amending to reflect amendments to the footpath as described above. To avoid future conflicts it would be preferable to plant standards within the proposed hedgerows and open space to the west of the site rather than on the boundary with existing properties. It would be preferable to see greater connectivity across the site and trees planted outside of the domestic curtilage within a roadside verge for example. The area of scrub planting to the east of the site provides an area of separation between the existing and proposed dwellings but is fragmented and would be better located along the canal corridor, connecting habitat to the north and south.</p>
Planning Policy	<p>Comments. The scheme comprises inappropriate development within the Green Belt. The North Lancashire Green Belt Review Full Report concludes that land to the west of Seaview Drive, Hest Bank makes strong contribution to the Green Belt. The</p>

	Slyne with Hest Neighbourhood Plan sought to allocate the site for residential development. The Inspector concluded removal from the Green Belt and its allocation for housing, "would be contrary to the Secretary of State's policies for keeping Green Belt land permanently open and also would not be in general conformity with the strategic policies in the Local Plan, especially with regard to the North Lancaster Green Belt". Very special circumstance which outweigh harm to the openness of the Green Belt would be required for the proposal to be acceptable and it is not considered that the scheme provides this. The SHMA does not provide evidence for the need for the type of accommodation proposed in this location. A determination as to whether the scheme accords with policy DM3, to provide 30% affordable housing, cannot be undertaken without the receipt and independent assessment of a viability appraisal. There is a missed opportunity to further reduce the associated CO2 emissions of the site given the use of gas boilers and it is not understood why solar PV installation has not been maximised across the site. A site specific "Agricultural Land Classification Report" or similar should be submitted to ensure that the land on this site is classified as grade 3b or below. It should be ensured that there is access to the canal path to help provide cycling connectivity.
Engineering Team	No comments received.
Conservation Team	Not providing comments.
Economic Development	Comments. The submitted Employment Skills Plan demonstrates a positive commitment to the objectives of the policy. Request a condition for a details Plan prior to commencement unless provided during the application.
Public Realm Officer	Comments. Concerns about the location on Green Belt Land, which has been protected from development which could constitute urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. 401.1m2 amenity space would need to be provided on site. Amenity Space needs to be 'a mown informal space where young children could have a kick about'.
Waste and Recycling Team	No comments received.
County Highways	Comments: raise the following concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Internal carriageway widths internal and on Sea View Close; • Impact on the wider highway network; • Lack of footways along property frontages; • Removal of existing turning head; • Position of remote footway to the West of the internal road; and • sustainable links
Lead Local Flood Authority	Object. Inadequate surface water sustainable drainage strategy.
Public Rights of Way Officer	No comments received.
GMEU	Comments. Advise that there will be no likely significant effects on nearby National Sites Network (SPA/Ramsars/SAC) designated sites. Recommend conditions requiring: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Habitat protection measures during construction; • A construction environmental management plan; • Vegetation clearance to avoid the bird breeding season unless it can be demonstrated that there is no nesting activity present; • Amphibian reasonable avoidance measures; • Design of the external lighting scheme; • Ecological permeability measure (small mammal/amphibian gaps at the foot walls and/or the 1.8m board fencing) • Drainage Surface Water Attenuation and Pollution Prevention Measures; • Landscaping specification, including locally native standard trees;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Landscape & Ecological Management Plan, indicating how the open space and other habitats will be managed for a 30 year period in order to reach their prescribed condition; • Biodiversity enhancement plan for bird, bat and bee boxes and amphibian hibernacula.
Natural England	Comments. A Habitats Regulations Assessment is required demonstrating consideration of the potential impacts on the nearby designated sites from recreation disturbance associated with the development.
Sport England	No comments. The proposal does not fall within their statutory or non-statutory remit.
RSPB	No comments received.
Ramblers Association	No comments received.
Canal and River Trust	No objection subject to conditions requiring: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A construction management plan to ensure that excavation works do not undermine the canal structure; • A construction and environmental management plan to reduce the risk of pollution to the canal; • A landscaping scheme to limit the impact of the development on the character and appearance of the waterway; and • Drainage details to ensure that any new discharge to the canal is adequately designed.
Lancaster Canal Trust	Comments. Supports the comments made by the Canal and River Trust in relation to the impacts of excavations on the canal, pollution risk, visual impacts and surface water drainage.
Lancashire Constabulary	Comments. Recommendations regarding heights or fences; management of landscaping; design of street furniture; visibility of parking areas from windows; security of windows and doors; visibility and illumination of garage doors; intruder alarms and external lighting. Raise particular concern around the green area and the footpath which snakes the site and what this area will be used for. Open green space can become vulnerable to antisocial behaviour and drug related crime if hidden away, therefore recommend ensuring the area is well lit with clearly defined footpaths to reduce the opportunity for crime lines.
United Utilities	No comments received.
NHS	No objection , subject to a financial contribution of £15,580 towards the extension and reconfiguration at Ash Trees surgery (Bolton-le-Sands)
Lancashire Fire and Rescue	Comments. It should be ensured that the scheme fully meets all the requirements of Building Regulations Approved Document B, Part B5 'Access and facilities for the Fire Service'.
Network Rail	No comments.

4.2 32 pieces of correspondence have been received which raise an objection to the application and the following concerns:

- **Loss of Green Belt:** Exceptional circumstances to change the Green Belt boundary have not been demonstrated; development is not appropriate due to the site's contribution to the wider landscape; green belt land protects against urban sprawl; the housing need is based on anecdotal evidence and a housing survey has not been undertaken; similar proposal to that contained in the Slyne with Hest Neighbourhood Plan which was rejected and the land to remain as Green Belt; will lead to continued erosion of the Green Belt; the Green Belt boundary was recently reviewed.

- **Landscape and visual impact:** impact on open aspect of the landscape when viewed from the canal; impact on rural environment
- **Access and highway safety:** Access to Sea View Drive is already difficult and dangerous due to parking and right angle bends and will be exasperated by additional traffic; impacts on safety from large construction vehicles; existing issues with road condition; larger vehicles, including emergency services will struggle to access the site; should include requirement to repair Rakes Head Lane leading to the canal bridge so it can be used all year; no suitable bus stops in reasonable walking distance of the site to serve the intended occupants..
- **Impact on and loss of wildlife:** great crested newts are present in most gardens on Sea View Drive and believed to be on the site; Kingfishers, otters, herons, water voles, bats and many other species can be spotted around this parcel of land; impacts to wildlife on canal banking from noise and construction;
- **Housing need:** No need for additional houses in this location; there is other development proposed within the Slyne-with-Hest boundary; the case for building retirement homes to release larger family homes is no longer relevant; question age restriction as people with disabilities also need bungalows to live in due to access needs and can be of any age
- **Drainage:** The existing sewerage system is at capacity; any large amount of rain causes flooding and sewerage water to Sunningdale; concern about flooding to neighbouring properties; the site is generally saturated with overflow running to the west;
- **Impacts on tourism/ recreation:** Impact on the use of this part of the canal for moorings and loss of visitors to village and local amenities
- **Impact on neighbouring housing and security:** footpath link will open up access to a quiet cul-de-sac and increase footfall on Sunningdale; impact on views and outlook from properties on Sea View Drive.
- **Covenants on the land**

5.0 Analysis

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

- Principle of development, including impact on the Green Belt
- Traffic impacts, access, parking and sustainable travel
- Landscape impact, layout, design and open space
- Flood risk and drainage
- Residential amenity
- Biodiversity and trees
- Impacts on Heritage Assets
- Affordable housing, housing standards and mix
- Education and health
- Sustainable Design and Renewable Energy

5.2 **Principle of development, including impact on the Green Belt NPPF paragraphs: 7 – 12 (Achieving Sustainable Development), 60-61 and 73-79 (Delivering a Sufficient Supply of Homes) and 137-138, 140-142 and 147-150; Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policies SP1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development), SP2 (Lancaster District Settlement Hierarchy), SP3 (Development Strategy for Lancaster District), SP6 (The Delivery of New Homes), EN3 (The Open Countryside) and EN4 (the North Lancashire Green Belt); Development Management (DM) DPD policies: DM1 (New Residential Development and Meeting Housing Needs), DM4 (Residential Development Outside Main Urban Areas), DM8 (Accommodation For Older People and Vulnerable Communities), DM50 (Development in the Green Belt)**

5.2.1 The site is located adjacent to the built-up area of Hest Bank and Slyne-with-Hest, between existing residential development and the Lancaster Canal, and currently comprises agricultural land. Hest Bank and Slyne-with-Hest are both identified in Policy SP2 of the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD as a Sustainable Rural Settlement which will provide the focus for growth outside the main urban areas. Policy SP3 goes on to say that development will be supported in sustainable settlements and, in general, the scale of housing growth in rural areas will be managed to reflect existing population size, be proportionate to existing scale and character of the settlement and the availability of, or the opportunity to provide, infrastructure, services and facilities to serve

the development and the extent to which development can be accommodated within the local area. Hest Bank and Slyne-with-Hest are both considered to be sustainable locations for new housing development. However, the site is also located within the North Lancashire Green Belt.

5.2.2 Local Plan policy, within EN4 of the SPLA DPD and DM50 of the Development Management (DM) DPD, sets out that proposal within the North Lancashire Green Belt will be considered in accordance with the NPPF and inappropriate development will be restricted. Policy DM50 sets out considerations in relation to certain types of the development, but does not cover this type of development and instead relies on the NPPF rather than repeating its requirements. Paragraph 137 of the NPPF sets out that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open and the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and their permanence. Paragraph 138 goes on to set out the five main purposes that the Green Belt serves, which are:

- To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas
- To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;
- To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- To preserve the setting of historic towns; and
- To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

5.2.3 The NPPF sets out that the construction of new buildings should be regarded as inappropriate development which is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances. Paragraph 149 does set out some exceptions to this, which includes limited infilling in villages and limited affordable housing. However, it is considered that the proposal does not fall into either of these categories as it would form an extension out towards the canal from the existing development and does not propose a wholly affordable housing scheme. Paragraph 148 sets out that, when considering any planning application, it should be ensured that substantial weight is given to any harm in the Green Belt and very special circumstances will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm from the proposal, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.

5.2.4 The allocation of this site for residential development has been proposed as part of the Slyne-with-Hest Neighbourhood Plan. Neighbourhood Plans are independently examined and, if found to meet the basic conditions set out in legislation, the Plan then moves to a local referendum. If over 50% of those voting support the plan, it will attain significant weight in decision making and then move forward to adoption and will then form part of the Development Plan. The Slyne-with-Hest Neighbourhood Plan has recently been considered by an Independent Examiner and the report has been submitted to the Local Planning Authority. In the report, the Examiner makes several recommendations for modifications to the submitted plan before it can be considered at a referendum. This includes the removal of the proposed housing allocation on this site which would have amended the existing Green Belt boundary. The proposed allocation therefore has no weight in the determination of this application. The Examiner also made several observations which are also relevant to the consideration of this application.

5.2.5 The Report on the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan concluded that the allocation would be contrary to the strategic policy EN4 covering the North Lancaster Green Belt, the boundary for which had been confirmed following the Review of the Green Belt and had been endorsed by the Local Plan Inspector who had noted the review to be a robust piece of work. It also set out that the allocation would not have regard to the Secretary of State's policy for the Green Belt, where its fundamental aim is to ensure the permanence of the Green Belt and to maintain its openness. A key point was made about the Council having up to date plan which had released land from the Green Belt, following a review, but had not proposed the release of this land to meet the District's housing needs.

5.2.6 The planning application was submitted prior to the report being received from the Examiner. The submission acknowledges that the proposal represents inappropriate development but sets out that very special circumstances exist to justify the development in the Green Belt. It states that there are a number of material considerations that are capable of contributing and/ or amounting to very special circumstances. These are:

- Lancaster City Council's longstanding support for specialist bungalows on the site, including through the Neighbourhood Plan submission;
- The draft allocation in the Neighbourhood Plan;
- The evidence submitted by the City Council to support the removal from the Green Belt through the Neighbourhood Plan, including that Slyne-with-Hest is a sustainable settlement and the site will help to meet identified strategic housing needs up to 2031;
- The absence of a non-Green Belt alternative site or a less harmful Green Belt site;
- Meeting the specialised local housing needs of older people in Slyne-with-Hest;
- Health and wellbeing benefits of age-restricted specialist bungalows for older people;
- Wider benefits of age-restricted bungalows for older people including enabling and encouraging downsizing and providing cost savings for local social care and health care systems;
- The housing land supply position in Lancaster which is 2.6 years and represents a significant shortfall; and
- Further benefits including a new footpath, biodiversity net gain in excess of what will be required by the Environment Act 2021 (10.58%) the addition of 27 households to support local services and facilities and economic, employment and skills benefits during construction.

5.2.7 It is acknowledged that the Local Planning Authority supported the submission of the Neighbourhood Plan, which included the allocation of this site for housing. However, as the Plan will not be progressing with this allocation, it will not form part of the Development Plan, even if the Plan passes the referendum stage. The submission relies on evidence that was submitted to support the allocation within the Neighbourhood Plan. Some of the comments made in the Examiner's report are therefore relevant to the consideration of this application. In particular, it sets out that, whilst policy SP6 of the SPLA DPD sets out an expectation for neighbourhood plans across the district to deliver 557 homes it does not set any parameters as to how much each settlement should deliver. The Examiner noted that Policy SP3 sets out general requirements which includes the wording: "the extent to which development can be accommodated within the local area" which would consider the constraints provided by the Green Belt. In terms of the housing need, the report sets out that the Local Plan does not specify a specific housing figure for the settlement nor has the Parish Council asked for a housing figure from the City Council. The Examiner therefore goes on to question the need and justification for housing in the village, setting out that this had not been quantified or based on any housing needs assessment due, in part, to the constraints imposed by the Green Belt. The report also notes that it could be assumed that Policy SP3 would be delivered from sites within the settlement boundary, otherwise it would have been expected that the Local Plan would make explicit statements of how the strategic Green Belt Policy (EN4) would be applied.

5.2.8 The Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2018 provides the most up to date evidence with regard to housing need. However, this relates to the district as a whole and the sub-areas assessed span extensive areas. The sub-area in which Slyne with Hest is located includes considerable land outside the Green Belt and also includes allocated housing sites. There is no evidence to suggest that the number and type of homes proposed are required to meet an identified need within Slyne with Hest or on this Green Belt site. The proposal does relate to age restricted bungalows and policy DM8 of the DM DPD supports accommodation for older people where it meets the genuine need. The SHMA suggests that there is a need to diversify the range of older persons housing provision and identifies a need for additional accommodation to meet this need. However, it considers specialist accommodation provision (sheltered housing, enhanced sheltered housing, extra care, residential care and nursing care) and does not provide evidence of need with regard to non-specialist older persons accommodation, such as that simply restricted by age and with M4(2) provision.

5.2.9 It is also important to consider whether, and to what degree, the proposal conflicts with the openness of the Greenbelt and the purposes set out in paragraph 138 of the NPPF. The site comprises an agricultural field which is open and free from development and visible from public view points, particularly the Lancaster Canal and its towpath. The North Lancashire Green Belt Review (November 2016) concludes that the parcel which covers this site (SWH03) makes strong contribution to the Green Belt stating that, "The parcel makes a strong contribution to one purpose and a moderate contribution to one purpose. The parcel is free from development and forms a strong and important gap between Slyne with Hest and Morecambe" (page 50). The parcel forms part of a

strategic parcel (SP28) which also provides a strong contribution, in particularly to the strategic gap between the settlements of Slyne with Hest and Morecambe” (pg58). The contribution of this site to the Green Belt has been questioned in the submission. Within the report on the Examination of the Neighbourhood Plan, the Examiner sets out that he was not convinced that the disagreements of the Parish Council with some of the Green Belt Review’s findings in respect of the site were so compelling to lead him to disagree with the Local Plan Inspector’s conclusion that it is fit for purpose. The report also sets out that that he was able to appreciate the openness of the site on his site visit, which contributes to the rural setting of the Lancaster Canal in this location.

5.2.10 The landscape and visual impacts are considered in more detail within a separate section below. However, it is clear the siting of 27 bungalows on this site, and the associated infrastructure, will introduce significant and permanent development and consequently result in a loss of openness both spatially and visually. Whilst the development will be seen in the context of some residential development, the proposal will erode an open and attractive piece of land which provides an important rural setting to the canal and buffer from the adjacent development, which is mostly low in scale and separated from the site by hedgerows. Whilst this development in isolation would not necessarily lead to coalescence with adjacent settlements, it would clearly result in an encroachment into the countryside which abuts the urban area.

5.2.11 On the basis of the above, it is considered that the scheme therefore fails to provide for very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt. It is also considered that it would cause significant harm to the openness of this part of the Green Belt as a result of the scale and permanence of the development, in addition to important views gained from the Lancaster Canal and its towpath, and would result in an encroachment into the countryside from the existing edge of the settlement, contrary to one of the purposes of the Green Belt. It is considered that this harm is not outweighed by the benefits that have been put forward in the submission, and set out above. The proposal would not meet an identified housing need in this location and, whilst it would provide a contribution towards housing in the District, where there is an acknowledged shortfall, this does not provide for very special circumstances required to justify the harm to the Green Belt.

5.3 **Traffic impacts, access, parking and sustainable travel** NPPF paragraphs: 104-106 and 110-113 (Promoting Sustainable Transport); Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policies: SP10 (Improving Transport Connectivity), T2 (Cycling and Walking Network) and T3 (Lancaster Canal); Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM29 (Key Design Principles), DM57 (Health and Well-being), DM58 (Infrastructure Delivery and Funding, DM60 (Enhancing Accessibility and Transport Linkages), DM61 (Walking and Cycling), DM62 (Vehicle Parking Provision), DM63 (Transport Efficiency and Travel Plans), and DM64 (Lancaster District Highways and Transport Masterplan)

5.3.1 The site is proposed to be accessed off Sea View Close, which is a small cul-de-sac that is accessed from Sea View Drive which then links onto Hest Bank Lane. County Highways have raised a number of concerns regarding the scheme. The existing turning head on Sea View Close is proposed to be removed. They have advised that this is acceptable in principle, however the redundant turning head would need to be stopped up and the new estate road, including its turning head, would need to be constructed to an adoptable standard and subsequently offered for adoption therefore providing a replacement turning area within the adopted highway. A continuation of the existing 1.8 metre footway has been shown across the redundant turning head on the south side of Sea View Close into the site, but not on the north side. County Highways have requested that the footway on the north side is extended into the site linking into the proposed internal footway. They have also recommended that all access roads to new developments are at least 5.5 metres wide and have highlighted that Sea View Close is only 4.8 metres wide. However, they have confirmed that as Sea View Close is short and with good visibility, they would not raise an objection to the se of this, although have requested that the road is widened to 5.5 metres at the location of the existing turning head.

5.3.2 In relation to the internal layout, County Highways have advised that all internal roads to be offered for adoption need to be at least 5.5 metre wide and the site plan currently shows a width of 4.8 metres. This is required to allow for the free flow of vehicles and to accommodate occasional on street parking. A 2 metre wide footway has also been requested where any property fronts onto the proposed adopted carriageway and they have also requested a 0.5 metre hard paved margin on the west side of the access road. The footway does appear to be 2 metres to the front of most properties,

with the exception of some at the southern end of the site which appear to share a private driveway. A remote footway has been indicated running north to south to the west of the internal carriageway. County Highways have advised that this would not be considered for adoption and needs to be located outside of the required 0.5 metre wide hard paved margin. The location of this aspect could be covered by a condition as there is scope to reposition this within the open space.

5.3.3 County Highways have advised that the development is currently unacceptable due to the above concerns. However, the response was not clear whether the development would fail to provide a safe and suitable access and, as such, further clarification was sought. Although the layout is not currently suitable for adoption, this would not necessarily mean that it is not safe. However, County Highways have confirmed that the existing turning head could not be stopped up due to the site's access road not being constructed to adoptable standards as it would be required to facilitate turning within the adopted highway. Therefore, it is considered that the proposed access and internal arrangements would not provide a safe and suitable access as no suitable turning head would be provided within the adopted highway.

5.3.4 County Highways have also advised that all development will have an influence on highway infrastructure across the district and will therefore be required to contribute to the combination of measures in Lancaster, following an equitable approach that considers all development in the district. The keys measures being developed include:

- M6 Junction 33 reconfiguration with link road (Central 1 option being assessed further);
- Infrastructure in and around the Bailrigg Garden Village area and connecting corridors supporting access both north and south;
- Lancaster wide sustainable transport improvements, including;
- Cycle superhighway
- High quality public transport route
- Park and Ride
- Lancaster City Centre Movement and Public Realm Strategy;
- Traffic management measures to the north and south of the Lune; and
- Changes to other key corridors in the district.

5.3.5 The centre of the site lies just under 1km from nearest convenience store and approximately 600 metres from the nearest school. The bus stops on Hest Bank Lane are over 400 metres away from the site. However, given the sites location within the settlement and its proximity to a range of services, it is considered to be an accessible location. Although the distance from services and bus stops does raise some concerns regarding the intended end user. The nearest existing bus stops are currently just post and flag and do not comply in every respect with Lancashire County Council's quality bus stop provision, lacking raised kerbs or appropriate thermoplastic lining. To encourage public transport usage from the proposed development, and make facilities more attractive, County Highways have advised that these stops should be upgraded to Quality Bus standard. This could be covered by a condition. Cycle storage can also be provided in garage or sheds in rear gardens and can be covered by condition, in addition to a condition requiring vehicle charging pints, although this is now required by Building Regulations.

5.3.6 The response from County Highways also sets out that that the funding for the Junction 33 link road scheme has been identified, however, the remaining elements of the infrastructure required will need to be delivered through contributions secured from development. A wider strategy is being developed by the highway authority that incorporates the above, providing levels of contribution from all developments in Lancaster in an equitable and evidence based manner to support Lancaster's Local Plan. The amount required has not yet been provided by County Highways, and it will need to be ensured that any contribution request complies with the CIL tests, in particular that it relates to the impacts of the development proposed. However, as the proposal has a clear conflict with the development plan and national policy, in particular relation to the location within the Green Belt, it is not necessary to delay the determination of the application to allow for the figure to be provided and agreed as this would be secured by a Section 106 Agreement in the event the permission was resolved to be granted.

5.3.7 The centre of the site lies just under 1km from nearest convenience store and approximately 600m from the nearest school. The bus stops on Hest Bank Lane are over 400m away from the site which

is considered to be an acceptable distance. However, given the site's location within the settlement and its proximity to a range of services it is considered to be an accessible location. Reference is made to Policy HE2 of the Submission version of the Neighbourhood Plan and the provision of links north and south of the site. These have been reflected in the applicant's layout with a footpath linking Sunningdale Crescent to the southern boundary. However, the footpath appears to end at the southern boundary and does not link to the footpath on Rakes Head Lane and the canal path. The towpath forms part of the cycle network identified in Policy T2 of the SPLA DPD and also forms part of the Sustrans National Cycle Network (NCN6). This potentially connects the site by cycle to Lancaster and the wider network. Policies DM 60 (II) and DM 61 require proposals to provide convenient and appropriate linkages to the existing network. It is considered that improvements should be sought, including clarification about the connectivity to the adjacent footpath network to ensure that suitable access can be gained.

5.3.8 As set out above, the proposed access and internal arrangements, would fail to provide an acceptable safe and suitable access to serve the development, as no suitable turning head would be provided within the adopted highway. In addition, the lack of a link to the canal path, as the proposed footpath ends at the south of the site, also raises concerns in terms of connectivity and encouraging the use of sustainable modes of transport. The proposal is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of the Development Plan, in particular policies DM60 and DM61 in addition to section 9 of the NPPF.

5.4 **Landscape Impact, Layout, Design and Open Space** NPPF paragraphs: 92-93, 98-100 (Promoting Healthy and Safe Communities including Open Space and Recreation), 126-134 (Achieving Well-Designed Places), 174 (Valued Landscapes and the Countryside); Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD: SP8 (Protecting the Natural Environment), EN3 (The Open Countryside) and T3 (Lancaster Canal); Development Management (DM) DPD policies: DM27 (Open Space, Sports and Recreational Facilities), DM29 (Key Design Principles), DM43 (Green Infrastructure), DM46 (Development and Landscape Impact) and DM57 (Health and Well-Being)

5.4.1 The site relates to an area of agricultural land which abuts the Lancaster Canal, in addition to existing residential development to the north and east. When viewed from the canal it provides an open and attractive buffer between this and the existing residential development. Whilst the existing dwellings are visible, they are not overly prominent, given their position set back from the canal, their relatively low height and hedgerow boundaries. The land rises from the canal by approximately 4.25 metres at the eastern boundary, making the land quite prominent locally. The site is located within the landscape character type Low Coastal Drumlins, sub type 12a Carnforth-Galgate-Cockerham. This type of landscape is characterised by areas of low, whaleback hills around 40m high, with broad rounded tops towards the northwest coast of the study area. The landscape is characteristically gentler and of lower altitude than that of the Drumlin Field and individual drumlins are more isolated and the alignment of drumlins gives the landform a distinctive grain. The strong pattern of pastures emphasises the undulating topography, with neat, low cut thorn hedges traversing the drumlins. Trees and shrubs are limited in this agricultural landscape, although small copses occur on the tops and sides of the drumlins and minor roads and the canal wind around the drumlins. The site appears to be on the lower slopes of a drumlin although the higher land to the east contains housing development.

5.4.2 Policy DM46 of the DM DPD sets out that the Council will support development which is of a scale and in keeping with the landscape character and which is appropriate to its surroundings. Policy DM29 also sets out that new development should make a positive contribution to the surrounding landscape. Paragraph 130 of the NPPF sets out that proposals should ensure that developments are sympathetic to local character and history, including the surrounding building environment and landscape setting. Whilst it is acknowledged that the site is not within a designated landscape area, it is considered that the site provides an important setting to the Lancaster Canal, which is a popular recreational route, both in terms of the waterway and the towpath. Paragraph 174 of the NPPF sets out that decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes and recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

5.4.3 The proposal will introduce new built development onto this agricultural land, comprising bungalows and associated infrastructure. Whilst a separation has been proposed between the canal and the built development, and the height of the buildings is relatively low, the land does rise from the canal

and the buildings will appear prominent and will erode the existing open and undeveloped character of the site. Whilst the site does lie adjacent to existing development, the site currently provides an open and attractive separation from this which would be lost by the development. It would not be possible to effectively screen the development, given the rising nature of the land. This would also likely harm the open character of the site. Whilst the impacts are likely to be relatively localised, it is considered that the development would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the landscape and the area in general, would appear overly prominent and would result in the loss of the open and attractive field which contributes positively to the setting of the Lancaster Canal in particular and views from this, contrary to both local and national policy.

5.4.4 Notwithstanding the above harm caused by the development, it would provide a frontage to the canal with an area of open space separating this. Driveways are mostly provided to the front, however it still leaves quite a lot of green space with the gardens to the front given the width of the plots. As such it would not appear overly car dominated. The layout is therefore considered to be appropriate in these regards. The dwellings are all true bungalows and have a slight variation of design which provides some interest across the street scene. There are concerns regarding some aspects of the design as it is considered that these does not positively respond to the local distinctiveness of the area or improve the overall quality, as advocated by local policy and the NPPF. It is acknowledged that the adjacent development mostly comprises relatively modern bungalows which are not overly attractive in terms of the design. However, the proposal would be very prominent from the canal and should therefore provide a high quality design.

5.4.5 In terms of materials, the design utilises a mix of brick and render and also proposed some cladding and uses a tiled roof. It is acknowledged that there is a mix of material in the local area, although brick does not appear to be an overly dominant material in the local area and it would be more appropriate to incorporate some natural stone to break up the render and provide some interests which would better reflect the more traditional buildings that can be seen further along the canal. There are also concerns regarding the large chimneys, although not used on every house type, however a more modern approach to this may improve the overall design. The dwellings also incorporate a mock Tudor detail and, whilst this is present on some dwellings in the area, it is not a dominant feature and would be more reflective of the overall area if removed and the elevations simplified. The use of natural slate for roofs would also be more appropriate, particularly given the prominent position in relation to the canal and that the roofs will be a key feature as these are single storey buildings. However, it is considered that the materials and finishes could be controlled by condition.

5.4.6 The development provides open space between the road and the canal and at the north of the site, in a relatively long and thin strip, although some of this would be planted and used for drainage infrastructure. The Public Realm Officer has advised that, using calculations set out in the Planning Advisory Note, the development should provide 401 square metres of amenity space which should provide a mown informal space where young children could have a kick about. However, it should be noted that the development is proposed to be age restricted, so there is probably less requirement for this to be suitable for young children. Overall, it will provide significantly more than this and, given the age restriction, is considered to be appropriate to serve the development.

5.4.7 Overall, it is considered that the proposal would result in the loss of this open field which provides an attractive rural setting to this part of the Lancaster Canal and the development would appear as a prominent intrusion into the open countryside to the detriment to the character and appearance of the landscape and area in general. This links to the concerns raised above with regards to the impact on the openness and purposes of the Green Belt. The proposal therefore fails to comply with policies DM29 and DM46 in particular, in addition to sections 12 and 15 of the NPPF.

5.5 **Flood Risk and Drainage** NPPF paragraphs: 159-165, 167 and 169 (Planning and Flood Risk); Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM29 (Key Design Principles), DM35 (Surface Water Run-off and Sustainable Drainage); 152, 154, 159-167 and 169 (Flood Risk and Drainage); Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policies SP8 (Protecting the Natural Environment); Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM33 (Development and Flood Risk), DM34 (Surface Water Run-off and Sustainable Drainage) and DM35 (Water Supply and Waste Water)

5.5.1 Paragraph 167 of the NPPF sets out it should be ensured that flood risk is not increased elsewhere and applications on sites over 1 hectare should be supported by a site-specific flood risk

assessment. Paragraph 169 goes on to say that major developments should incorporate sustainable drainage systems that:

- take account of advice from the Lead Local Flood Authority;
- have appropriate proposed minimum operational standards;
- have maintenance arrangements in place to ensure an acceptable standard of operation for the lifetime of the development; and
- where possible, provide multifunctional benefits.

5.5.2 Whilst a drainage drawing has been submitted with the application, a supporting drainage strategy has not been included. This was requested at the beginning of November, however this has still not been provided. As such, it is not possible to determine whether the drainage scheme shown on the plan would adequately deal with surface water within the site and comply with the requirements of the NPPF, Planning Practice Guidance, or local planning policy set out in DM34 of the Development Management DPD.

5.6 **Residential Amenity** NPPF paragraphs: 92 (Promoting Healthy and Safe Communities), 130 (Achieving Well-Designed Places), 183-189 (Noise and Pollution); Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM29 (Key Design Principles), and DM57 (Health and Well-Being).

5.6.1 The site abuts residential properties on Sea View Close and Sea View Drive to the east and Sunningdale Crescent to the north. The new dwellings will be separated from the properties on Sunningdale Crescent by an area of open space. The proposed dwellings are all true bungalows and the side wall of five of these would face the rear gardens of the dwellings on Sea View Drive and the side wall of a further one would face the side of a dwelling on Sea View Drive. Given the small scale of the buildings and the distance from the boundaries and the adjacent dwellings, it is considered that the proposal will not have a detrimental impact on the residential amenity of the adjacent residential properties. There is an existing strong boundary comprising hedging, which could be bolstered, in addition to a small section of wall.

5.6.2 In terms of the amenity of the proposed dwellings, the shortest separation distance between rear walls is 20.5 metres. Whilst just under the recommended separation distance between windows of habitable rooms, as these are bungalows with no upper floor, any overlooking would be prevented by boundary treatments. Other separation distances are acceptable in terms of potential impact on light. There are a few situations where the gable of a dwelling is very close to the rear boundary of an adjacent garden. However, given the relatively low height, it is considered that this would not have an overbearing impact on future occupants. Almost all the gardens are at least 10 metres in length and are over 50 square metres in areas. As such, it is considered that the layout provides adequate private amenity space for all the dwellings.

5.7 **Biodiversity and Trees** (NPPF paragraphs: 174 and 179-182 (Habitats and biodiversity); Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policies: SP8 (Protecting the Natural Environment and EN7 (Environmentally Important Areas); Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM43 (Green Infrastructure), DM44 (Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity) and DM45 (Protection of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland).

5.7.1 The site is located approximately 370 metres from Morecambe Bay, which is designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Area (SPA), and Ramsar Site. As a competent authority under the provisions of the Habitats Regulations, the Local Planning Authority should have regard for any potential impacts. It therefore needs to be determined whether the proposal is likely to have a significant effect on the designated areas, proceeding to the Appropriate Assessment stage where significant effects cannot be ruled out.

5.7.2 GMEU have undertaken a Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) screening opinion on behalf of the LPA. The site is considered to be on the margins of the settlement envelope where Likely Significant Effects such as land take or functionally linked land would occur. However, the site is relatively small and is bound on the north and east by housing development, with the western boundary being formed by the Biological Heritage Site the Lancaster Canal. The southern boundary is short but does abut open countryside, however, it is separated from the grazing 'birds-eye views' by three hedges and a public right of way. The response also considers drainage and recreational

disturbance, from future occupants, and considers that these will not have a likely significant effect given the distance and the presence of the canal which provides a recreational route.

- 5.7.3 Natural England have commented on the HRA and have advised that it is not possible to conclude that the proposal is unlikely to result in significant effects on the designated sites. In particular, the development will result in a net increase in residential dwellings within the area and recreational pressure is an issue across the Lancashire area particularly through in-combination effects. They have therefore advised that an appropriate assessment should be undertaken in relation to recreational disturbance. As such, the Habitats Regulations Assessment has been amended to acknowledge that impacts from recreational disturbance cannot be screened out without mitigation. However, impacts could be mitigated by a condition requiring homeowner packs to be distributed to occupants which advise on the characteristics and sensitivities on the designated site and particularly the need to avoid disturbing birds on visits to the coastline.
- 5.7.4 An ecological appraisal and biodiversity net gain report have been submitted with the application. GMEU have advised that the report appears to have used reasonable effort to survey the habitats on site and make an assessment of their suitability to support protected/species of principal importance. The surveys were conducted in 2019 and 2021, however, given the nature and size of the proposal this is not considered to be a constraint on the assessment and does not invalidate its findings. The report concludes that the site lies adjacent to a Biological Heritage Site but itself does not support high value biodiversity habitats. Whilst not being completely satisfied with the methodologies of survey, in relation not birds and bats, GMEU have advised that there is no merit in requiring additional survey work to be undertaken. The report has utilised the Natural England Rapid risk assessment to conclude that there is no likely risk of a breach to the Habitats Regulations in respect of great crested newt, but notes that toad are present on the site, which is a Species of Principal Importance (NERC 2006 [Natural Environment & Rural Communities Act]).
- 5.7.5 It is recommended that, in order to comply with planning policy, mitigation will be required which can be controlled by condition. The Ecological Assessment shows hedgerow and canal-side vegetation to be retained and this should be securely temporarily fenced to avoid accidental spillage of spoil or stored material onto features of interest. A Construction Environmental Management Plan should be provided and include protection measures and a Construction Surface Water Drainage Plan, to ensure that the water quality of the canal is protected from uncontrolled run-off and sediments prior to the creation of the drainage basin. This should also include a construction lighting plan to avoid light spillage during construction onto the canal and adjacent hedgerows. Reasonable Avoidance Measures for amphibians, set out in the report, can also be included within the management plan, in addition mitigation to protect breeding birds, namely the timing of works unless further surveys are undertaken to demonstrate their absence.
- 5.7.6 In addition to the mitigation during construction, a lighting scheme should be designed to avoid impacts to habitats, particularly along the western and southern boundaries. It is also recommended that gaps are created within walls and/ or fencing to allow for small mammals and amphibians permeability across the site. The drainage basin and headwalls should be designed so that they do not present amphibian traps and all road run-off should be directed into suitable sediment traps and oil interceptors. The management within the basin should also take account of biodiversity.
- 5.7.7 The Arboricultural Implications Assessment (AIA) identifies five sections of hedgerow, six individual trees and two groups located around the perimeter of the site. It sets out that two groups (6G & 7G) will be impacted by the development of a footpath to the north of the site, and two hedgerows (1H, 4H) will require partial removal to install the pumping station and site access. However, it would appear that the design of the footpath has been amended since the AIA was produced, with the footpath falling outside of the root protection area of both groups. The tree protection measures are considered be appropriate but would need amending to reflect amendments to the footpath and this could be covered by a condition. The boundaries to the site are shown on the OS Map published in 1895, indicating that they could be of notable age. However, the small scale losses outlined in the AIA are not a barrier to this development and are adequately compensated for in the submitted landscape plan.
- 5.7.8 The landscaping appears extensive, with a mix of habitats located around the perimeter of the site. To avoid future conflicts it would be preferable to plant standards within the proposed hedgerows and open space to the west of the site rather than on the boundary with existing properties. This

would also allow longer living, larger growing tree species to be planted and greater numbers. It would be preferable to see greater connectivity across the site and trees planted outside of the domestic curtilage within a roadside verge for example. The area of scrub planting to the east of the site provides an area of separation between the existing and proposed dwellings but is fragmented and would be better located along the canal corridor, connecting habitat to the north and south. A native species hedgerow specification has been provided, but it is also recommended that standard trees are utilised and on the western margins these are locally native species. The landscaping should include the specification for grass seeding mixes and drainage basin marginal planting.

- 5.7.9 Biodiversity Net Gain has been demonstrated to be achieved and this should be supported by a management plan indicating how the open space and other habitats will be managed for a 30 year period in order to reach their prescribed condition. Additional information will be necessary to identify how remediation will occur if required. It is also considered that additional species specific enhancement is achieved via condition with the introduction of a biodiversity enhancement plan for bird, bat and bee boxes and amphibian hibernacula. Overall it is considered that the proposal will not have a detrimental impact on biodiversity and can provide an appropriate net gain, subject to a number of conditions, as discussed above.
- 5.8 **Impacts on Heritage Assets** NPPF paragraphs: 189, 194 - 197, 199 – 206 (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment); Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policies SP7 (Maintaining Lancaster District's Unique Heritage); Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM37 (Development Affecting Listed Buildings), DM39 (The Setting of Designated Heritage Assets)
- 5.8.1 Rakes Head Bridge crosses the canal approximately 20 metres to the south and is Grade II listed. Occupation Bridge is also Grade II and crosses the canal approximately 250 metres to the north. Slyne-with-Hest Conservation Area also lies approximately 700 metres to the east. Rakes Head Bridge is similar to others along the Lancaster Canal which were built to accommodate crossings in both rural and urban situations. There is a buffer between the site and the bridge and some vegetation. The site is not overly prominent from the canal path at the location of the bridge and it is likely that intervisibility will be limited. As such, it is considered that the development would not have a detrimental impact on the significance of the heritage asset as a result of any impact to its setting. In addition, given the distance from the other bridge and the Conservation Area, and the intervening development, it is considered that the development would also not cause harm the setting of these heritage assets.
- 5.9 **Affordable housing, housing standards and mix** NPPF: paragraphs 62 and 63 and 78 (housing needs and affordable housing); Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policy: SG1 (Lancaster South Broad Location for Growth) Development Management (DM) DPD policies: DM1 (Residential Development and Meeting Housing Needs), DM2 (Housing Standards), DM3 (The Delivery of Affordable Housing) and DM8 (Accommodation for Older People and Vulnerable Communities)
- 5.9.1 Policy DM8 requires that accommodation for older people falling within Use Class C3 contributes to the provision of affordable housing in accordance with policy DM3. Policy DM3 sets out that 30% affordable housing will be required on site on greenfield sites, for 15 units and over. The scheme would be expected to provide 8 affordable homes as a 50/50 split of affordable rented and shared ownership properties. Table 5.5 of the SHMA identifies the need for older people affordable homes to be 1 and 2 bedroom homes and it is considered that the affordable homes should be amended to reflect this identified need, with an even mixture of 1 and 2 beds for both the affordable rented and shared ownership properties. However, the affordable rented properties should not be restricted by age, to ensure that they meet wider affordable housing needs for this type of property. Policy DM3 requires the provision of 30% of new housing as affordable homes on the application site. The Affordable Housing Statement within the Planning Statement indicates an assumption that the scheme could not viably achieve this requirement and that a viability appraisal will be provided if the scheme is considered acceptable. Notwithstanding the constraints and policy relating to the sites location within the Green Belt, the amount of affordable housing provision would be an integral part of determining if development is sustainable and provides for very special circumstances. A determination as to whether the scheme accords with policy DM3 cannot be undertaken without the receipt and independent assessment of a viability appraisal.

- 5.9.2 The application proposes the whole of the site to be restricted to older people and for it all to meet the accessible and adaptable requirement of the Building Regulations (M4(2)). Policy DM8 supports accommodation for older people where it meets the genuine need. The SHMA suggests that there is a need to diversify the range of older persons housing provision and identifies a need for additional accommodation to meet this need. It however considers specialist accommodation provision of sheltered housing, enhanced sheltered housing, extra care, residential care and nursing care, and does not provide evidence of a need with regard to non-specialist older persons accommodation, such as that simply restricted by age and with M4(2) provision. The proposed scheme will provide a significant number of larger 3 bed bungalows rather than meeting the district wide need identified in the SHMA. The SHMA does not provide evidence for the need for the type of accommodation proposed for the village of Slyne with Hest. It is therefore considered that the type and mix proposed fails to meet an identified housing need and is therefore contrary to Policy DM1 and DM 8 of the Development Management DPD.
- 5.9.3 Policy DM2 sets out that all new dwelling should meet the Nationally Described Space Standards. All of the dwellings proposed meet the minimum sizes set out in the standards.
- 5.10 **Education and Health NPPF paragraphs: 93 and 95 (Services and School Places); Development Management (DM) DPD policies: DM57 (Health and Wellbeing) and DM58 (Infrastructure Delivery and Funding)**
- 5.10.1 As the application proposes age restricted houses for older people it is not anticipated that it would generate a requirement for additional school places. As such, the Schools Planning Team have not been consulted on this application and no contribution would be expected from this development.
- 5.10.2 The response from the NHS sets out that the proposal will generate approximately 62 new patient registrations based on average household size of 2.4. The site falls within the catchment area of Ash Trees Surgery and they have advised that this need, along with other new developments in the area, can only be met through the extension and reconfiguration of the existing premises in order to ensure sustainable general practice. The response goes on to say that the growth generated from the development would not trigger consideration of the commissioning of a new general practice but would trigger a requirement to support the practice to understand how the growth in the population would be accommodated and therefore premises options. However, no details have been provided in relation to any projects or how the money would be spent. With a lack of evidence to support this request, it is considered that it fails to meet the requirements of the CIL regulation tests and could not therefore be requested at this time.
- 5.11 **Sustainable Design and Renewable Energy NPPF paragraphs: 126 (Achieving Well-Designed Places) and 154 -155 and 157 (Planning for Climate Change); Development Management (DM) DPD policies: DM29 (Key Design Principles), DM30 (Sustainable Design) and DM53 (Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation)**
- 5.11.1 In the context of the climate change emergency that was declared by Lancaster City Council in January 2019, the effects of climate change arising from new/ additional development in the District and the possible associated mitigation measures will be a significant consideration in the assessment of the proposals. The Council is committed to reducing its own carbon emissions to net zero by 2030 while supporting the district in reaching net zero within the same time frame. Buildings delivered today must not only contribute to mitigating emissions, they must also be adaptable to the impacts of the climate crisis and support resilient communities.
- 5.11.2 One of the primary areas for emissions reductions for residential development in supporting the transition to net zero is in building to high fabric standards and supplying the new homes with renewable and low carbon energy. This is highlighted in the adopted Local Plan in policies DM29 and DM30 and supported by 'PAN9 – Energy Efficiency in new Development Planning Advisory Note'. It is encouraging to see that the energy statement provided stipulates a fabric first approach to construction, albeit with u-values/air tightness moderately exceeding the minimum standards required by current building regulations. However, the proposal will make use of gas boilers for heating supply which contribute to CO2e emissions, cannot be decarbonised, and will have to be retrofitted out in the future. This is a particular shame given that the fabric efficiencies of the proposed properties are approximately in line with those required for heat pumps to be effective. This is therefore a missed opportunity to further reduce the associated CO2 emissions of the site,

provide for homes that can be decarbonised when the grid decarbonises and improve the reduction over the minimum building regulations. Solar PV installation could also be maximised across the site and typologies.

6.0 Conclusion and Planning Balance

- 6.1 The proposal represents inappropriate development within the Green Belt and would also cause permanent harm to its openness and would conflict with one of the purposes of the Green Belt as it would result in an encroachment into the countryside. The proposal fails to demonstrate that very special circumstances exist to justify the inappropriate development and the additional harm identified. Whilst the Council cannot currently demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing site, this does not in itself provide very special circumstances and the type of development proposed would also fail to meet a specific identified local need. The development of this site would have cause harm to the character and appearance of the landscape and area in general, particularly when viewed from the Lancaster Canal and its towpath. The current layout also fails to provide a safe and suitable access, and the proposal has not demonstrated that it would provide an appropriate level of affordable housing or housing mix. The submission also fails to demonstrate that an appropriate sustainable drainage scheme can be provided within the site due to the lack of a detailed drainage strategy. The development is therefore contrary to both Local and National Planning policy as discussed above.
- 6.2 Whilst the concerns regarding drainage and highway impact are likely to be able to be addressed through amendments and additional information, it is considered that the harm to the Green Belt and the landscape and visual impact could not be overcome. As set out above, the Council cannot currently demonstrate a five year supply of housing and it is acknowledged that there is significant shortfall. In accordance with the NPPF, and the presumption in favour of sustainable development, a tilted balance should be applied unless other policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provide a clear reason for refusing the proposal. In this case, there is harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness and the other harm identified, without demonstrating very special circumstances exist. As such, it is considered that a normal planning balance, rather than a tilted one would apply. However, even if a tilted balance was to be applied it is considered that the adverse impacts identified would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits provided by the 27 age restricted bungalows in this location.

Recommendation

That Planning Permission BE REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. The proposal represents inappropriate development within the Green Belt, results in an encroachment into the countryside and fails to preserve its openness, without demonstrating the very special circumstances exist. It is therefore contrary to the aims of objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular Section 13, Policy EN4 of the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations Development Plan Document and Policy DM50 of the Review of the Development Management Development Plan Document.
2. As a result of the location and sloping nature of the site and the nature of the proposal, the development would have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the landscape and area in general and would result in the loss of an open field that provides an attractive setting to this part of the Lancaster Canal. As such, the proposal fails to comply with the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular Sections 12 and 15, Policy T3 of the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations Development Plan Document and Policies DM29 and DM46 of the Review of the Development Management Development Plan Document.
3. The proposed access and internal arrangements would fail to provide an acceptable safe and suitable access to serve the development, as no suitable turning head would be provided within the adopted highway. In addition, the scheme fails to provide appropriate connectivity to the canal towpath. The proposal is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular Section 9, Policy T3 of the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations Development Plan Document and Policies DM60 and DM61 of the Review of the Development Management Development Plan Document.
4. Due to the lack of the submission of a drainage strategy, the proposal fails to adequately demonstrate that surface water can be appropriately accommodated within the site. It is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular Section 14, Policy SP8

of the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations Development Plan Document and Policy DM34 of the Review of the Development Management Development Plan Document.

5. The development fails to provide affordable and open market housing in line with the identified housing needs within the District. As a result, the proposal is contrary to the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular Section 5, and Policies DM1, DM3 and DM8 of the Review of the Development Management Development Plan Document.

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

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

Background Papers

None

Agenda Item	A7
Application Number	22/01291/FUL
Proposal	Siting of 5 portable buildings to provide temporary office space and creation of associated car parking
Application site	Land Adjacent 1 Southgate White Lund Industrial Estate Morecambe Lancashire
Applicant	Balltec Ltd
Agent	Mr Alban Cassidy
Case Officer	Mr Robert Clarke
Departure	No
Summary of Recommendation	Approval

(i) **Procedural Matters**

This form of development would normally be dealt with under the Scheme of Delegation. However, Lancaster City Council has an interest in the site to which this application relates, therefore the application must be determined by the Planning Regulatory Committee.

1.0 Application Site and Setting

1.1 The site forming the subject of this application is a parcel of land located to the east of an industrial building on the southern periphery of the White Lund Industrial Estate. The land is situated adjacent to the A683 although access to this site is from Southgate. The site area measures 1590 square metres. The site forms part of the White Lund Industrial Estate employment allocation (EC1.12 and EC4), it is also identified as falling within flood zones 2 and 3 and also benefits from flood defences. There is also an identified low risk of surface water flooding.

2.0 Proposal

2.1 The development relates to the occupier of the adjacent industrial building which has recently suffered fire damage. This application seeks planning permission for the siting of 5 linked portable buildings in order to provide temporary office space along with the temporary change of use of land to provide associated car parking facilities. The development proposed is to be temporary lasting for a period of 18 months whilst essential repairs to the fire damaged property are undertaken. The application relates to the change of use of land and siting of portable buildings only, no other operational development is proposed.

3.0 Site History

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

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
12/00094/FUL	Creation of a 24-hour unmanned filling station for heavy goods vehicles including the erection of a canopy	Permitted
20/00321/FUL	The erection of 2.4m fencing and the installation of underground treatment tank	Permitted

4.0 Consultation Responses

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

Consultee	Response
Parish Council	No objection.
County Highways	No objection subject to a condition requiring the submission and agreement of a Construction Management Plan and control over the timings of deliveries.
Fire Safety Officer	No response provided.
Cadent Gas	No objection subject to advice.
Health and Safety Executive	No objection.
United Utilities	No objection subject to a condition requiring the submission and agreement of a detailed foul and surface water drainage strategy and associated maintenance.
Environment Agency	No response provided.
Environmental Health Officer	No response provided.
Lancaster City Council Property Services	No response provided.

4.2 The following responses have been received from members of the public:

- No responses from members of the public have been received.

5.0 Analysis

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

- Principle of development
- Design
- Flood risk and drainage
- Highways

5.2 **Principle of development** NPPF Section 2 (Achieving sustainable development), Section 6 (Building a strong, competitive economy); Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policies SP1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development), EC1 (Established Employment Areas), EC4 (White Lund Employment Area); Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM14 (Proposal involving employment and premises).

- 5.2.1 The site falls within the White Lund Industrial Estate which is land allocated for employment generating uses within the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policies EC1 and EC4. Following fire damage to the adjacent industrial unit occupied by Balltec Ltd, this application seeks planning permission for the siting of portable buildings in order to provide ancillary office facilities and associated services for a period of 18 months whilst essential repairs and refurbishment to the main building are undertaken. The adjacent land surrounding the portable building is to be used for associated parking for a temporary 18-month period also. In light of the circumstances which have given rise to this proposal and the fact that the facilities represent a temporary form of development providing essential employment facilities for the existing business, the principle of the development proposed is acceptable at this site.
- 5.3 **Design NPPF Section 2 (Achieving sustainable development), Section 12 (Achieving well-designed places) Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM29 (Key design principles).**
- 5.3.1 Views of the development will be achieved from the A683 which is located to the east of the site. From this public viewpoint, the portable buildings will be located adjacent to a rather large industrial building and in the context of the wider White Lund Industrial Estate. In this context the siting of portable cabins proposed for a temporary period of 18 months along with the change of use of the existing hardstanding area to a car park is supported in design terms. No other form of operational development such as formal re-surfacing works are proposed. The site already benefits from a hardcore surface which is suitable for both siting the portable buildings and the car park.
- 5.3.2 In light of the utilitarian design and appearance of the portable buildings proposed, their retention on a permanent basis would not be supported as a higher quality and standard of design should be sought for a permanent structure. As a result, a condition is recommended to limit the duration of this development to 18 months following the date that planning permission is granted. Following the expiry of this permission, the portable buildings will need to be removed from the site and the land re-instated to its previous condition, whilst the use of the adjacent land for a car park will cease.
- 5.4 **Flood risk and drainage NPPF Section 2 (Achieving sustainable development), Section 14 (Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change); Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM33 (Development and flood risk), DM34 (Surface water run-off and sustainable drainage).**
- 5.4.1 A small section of the western periphery of site is located within flood zone 2 and 3 although the site is also identified as benefitting from protection from flood defences. The centre and western periphery of the site is also identified as being susceptible to surface water flooding. As required by policy, the application is supported by a Flood Risk Assessment. The proposed employment use is categorised as a 'less vulnerable' use with regard to the flood risk vulnerability classification table contained within the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). In accordance with Flood Risk Vulnerability and Flood Zone 'Compatibility' Assessment contained within the NPPG, development within the Industrial Estate for employment uses would be considered appropriate. Furthermore, given the small-scale and temporary nature of the development proposed, it is considered that the proposals will not have any residual impact upon existing measures for flooding and associated evacuation measures within the local area. On this basis, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in flood risk terms.
- 5.4.2 As the site is located partly within flood zone 3, the application must be subject to the sequential test. The aim of the sequential test is to direct development to sites with the lowest probability of flooding. However, the NPPG is clear in that when applying the sequential test, the Local Planning Authority should adopt a pragmatic approach to the availability of alternative sites. Paragraph 33 of the NPPG (Paragraph: 033 Reference ID: 7-033-20140306) provides an example stating that this pragmatic approach could be employed when considering planning applications for extensions to existing businesses as it might be impractical to suggest that there are more suitable alternative locations for that development elsewhere. In this instance, the proposal seeks to provide office facilities for a temporary period to replace those which were damaged as a result of the aforementioned fire. The facilities are functionally linked to the operation of the adjacent business Balltec Ltd and must be located close to the main building to enable the effective operation of the business and minimise disruptions for employees. For this reason, it is considered that a pragmatic approach to the sequential test should be adopted in this instance. When assessing the available land within the site, it is clear that the current service yard would be the logical location for the

proposed development, no other area that is within the applicant’s ownership could accommodate the development proposed. On this basis, the proposed development is considered to satisfy the sequential test.

5.4.3 With respect to surface water drainage, the proposal sets out that, in light of the temporary nature of the development for a period of 18 months, no formal drainage strategy for surface water arising from the temporary buildings is proposed. Surface water would be directed to the ground into order to infiltrate into the ground, there would therefore be no change in the way in which the site would drain. As the development is for a temporary period only, it is considered that this is an acceptable drainage solution. United Utilities have requested a condition requiring the submission and agreement of a detailed drainage strategy, however, given the circumstances surrounding this permission, this is considered to be onerous upon the applicant. Should the development proposed be for a permanent form of development, then the requirement for such a detailed drainage solution for the site would be reasonable, however, this is not the case.

5.4.4 The proposed portable buildings containing services and facilities for which there would be a foul drainage discharge. No foul drainage connection to the mains sewers is required as each building contains its own waste tank which is to be periodically emptied. This is considered an acceptable solution in light of the temporary nature of the development.

5.5 **Highways** NPPF Section 9 (Promoting sustainable transport) Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM29 (Key Design Principles), DM60 (Enhancing Accessibility and Transport Linkages), DM61 (Walking and Cycling), DM62 (Vehicle Parking Provision).

5.5.1 Lancashire County Highways Authority have reviewed the proposal and raised no objection to the development. They have, however, requested conditions requiring the submission and agreement of a Construction Management Plan and control over the timings of deliveries. In light of the temporary and small-scale nature of the development proposal combined with the nature of the development site being a large industrial site, these conditions are not recommended, as these would seek to control and manage the operation of the highway network which is more appropriately controlled through separate highways related legislation, rather than through the planning system.

6.0 Conclusion and Planning Balance

6.1 The siting of portable buildings as proposed for a period of 18 months in order to provide temporary office accommodation and associated services whilst repairs to the main industrial building are undertaken is acceptable at this site. A condition to ensure the development is undertaken for the temporary period specified is recommended. The application is considered to be acceptable in all other regards.

Recommendation

That Planning Permission BE GRANTED subject to the following conditions:

Condition no.	Description	Type
1	Temporary planning permission for a period of 18 months	Control
2	Development in accordance with the approved plans	Control

The following advice note is also recommended:

1. A copy of the consultation response from Cadent Gas the is attached. The applicant is advised to note the contents of this letter and contact Cadent Gas direct should you have any queries regarding any of the points raised.

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

Lancaster City Council has made the decision 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 decision 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

LANCASTER CITY COUNCIL

APPLICATION NO	DETAILS	DECISION
21/00161/DIS	Ward Field Farm, Main Road, Galgate Discharge of condition 8 on approved application 19/01100/REM for Miss Hannah Homes (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/01552/FUL	Land Adjacent, 26 Moorside Road, Brookhouse Erection of a detached dwelling (C3) and creation of a new vehicular access for Mr and Mrs Brian Pinington (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/00019/DIS	Ward Field Farm, Main Road, Galgate Discharge of conditions 6, 12 and 17 on approved application 17/00944/OUT for Hollins Homes (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/00075/DIS	Former J Wedlake And Son, Wheatfield Street, Lancaster Discharge of conditions 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 on approved application 20/00964/FUL for Mr K Jayousi (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision
22/00731/FUL	Borwicks House, Plantation Lane, Abbeystead Demolition of garage and agricultural building, change of use and conversion of agricultural building to dwelling (C3), erection a single storey extension, installation of windows, doors, drainage, and flue, change of use of agricultural land to associated domestic garden, and demolition of existing single storey side extension to existing farmhouse and erection of a two-storey side extension for Mr G Fleming (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/00087/DIS	Central Lancaster High School , Crag Road, Lancaster Discharge of conditions 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10 on approved planning application 21/01174/FUL for Central Lancaster High School (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision
22/00867/FUL	Yew Tree Cottage, Selby Lane, Melling Erection of a front and side single storey extension and erection of a detached outbuilding to form ancillary accomodation in association with Yew Tree Cottage for Mr and Mrs David Gordon (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/00868/FUL	Fuel Proof Limited, Middleton Business Park, Middleton Road Erection of single storey extension to existing industrial unit for Fuel Proof Ltd (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/00898/FUL	2 Crookhey Gardens, Cockerham, Lancaster Erection of detached outbuilding to create ancillary accommodation in association with 2 Crookhey Gardens for Mrs Sarah Hurst (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn
22/00899/LB	2 Crookhey Gardens, Cockerham, Lancaster Listed building application for erection of detached outbuilding to create ancillary accommodation in association with 2 Crookhey Gardens for Mrs Sarah Hurst (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

22/00901/FUL	2 Churchfield Barn, Church Lane, Tunstall Installation of solar panels on the south elevation of house and west elevation of garage for Mr Jonathan Randall-Paley (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/00902/FUL	1 Churchfield Barn, Church Lane, Tunstall Installation of solar panels on the South and West facing roofs for Mr Joseph Armistead (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/00913/FUL	Yealand Hall, Silverdale Road, Yealand Redmayne Demolition of existing outbuilding, change of use of garage to dwellinghouse (C3) with erection of a single storey rear extension and outbuilding, associated access and parking, and installation of a package treatment plan for Mr And Mrs Lock (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/01151/FUL	20 Winmarleigh Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of single storey side and rear extension and conversion of existing garage to a habitable room for Mrs Lena Nemeth (Scotforth East Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/00969/FUL	18 Wentworth Drive, Lancaster, Lancashire Demolition of single storey rear kitchen, erection of single storey rear extension and installation of roof light to rear for Dr Piyush Pankhadiwala (John O'Gaunt Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/01057/FUL	Skirpin Cottage, High Road, Halton Erection of a single storey rear extension for Rachel Wolstenholme (Halton-with-Aughton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/01112/FUL	6 Wennington Road, Wray, Lancaster Construction of a raised roof, two dormer extensions to the rear elevation and two rooflights to the front elevation for Annie Denby (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
22/00116/DIS	Mansergh House, Borwick Lane, Borwick Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 20/01055/LB for Mr Ken Howson (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/00117/DIS	1 Low Road, Middleton, Morecambe Discharge of conditions 3 and 4 on approved application 19/01481/LB for Mrs Shelley Hodgson (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision
22/00119/DIS	The Bath, 5 - 7 Northumberland Street, Morecambe Discharge of conditions 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 on approved application 21/01356/FUL for Messrs Howard and Robinson (Poulton Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision
22/00120/DIS	Mansergh House, Borwick Lane, Borwick Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 20/01054/FUL for Mr Ken Howson (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/01134/FUL	5 Church Court, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr John Feather (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/00122/DIS	Hill Top Farm, Hill Lane, Nether Kellet Discharge of part of condition 3 and discharge of conditions 4, 5, 6 and 7 on approved application 22/00872/VCN for Mrs M Cornthwaite	Split Decision

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

(Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)

22/01159/FUL	Whitley Bank, Bay Horse Road, Ellel Demolition of existing outbuilding and erection of a 2 bed holiday cottage in association with Whitley Bank for Mr & Mrs C Pope (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
22/00125/DIS	Bath House , 43 Bath Street, Lancaster Part discharge of condition 3 on approved application 22/00654/LB for Mr Stephen Wearden (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/01169/FUL	42 Sycamore Road, Brookhouse, Lancaster Construction of a dormer extension to the rear for Mr Lee Blundell (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/01179/VCN	Lancaster Golf Club, Ashton Hall, Ashton Road Construction of a shelter over existing driving range (pursuant to the variation of condition 7 on planning permission 15/01572/FUL to include external lighting) for Mr Aaron Williams (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/01184/LB	26 Corless Cottages, Dolphinholme, Lancaster Listed building application for the installation of replacement sliding wooden sash double glazed windows to the front and rear elevations for Ms Amy Kelly (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/01194/FUL	Stables Barn, Main Street, Hornby Installation of 8 solar panels on the south (front) facing roof of the detached garage for Mr Mark Whitaker (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/01202/HLDC	Lancaster Railway Station, Westbourne Road, Lancaster Certificate of Lawfulness for proposed works to a Listed Building for the installation of replacement Customer Information Screens for Mr Stuart Walton (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
22/00130/DIS	East Lodge , Aldcliffe Road, Lancaster Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 22/00657/LB for Mr M Stainton (Scotforth West Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/01204/FUL	143 Lancaster Road, Carnforth, Lancashire Demolition of 2 conservatories, erection of replacement side and rear extensions and erection of a side extension to existing garage for Mr & Mrs Hawkins (Carnforth And Millhead Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/01211/EIR	Land Off, Powderhouse Lane, Lancaster Screening opinion for the erection of up to 600 dwellings and associated works for Wrenman Strategic Land Ltd (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	ES Required
22/00131/DIS	East Lodge , Aldcliffe Road, Lancaster Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 22/00795/LB for Mr M Stainton (Scotforth West Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/00132/DIS	East Lodge , Aldcliffe Road, Lancaster Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 22/00794/FUL for Mr M Stainton (Scotforth West Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

22/01212/FUL	Lancaster Castle , Castle Park, Lancaster Works to The Keep and adjoining areas including installation of replacement roof with solar panels to south facing roof, installation of flagpole, iron balustrade and handrail to stair, replacement walkway with handrail, new balustrade to roof covering perimeter, dismantle and rebuild chimney, alterations to existing gate, masonry repairs, construction of external steps and ramp with balustrade and handrail, re-paving/re-levelling of external area, installation of new doors/windows and new external rainwater system for Ms Vicki Mathews (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/01213/LB	Lancaster Castle , Castle Park, Lancaster Listed building application for works to The Keep and adjoining areas including installation of replacement roof with solar panels to south facing roof, removal of roof timber walkways/ladders, installation of flagpole, iron balustrade and handrail to stair, replacement walkway with handrail, new balustrade to roof covering perimeter, dismantle and rebuild chimney, remove existing internal rainwater pipe, install new lead downpipes, associated hopperheads, fittings and cruciform wrought iron safety fixings, repointing works, masonry repairs, alterations to existing gate, repairs to existing concrete steps and railings, localised removal and reinstatement of finishes in chapel yard, removal of existing masonry infill to arch, construction of external steps and ramp with balustrade and handrail, re-paving/re-levelling of external area, and internal works including removal of staircase and partitions, install new staircases to first floor, removal of plaster, expose historic fireplace openings, alterations to openings, installation of new doors/windows, repairs to existing windows, including installation of opening lights, blocked embrasures opened and fitted with openable windows, modify internal grille, replacement/repair of damaged floor boards to second floor, repair of stone spiral staircase, removal of the flat plasterboard ceilings at second and third floor and installation of emergency lighting for Ms Vicki Mathews (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/01219/FUL	19 Norwood Drive, Morecambe, Lancashire Demolition of existing rear extension and erection of a rear and side extension for Mr & Mrs A Love (Torrisholme Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/01222/FUL	19 Taylor Grove, Morecambe, Lancashire Demolition of existing rear conservatory with an erection of a single storey side and rear extensions for Mr Phil Helmn (Bare Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/01224/FUL	30 Hornby Road, Caton, Lancaster Demolition of existing dormer with installation of replacement dormer, installation of sun tubes to side elevation, installation of roof light to front elevation, installation of solar panels to rear elevation, Installation of light well to front elevation, installation of doors and windows to rear and side elevation for Mr Andrew Entwistle (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/01229/FUL	5 Scowcroft Drive, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of a single storey rear extension with demolition of existing	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

garage to an erection of a single storey rear outbuilding for Mr and Mrs Chester (Torrisholme Ward 2015 Ward)

22/01244/PAA	Pheasantfield Farm, Borwick Road, Borwick Prior approval for the change of use of agricultural building into 3 dwellings (C3) for Mr N Taylor (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Refused
22/00133/DIS	2 Longtons Cottages, Kirkby Lonsdale Road, Over Kellet Discharge of conditions 3 on approved application 22/00742/FUL for Mr Ian Barlow (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/01251/FUL	Swallow Barn, Kirkby Lonsdale Road, Newton Erection of single storey rear extension for MRS JUDIE GRAHAM-CLEGG (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/01260/FUL	29 Anstable Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of a single storey side and rear extension for Mr.& Mrs. M. Norfolk (Bare Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/01265/FUL	Ocean Edge Holiday Park, Moneyclose Lane, Heysham Creation of a new seating area and children's playground/outdoor activity area, including the permanent siting of 2 portable buildings for use as food outlets, and walk-in fridge freezers with canopy for Mr David Kidd (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/01266/FUL	21 Church Grove, Overton, Morecambe Erection of detached dwellinghouse (C3) for Mr & Mrs Betts (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/01327/LB	Moorside Cottage, New Street, Brookhouse Listed building consent for the retention of a single storey outbuilding for use as a holiday let in association with Moorside Cottage for Mr Alan King (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/01278/FUL	Footpath Outside, 1 Dalton Square, Lancaster Removal of existing phone box and installation of freestanding 'Street Hub' unit for Mr James Browne (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
22/01279/ADV	Footpath Outside, 1 Dalton Square, Lancaster Advertisement application for the display of two internally illuminated digital 75 inch LCD display screens on freestanding 'Street Hub' unit for Mr James Browne (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
22/01284/FUL	82 Palatine Avenue, Lancaster, Lancashire Construction of pitched roof to existing rear outrigger, construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation, installation of solar panels to the front roof and installation of an air source heat pump for J. Bebbington (Scotforth West Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/01285/FUL	Stable End, Berrys Farm, Conder Green Road Demolition of existing garage and construction of a single storey side garage with wc and storage room for Messrs Moss and Garnett (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/00137/DIS	Land East Of 61 Stankelt Road, Silverdale, Carnforth Discharge of conditions 3,4,5,6,7,8, 9 and 10 on approved application 22/00983/VCN for Mr Ripley (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

22/00138/DIS	Ellel Hall, Ellel Hall Gardens, Galgate Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 22/00815/FUL for Mr & Mrs Smith & Hewitt-Smith (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/00140/DIS	Land North Of Hala Carr Farm, Bowerham Road, Lancaster Discharge of condition 8 on approved application 19/01158/FUL for Oakmere Homes (University And Scotforth Rural Ward)	Application Permitted
22/01307/LB	Grand Theatre , St Leonards Gate, Lancaster Listed building application for the installation of lighting to front and side elevations and installation of signs to side elevations for Mike Hardy (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/00141/DIS	Field No 7989, Becksides Mews, Borwick Discharge of conditions 3 on approved application 20/00735/FUL for Mr John Beaumont (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/00142/DIS	Ivy Lodge, Lowgill Lane, Lowgill Discharge of condition 5 on approved application 21/00306/LB for Miss Caroline Parkinson (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/01310/PLDC	50 Barton Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed lawful development for the construction of hip to gable extension, construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation, installation of rooflights and PV panels to the front for Mr Hugh Gibson (Scotforth East Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/01311/ADV	Grand Theatre , St Leonards Gate, Lancaster Advertisement application for the installation of halo illuminated individual letter signage for Mike Hardy (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/01321/FUL	21 Morecambe Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of a two storey side extension, demolition of existing rear conservatory and erection of replacement single storey rear extension and front porch extension for Mrs. J. Sedgwick (Torrisholme Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/01324/FUL	34 Rydal Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Demolition of existing rear single-storey outrigger, construction of a rear single-storey extension for Ms. Leonard & Mr Brayard (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/01326/LB	14 Penny Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Listed building application for shop fit out works including the removal of existing wall panels, installation of stud walls, painting of ceilings, walls and external shop front, installation of new flooring, installation of boards, panels and shelves to walls, installation of fitted kitchen units, installation of LED illuminated logo onto interior glass, installation of two signs to front elevation, installation of vinyl graphics to glass and new electrical installations for Mr Sohel Seedat (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/01335/PRENG1	Land East Of Nether Beck, Netherbeck, Carnforth Pre application advice for the erection of an agricultural building with associated new access and internal track for Colin Birkett (Carnforth And Millhead Ward 2015 Ward)	Closed

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

22/01338/FUL	51 Foundry Close, Halton, Lancaster Erection of a single storey rear extension for Ms P. Holt (Halton-with-Aughton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/01340/FUL	Old Malt Barn, Borwick Road, Borwick Erection of two detached outbuildings and conversion of attached outbuilding to ancillary residential for Mr.& Mrs. M. Rigby (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/01359/AD	Collingholme Farm, Low House Lane, Cowan Bridge Agricultural determination for creation of access track for JB + AH Coates (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Not Required
22/01352/FUL	Gatehouse, Natterjack Lane, Middleton Change of use of Gatehouse to mixed use unit comprising office and living accommodation (sui generis), erection of a two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and detached double garage for Mr Ward (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn
22/00149/DIS	Grand Theatre , St Leonards Gate, Lancaster Discharge of condition 3 of approved application 21/01472/LB for Mike Hardy (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/00151/DIS	Land Southwest Of Springfield House, Ball Lane, Caton Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 18/01114/OUT for Mr Mark Pye (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/00152/DIS	Land South Of Playing Field Trumacar Lane, Middleton Road, Heysham Discharge of condition 4 on approved application 17/00848/OUT for Mark Barnes (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/00154/DIS	Land East Of, Scotland Road, Carnforth Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 21/00694/REM for Mrs Vicky Beeton (Carnforth And Millhead Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/00155/DIS	Units 1 - 9, Lansil Way, Lancaster Discharge of conditions 5 and 6 on approved application 22/00175/FUL for Sam Lowman (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/01425/PLDC	69 Ingleton Drive, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a single storey rear extension for Amy Slack (Scotforth East Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
22/01461/NMA	Site Of Former Sports Centre, Farrer Avenue, Lancaster University Non material amendment to planning permission 19/00918/FUL to alter the external finish of the rooftop plant room walls for Mr Guy Constantine (University And Scotforth Rural Ward)	Application Permitted
22/01472/NMA	26 Hall Park, Lancaster, Lancashire Non material amendment to planning permission 17/01168/VCN to add a rooflight to the south elevation and alter the parking arrangement to the front for Mr Brian Smith (Scotforth West Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
22/00174/DIS	The Red Well Country Inn, Kirkby Lonsdale Road, Arkholme Part discharge of condition 3 on approved application 21/01417/FUL for Mr P Benson (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision

