



Committee: PLANNING REGULATORY COMMITTEE

Date: MONDAY, 4 SEPTEMBER 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 17th July 2023 (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 22/00341/FUL | Crook O Lune Holiday Park Lancaster Road Quernmore Lancaster | Lower Lune Valley Ward | (Pages 4 - 18) |
| | | Change of use of land for the siting of 19 static holiday caravans together with associated parking, access roads, drainage and landscaping and the retention of earthworks. | | |
| 6 | A6 23/00567/OUT | Land South Of Aldcliffe Hall Lane Aldcliffe Hall Lane Aldcliffe Lancashire | Scotforth West Ward | (Pages 19 - 33) |
| | | Outline application for erection of 7 dwellings with associated access and landscaping. | | |
| 7 | A7 23/00231/VCN | Lancaster Brewery Lancaster Leisure Park Wyresdale Road Lancaster | John O'Gaunt Ward | (Pages 34 - 36) |
| | | Erection of a side extension and creation of an additional parking area to the rear (pursuant to the variation of condition 3 in relation to surface water drainage and maintenance regime on planning permission 22/01137/FUL). | | |

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Agenda Item | A5 |
| Application Number | 22/00341/FUL |
| Proposal | Change of use of land for the siting of 19 static holiday caravans together with associated parking, access roads, drainage and landscaping and the retention of earthworks |
| Application site | Crook O Lune Holiday Park Lancaster Road Quernmore Lancaster |
| Applicant | Pure Leisure Group |
| Agent | Mr Alexis De Pol |
| Case Officer | Mrs Petra Williams |
| Departure | No |
| Summary of Recommendation | Refusal |

1.0 Application Site and Setting

- 1.1 The site that forms the subject of this application is located to the north of an existing static caravan park, approximately 900 metres to the west of the village of Caton and approximately 1.5 miles to the east of the urban fringe of the city Lancaster. The Scarthwaite Hotel is located to the east of the site and utilises the same vehicular access from the A683. The proposal site is relatively level clearing within established wooded area although there are areas of concrete within it.
- 1.2 The site is bounded by mature trees and hedgerows. The site is covered by Tree Preservation Order (No.624(2017)) which largely relates to Eagles Nest Wood which is a substantial, mature woodland to the west of the site. Eagles Nest Wood has recently been designated by Natural England as Ancient Woodland. The area to the east of the wood proposed for the siting of caravans has largely regenerated since initial site clearing took place in 2020.
- 1.3 The site is located within the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and the site is separated from the River Lune, which runs approximately 65 metres to the east, by the A683. The River Lune is covered by the River Lune Biological Heritage Site designation. Crook O Lune Wood lies between the western bank of the river and the A683 and this wood is designated as the Crook O Lune Wood Biological Heritage Site. There is a public footpath (FP15) which follows the western bank of the river and as the river tracks northwards, the track runs parallel to the river's southern bank. The site lies within a Mineral Safeguarding Area and is also located within a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) impact risk zone.

2.0 Proposal

- 2.1 The application proposal consists of 19 new static caravans, to be utilised for recreation and holiday purposes, sited on concrete bases, located along a central spine access road running through the centre of the site. This utilises the existing access. Each of the proposed caravans will be accessed

from the proposed spine road and will have its own dedicated gravel parking space. The submitted application confirms that as part of the proposal, one tree will be felled to allow for the proposed development and a further three trees require removal for arboricultural reasons to facilitate the development, although a further 27 trees will be planted as part of the submission.

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 |
|--------------------|---|--|
| 22/00390/EIR | Screening request for change of use of land for the siting of 19 static holiday caravans together with the retention of earthworks and associated parking, access roads, drainage and landscaping | ES Not Required |
| 20/01240/FUL | Change of use of land for the siting of 19 holiday caravans together with the retention of earthworks | Refused |
| 18/00643/CU | Change of use of woodland for the siting of 19 additional static holiday caravans. | Permitted but decision quashed following a legal challenge |
| 17/01064/VLA | Variation of legal agreement attached to planning permission 02/01282/FUL to allow all year-round holiday occupancy | Permitted |
| 13/00434/FUL | Installation of a buried sewage treatment plant and erection of a small kiosk | Permitted |
| 10/01264/VCN | Operation of caravan site without compliance of condition 2 on application 95/00783/FUL and condition 2 on application 02/01282/FUL relating to occupancy restrictions | Permitted |
| 02/01282/FUL | Modification of condition no. 2 on application no. 95/00783 to allow use of site from 14 February to 3 January in any subsequent year | Permitted |
| 99/00655/CU | Change of use of land known as touring field to site static caravans | Permitted |
| 98/01068/FUL | Construction of new service road within caravan park including associated landfill | Permitted |
| 95/00783/FUL | Modification of condition to allow opening of site between 1 February and 30 November each year | Permitted |

4.0 Consultation Responses

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

| Consultee | Response |
|----------------------------|--|
| Environment Agency | No objection - satisfied that the plans clearly show the proposed foul drainage infrastructure and how it will relate to the existing infrastructure on site. |
| Lead Local Flood Authority | No objection – subject to conditions relating to a final surface water sustainable drainage strategy, a construction surface water management plan, a sustainable drainage system operation and maintenance plan, and a verification report of constructed sustainable drainage system. |
| Arboricultural Officer | Objection - Eagle's Nest Wood is identified as Ancient and Semi Natural Woodland (ASNW) on Natural England's Ancient Woodland Inventory and has a clear historical, landscape and environmental value. Ancient woodland is irreplaceable and any development which results in the loss or deterioration of such habitat should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons (NPPF paragraph 180c). placing 19 plots within an area of mature trees and woodland will put pressure on the trees to be pruned or felled in the future. |

| | |
|--|--|
| Greater Manchester Ecology Unit | Neither object to nor supports but states that the application as currently submitted does not appear to be compliant with the Natural England's Standing Advice that a 15m buffer zone to protect Ancient Woodland and the woodland wildlife is supports should be provided. The standing advice states you should not approve development proposals, including gardens within a buffer zone. |
| Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Beauty Partnership | Objection – The proposal would have an adverse impact on the local landscape character. |
| Forestry Commission | Neither object to nor supports the application but provides advice on the potential impact that the proposed development would have on the ancient woodland. The proposed site includes part of Eagles Nest Wood which has been confirmed as ancient woodland by Natural England. Ancient woodlands are an irreplaceable habitat. They have great value as they have a long history of woodland cover, with many features remaining undisturbed. |
| Natural England | Neither object to nor supports the application but given the sensitive location there is the potential for this proposed development scheme to have an adverse impact on the purpose of designation of the AONB. Planning permission should be refused if development will result in the loss or deterioration of ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees. |
| County Highways | No objection – The proposed development should have a negligible impact on highway safety and highway capacity within the immediate vicinity of the site. |
| Quernmore Parish Council | Objection - The proposed development will destroy a natural meadow within an 'Ancient Woodland' which should be retained for amenity and wildlife value. There would be a significant impact on local wildlife. Consideration should be given the plans for foul sewage and surface water removal from the area. The development will be close to the main A683 highway and will be visible from the road. This is considered to be incompatible with retaining the landscape character of the AONB. New planting is unlikely to completely screen the development. The existing entrance to the Caravan Park and other properties is considered to be unsuitable to cope with the additional traffic which will be generated by this development. This junction is already considered to be dangerous and any increase in traffic will exacerbate the issue. Questions whether there is a demand for additional static caravans at this location. This development is unlikely to increase employment in the area. 'Residents', will put an additional strain on local services and will significantly affect the rural character of the area and impact on existing residents and visitors. |
| United Utilities | No objections |
| Lancashire Fire and Rescue Service | Advice |
| Engineers | Neither object to nor supports the application but highlights concern in relation to the foul drainage. |
| Environmental Health | No comments received |
| Lune Rivers Trust | Objections - The proposed Drainage Strategy does not appear to adequately consider the risk of pollution to the nearby River Lune at a popular swimming spot. The treated effluent from this plant discharges into a tributary stream of the River Lune, via what sounds like a highways drain. Lune Rivers Trust would urge Lancaster City Council to include adequate provision in any planning permission to ensure that the developer is required to both adequately maintain the wastewater disposal/treatment system and to demonstrate that this is being complied with. |
| Mineral Safeguarding Lancashire County Council | No comments received |
| Cadent Gas | No comments received |
| Planning Policy | No comments received |

4.2 At the time of writing this report a total of 58 items of public comments have been received in response to the application, all of which are objections. A summary of the main reasons of opposition are as follows:

Biodiversity and arboricultural impact

- Scheme would be harmful to local ecology credentials and cause undue disruption.

- Increased pressure on local systems is not necessary.
- Development is harmful to valued trees and does not adequately protect them.
- Site is considered Ancient Woodland and should not be lost.
- Ecological impact of development not appropriately considered.

Landscape impact

- Proposed development is harmful to the AONB and local character of area.
- Caravans do not enhance or preserve the AONB as policy dictates.
- Development is visible and thus invasive.
- Waste and rubbish from the site will be seen.
- AONB should remain undeveloped and accessible for all.
- Gateway site into AONB should be preserved.

Residential amenity

- 19 additional caravans in close proximity to existing dwelling would be harmful to amenity due to noise, headlights and overlooking.
- There is no provision for bins on the plans for the new development.
- Since the existing caravan park was granted 12-month occupancy there has been an enormous increase in vehicular movement on and off the site with many deliveries of post, online orders and supermarket grocery orders.

Drainage

- There are existing drainage problems at Crook O Lune Holiday Park which causes the outfall on the A683 to flood out a mixture of wastewater and surface water.
- Inconsistent drainage documents.

Need for development

- Due to the proximity of the existing site, the locality does not need more caravans.
- The existing caravans aren't used as holiday homes and are used by people as their main residence.

Highway matters

- Access and visibility are poor and safe access cannot be secured.
- Highway adjacent to site floods and this hampers safe access to and from public highway.
- Pedestrians at risk of vehicle strike.
- Insufficient passing places.
- Dangerous turning with long vehicles likely.

5.0 Analysis

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

- Principle
- Landscape impacts (including impact upon FOB AONB)
- Arboricultural implications
- Ecological implications
- Drainage
- Residential amenity
- Highway matters

5.2 **Principle:** NPPF Section 6 (Building a strong, competitive economy) Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policies: SP8 (Protecting the Natural Environment); EN2 (Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty); EN3 (The Open Countryside); EN7 Environmentally Important Areas

- 5.2.1 The application site is located within the open countryside (Policy EN3) and is within the Forest of Bowland AONB with the settlement of Caton located approximately 900m to east of the application site. The site is undeveloped although the existing Crook O'Lune caravan park lies to the south as does the Scarthwaite Hotel. Undeveloped and undulating open countryside lies beyond the application site's northern and western boundaries with limited built form in the immediate vicinity.
- 5.2.2 Both national and local policy seek to deliver developments which are sustainable, and this requires schemes to deliver economic, social and environmental benefits. Broadly speaking, the 2021 NPPF and the development plan seek to steer development proposals towards sustainable locations where environmental impacts are limited and social benefits can be derived. However, there will, on occasions be instances where development proposals are potentially located away from main settlements and given the very nature of the district, are more difficult to access via public transport. This is particularly relevant to rural businesses and those ventures that are located in open countryside away from the district's main urban areas; and even more so when such businesses offer camping and rural holidays.
- 5.2.3 In this regard, paragraph 84 of the NPPF sets out that LPAs should support the growth of rural businesses. In particular, the NPPF also advises where sustainable rural tourism is proposed which respects the character of the countryside, it should be approved. Paragraph 85 of the framework however acknowledges that rural sites may not be well served by public transport but that it remains important to exploit opportunities to develop existing walking and cycling routes for example. Policy SP4 of the SPLA DPD provides that the Council will, where appropriate, seek to support sustainable economic growth to ensure that the needs of rural business can be met, and this is further bolstered by policy DM47.
- 5.2.4 Given that the site is located within the AONB, in terms of establishing the principle of development, paragraphs 176 and 177 of the NPPF must be considered. These advise that great weight should be given to conserving landscape designations such as AONBs and paragraph 177 specifically advises that 'major' development within AONBs should be refused unless a number of exceptional circumstances can be evidenced. For the purposes of paragraphs 176 and 177, whether a proposal is 'major development' is a matter for the decision maker, taking into account its nature, scale and setting, and whether it could have a significant adverse impact on the purposes for which the area has been designated or defined. In establishing whether development within the AONB is major, it is also useful to refer to the now generally accepted 'Maurici principle' as this sets a number of important factors that may be relied upon by decision makers.
- 5.2.5 In this instance, the scheme represents an extension to an existing caravan park and does not therefore represent a 'new' use within the AONB. The broad principle of caravan site extensions is also supported given the provisions of policy DM52 of the DM DPD and the nature of the development is not therefore such that the LPA would seek to refuse it on principle grounds alone. In terms of the scale, the proposal only seeks permission for 19 units and although the location plan encompasses the wider woodland, the caravans would be sited on a much smaller clearing amounting to approximately 0.3ha. This is not significant within the context of the wider caravan site. Long distance views of the site are not readily possible although transient users of the adjacent highway network immediately adjacent to the site will see glimpsed views into the complex until such a time as the proposed planting matures and thickens. The visual impact of the development is limited to users of the immediate area and views inwards from the wider AONB are not possible or significant to such an extent that the development is judged to adversely impact the AONB or undermine the key characteristics of its designation. Accordingly, given the modest scale of the development and lack of an unacceptable or adverse impact upon the wider AONB, the scheme is not judged to represent 'major' development within the context of paragraph 177 of the NPPF or when analysed with respect to the key components of the 'Maurici principle'.
- 5.2.6 The district contains a large number of touring and static caravan sites for visitors who are attracted by the unique character of the locality. Caravan sites provide a valuable source of visitor accommodation and can contribute significantly to the local economy and the sustainability of rural settlements. However, they can also have significant impacts on the local amenity of an area, through the creation of traffic or their intrusion on the local landscape. Accordingly, policy DM52 of

the DM DPD clarifies that within the Forest of Bowland AONB (or its setting), proposals for new static or touring caravan development will not be permitted where it is concluded that such proposals will have an adverse impact on conserving the landscape and natural beauty of the AONB. As demonstrated in the next section, no adverse impact upon the landscape has been identified and this allows the broad principle to be considered favourably in this instance.

- 5.2.7 Accordingly, given the provisions within the NPPF, those within the development plan and the lack of an adverse impact upon the AONB designation, the principle of development with respect to a modest extension of an existing caravan park is something that can be supported. The landscape impacts are considered below.
- 5.3 **Landscape impacts (including impact upon FOB AONB):** NPPF paragraphs: 126-134 (Achieving Well-Designed Places), 174 (Valued Landscapes and the Countryside); Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD Policies SP8 (Protecting the Natural Environment), EN2 (Areas of outstanding natural beauty) and EN3 (The Open Countryside); Development Management (DM) DPD Policies DM29 (Key Design Principles) and DM46 (Development and Landscape Impact)
- 5.3.1 Given the verdant nature of the locality and the site's location within the Forest of Bowland AONB, the potential impact of the development upon the prevailing landscape is a key consideration. The importance of protecting and preserving valued landscapes is set out within paragraphs 130, 145, 174, 176 and 177 of the NPPF. This is consistent with policy EN2 of the SPLA DPD and policies DM29, DM46 and DM52 of the Development Management DPD.
- 5.3.2 Critically, the statutory purpose of AONB designation is to conserve and enhance the natural beauty of the areas. In the National Planning Policy Framework, the Government places great weight on conserving the landscape and scenic beauty of AONBs, which have the highest status of protection. If these characteristics are damaged, for example by insensitive development, then that will compromise the primary purpose of the AONBs and the enjoyment of the areas by the public. Where a development proposal would create conflict between the primary purpose of the AONB and other uses of the AONB, greater weight will be attached to the purpose of conserving and enhancing the landscape and natural beauty of the AONB.
- 5.3.3 Specifically, policy DM46 advises that development proposals should, through their siting, scale, massing, materials, landscaping, vernacular style and design seek to contribute positively to the conservation and enhancement of the protected landscape and its setting. Accordingly, the application is supported by a Landscape Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) which has been undertaken in accordance with the GLVIA3 guidance. The LVIA has assessed the impact of the proposed development on the relevant landscape character within the AONB as outlined within the AONB 2009 Landscape Character Assessment with an overall conclusion that a significant adverse impact upon the landscape will not arise.
- 5.3.4 The submitted assessment identifies a range of relevant suitable receptors and considers the impacts on both the landscape character and the resultant visual effect arising from the development. This consideration sets out that the impact has been analysed from the point of construction, the point of completion and 15 years post completion. Given the scale of the development, this is considered appropriate. In terms of the landscape effect, it is duly noted that during the construction phase there is likely to be minor adverse impact but given the limited site size and the current derelict state, this is not a significant constraint or weight against the scheme. Upon completion and during operation, the submitted assessment considers the landscape impact within the context of the following:
- 5.3.5 Bowland Fringe and Pendle Hill - With regard to the Bowland Fringe and Pendle Hill, the NCA designation covers a relatively large area and as a result, the expected and likely magnitude of landscape change arising from the modest development would, in this case, be negligible; and this applies to the overall landscape effects too. Ultimately, in relation to this receptor, no material change to the key characteristics that define the Bowland Fringe and Pendle Hill have been identified.
- 5.3.6 Local Landscape impact based on Lancashire strategy for Landscape Character - In terms of the impact upon Langthwaite Ridge (LCA 7C), the site occupies a very small area of this and the key features within (woodland cover, rising topography) are not changed by the development. The

extension to the caravan site will not therefore adversely impact the LCA 7C landscape character and at the 15-year point, the impact is likely to be negligible.

- 5.3.7 Forest of Bowland AONB - Insofar as the Forest of Bowland AONB is concerned, the landscape visual impact assessment duly notes that the value of this landscape designation is high, and that the overall sensitivity is also high. However, as above, the site occupies a relatively small area within the AONB designation; as a result, the application site only shares a very minor number of key characteristics with the wider AONB designation and the resultant change to the land is not therefore significant. The site's location on the periphery of the AONB and the undulating landscape further mitigate the potential impact upon the AONB designation from a landscape perspective. The site's existing level of natural screening and the small development size therefore result in a minor impact upon completion with this ultimately diminishing to negligible after 15 years and it is extremely localised with long, distant views not possible.
- 5.3.8 Site and immediate visual context - In relation to the site and the immediate site, although the number of public objections which suggest that there would be a significant and unacceptable impact on the local landscape are noted, this is not a conclusion that the LPA have reached. Given the size and nature of the proposed development, it is not anticipated to have an extensive impact on the immediate context or the prevailing surrounding landscape. It is accepted that there will be a direct impact as a result of caravans being placed on a currently open site, however there are only 19 and the site will operate as an extension to the existing caravan park. Current, established landscape features will be retained and additional planting will provide further screening to the development. Despite being located within the AONB, the site lies on the periphery of the designation and will, in any event, be developed adjacent to the existing caravan park. The existing topography and screening vegetation limit the wider impact with the majority of change being noticed within the site as opposed to being from receptors outside the site looking in.
- 5.3.9 In addition to the landscape impacts, the LVIA also considers the potential visual impacts arising from the development. This is achieved by identifying surrounding land and vantage points from within which views towards any part of the application site may be achieved or secured; this is the visual envelope of the development (VE). It should be noted however that the VE is not an indicator of the effect of the proposed development on a particular view; it merely confirms the visible extent in the surrounding landscape.
- 5.3.10 As with the impacts on the landscape, it is duly noted that during the construction phase there would be some unavoidable visual impact; but these would be limited and, given the scale of the development, relatively minor in scale. Although the initial short-term impact of the construction phase would likely be 'moderate adverse' these would be limited to a small number of receptors such as transient users of the A638 and visitors to the existing caravan park. The submitted impact assessment further sets out the impact of the development, post completion, upon the following receptors:
- 5.3.11 Nearby residential properties and settlement - Given the lack of long-distance views from the locality's existing settlements, an adverse impact in terms of visual amenity is not considered to arise. However, due to the introduction of additional caravans onto the site, existing users of the site will experience a degradation in their view. Such views, however, are only glimpsed and given the existing vegetative screening and the proposed planting schedule, they will not be significant in any event.
- 5.3.12 Public rights of way and footpaths in locality - The area benefits from an extensive number of footpaths and PROW connections. However, given that these are predominately along the River Lune and at a lower level compared to the site, a significant visual adverse impact is not judged to arise. The site's existing screening and vegetative boundaries further seek to protect visual amenity and the experience of those using the area's footpath network is not judged to be compromised to such an extent that a refusal on visual grounds could be defended.
- 5.3.13 Road and transport users - The site lies adjacent to the A638 and as a result, those who drive past the site or enter the complex will, to a degree, notice and see elements of the development. However, views inwards are limited due to the existing, mature tree screening that tracks along the site's eastern boundary.

5.3.14 Accordingly, having considered the proposed development's likely impacts upon the prevailing landscape and the resultant visual impact, a conflict with policy EN2, DM46 and DM52 has not been identified. Ultimately, given the existing vegetation, the natural topography, the presence of the A638, the existing holiday park and the modest scale of the development, the proposal is not considered to give rise to unacceptable visual or landscape effects.

5.3.15 In considering the visual impact of the development and in particular the effect upon the immediate character, it should be noted that although the scheme seeks permission to change the use of the land (as opposed to seeking permission for operational built development), the colour of the caravans used on the site has the potential to cause adverse impacts. Jarring, strident and bright colours for example would be more evident even with the glimpsed views available and this would likely be unacceptable. As such, had the application been recommended for approval, a condition would have been imposed on the permission that required the applicant to agree the colour and external appearance of the proposed static units with the LPA prior to their installation on the site. It would also be necessary to condition the approved locations of the units to prevent them being re-positioned in a poor layout which may also be harmful to wider visual amenity receptors.

5.4 **Arboricultural implications: (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).**

5.4.1 During the course of the previously refused application 20/01240/FUL, the status of the site's woodland was contested at length. However, Eagle's Nest Wood (which is within the red edge but not proposed for the siting of caravans) is now identified as ancient semi-natural woodland on Natural England's Ancient Semi-natural Woodland Inventory indicating that the site has had a continuous woodland cover since at least 1600 AD and should therefore be afforded the full protections under paragraph 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Ancient woodland takes hundreds of years to establish and is defined as an irreplaceable habitat. The NPPF recognises the importance that trees make in contributing towards a locality's sense of character (paragraph 131, 174 & 180) and policy DM45 echoes this by confirming that the LPA will seek to retain trees, hedgerows and important landscape features where possible. The submitted Arboricultural Assessment (which does not acknowledge Eagles Nest Wood as ancient woodland) proposes the removal of 4 trees to accommodate the development and landscaping proposals provide new tree planting in the form of 27 heavy standard trees and areas of mixed native species tree and shrub planting across the site. The Arboricultural Assessment does not highlight any conflict between the development and the existing habitat but recommends that the ancient woodland flora which has developed along the woodland margin be protected and the woodland proactively managed. No acknowledgment is made of the importance of open space within a woodland setting and the impact of changing the use of the site, with increased pressure on the woodland and wildlife from recreational activity. However, as highlighted by the LPA's Arboricultural Officer, open areas and edge habitat are an important component of ancient woodland and diversify the woodland structure, providing valuable habitat.

5.4.2 With respect to the current proposal, the arboricultural impacts associated with the development can be categorised into:

- Direct impacts arising from proposed drainage infrastructure
- Impact upon Ancient Woodland

With regard to drainage infrastructure, although the red edge of the submitted site location plan incorporates the wooded area to the west of the site, (Eagle's Nest Wood) the caravans and access road are confined to a smaller development parcel of approximately 0.3Ha. As demonstrated through the submitted tree survey work, the site is significantly constrained by the adjacent woodland with a number of large, mature and healthy trees present on the periphery of the site. These trees make a significant contribution to the locality's character, and they are also subject to an extant preservation order: TPO 624(2017). The submitted tree survey plots the location of each tree and clarifies the likely root protection areas (RPA) and it acknowledges the important value of the trees in this location. Following the submission of a revised Drainage Strategy the Arboricultural Officer is now satisfied that the proposed drainage layout can be implemented without undue impact on tree

roots. However, the overriding objections raised by the Arboricultural Officer remain and will be discussed in the following paragraphs.

5.4.3 With regard to the impact of the proposed development upon ancient woodland, the NPPF states that such woodlands should be seen as irreplaceable habitats and where development results in the loss or deterioration of such habitats, proposals should be refused unless there are “wholly exceptional” reasons (paragraph 180c). Development can affect ancient woodland, ancient and veteran trees, and the wildlife they support on the site or nearby. Direct impacts of development on ancient woodland or ancient and veteran trees include:

- damaging or destroying all or part of them (including their soils, ground flora or fungi)
- damaging roots and understorey (all the vegetation under the taller trees)
- damaging or compacting soil around the tree roots
- polluting the ground around them
- changing the water table or drainage of woodland or individual trees

In addition, nearby development can also have an indirect impact on ancient woodland or ancient and veteran trees and the species they support. These can include:

- breaking up or destroying connections between woodlands and ancient or veteran trees
- reducing the amount of semi-natural habitats next to ancient woodland
- increasing the amount of pollution, including dust
- increasing disturbance to wildlife from additional traffic and visitors
- increasing light or air pollution
- increasing damaging activities like fly-tipping and the impact of domestic pets
- changing the landscape character of the area

The submitted application fails to illustrate how the above risks will be satisfactorily avoided. The standing advice from Natural England states that where development is permitted, an appropriate buffer of at least 15 metres should be secured. However, in this instance, the submitted layout plan demonstrates that this cannot be achieved as at least 9 of proposed locations for the static caravans fall significantly below the required buffer zone. The submitted layout plan indicates that the caravans would have a dimension of 8.5 metres by 3 metres and associated hardstanding. Static caravans can vary in size, including smaller single unit caravans at around 3 metres by 8 metres and larger twin unit caravans at around 6 metres by 12 metres. In all cases they would meet the definition of a caravan in the Caravan Sites and Control of Development Act 1960.

5.4.4 It is considered that the proposal has the potential to lead to the intensification of the recreational activity of humans and their pets which can result in vegetation damage, trampling, litter, and fire damage. Noise, light and dust pollution occurring from the development, during both construction and operational phases are also points of concern. Furthermore, where the woodland edge overhangs a development site (as in this case), trees can become safety issues and be indiscriminately lopped/felled, resulting in a reduction of the woodland canopy and threatening the long-term retention of such trees.

5.4.5 With regard to habitats and biodiversity the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 180c states: -

“development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats (such as ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees) should be refused, unless there are wholly exceptional reasons, and a suitable compensation strategy exists.”

Footnote 63 gives the example of wholly exceptional reasons as being infrastructure projects (including nationally significant infrastructure projects, orders under the Transport and Works Act and hybrid bills), where the public benefit would clearly outweigh the loss or deterioration of habitat.

In addition, the Forestry Commission has prepared joint Standing Advice on ancient woodland which provides information on how to access planning applications that have potential to cause loss or deterioration to ancient woodland. When making planning decisions, the following should be considered:

- conserving and enhancing biodiversity
- avoiding and reducing the level of impact of the proposed development on ancient woodland and ancient and veteran trees

The advice goes on to state that planning permission should be refused if development will result in the loss or deterioration of ancient woodland, ancient trees and veteran trees unless both of the following applies:

- there are wholly exceptional reasons
- there's a suitable compensation strategy in place (this must not be a part of considerations of wholly exceptional reasons) in line with paragraphs 033 and 034 of the Planning Practice Guidance on compensation guidance.

5.4.6 Paragraph 033 states that local planning authorities need to consider both the direct and indirect impacts on ancient woodland and ancient or veteran trees when assessing development proposals and the scope for avoiding or mitigating adverse impacts. Their existing condition is not something that ought to affect the local planning authority's consideration of such proposals (and it should be borne in mind that woodland condition can usually be improved with good management). In terms of compensation paragraph 034 states that where development that results in the loss or deterioration of ancient woodland is exceptionally permitted in line with the Framework, a suitable compensation strategy should be secured and implemented via planning conditions or obligations. Compensation measures need to be decided on a case-by-case basis and be appropriate to the scale, nature and impacts of the development, but it is desirable for them to be provided as close to the development site as possible. Appropriate compensation might include restoring or improving other nearby ancient woodland. However, it is considered that although there are likely to be some economic benefits arising from the proposal, there are no wholly exceptional reasons to permit the development as the proposal does not meet the criteria set out within footnote 63 of the NPPF. Furthermore, although the submission suggests that management of the ancient woodland would improve its ecological value, and that this could be secured by s.106 if permission were to be granted, this does not form part of the considerations of wholly exceptional reasons as set out within the Forestry Commission's Standing Advice. It is also noted that although the Woodland Trust is generally supportive of sensitive ancient woodland management, they advise that this should be undertaken for the purposes of improving biodiversity, and not as a condition of an approved planning application which is likely to result in the deterioration of the ancient woodland habitat.

5.4.7 It is acknowledged that the scheme proposes to plant 27 additional trees. Given the ratio of felling to planting this would be suitably compliant with policy DM45. The value that these trees would create is of course noted but given the above discussion, this is not sufficient to negate the likely harm identified.

5.4.8 It is concluded that, given the lack of space available to incorporate a sufficient buffer zone between the proposed development and the ancient woodland, and notwithstanding the suggested management of the ancient woodland, the submission has not satisfactorily demonstrated how harm to this important feature is to be avoided. This therefore represents a significant conflict with paragraph 180c of the NPPF, policy SP8 of the SPLA DPD and policies DM44 and DM45 of the DM DPD.

5.5 **Ecological Implications:** (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).

5.5.1 As required by the National Planning Policy Framework at paragraphs 8c, 174 and 179 the Local Planning Authority has a duty to consider the conservation of biodiversity when determining planning applications. The NPPF indicates that when determining planning applications, Local Planning Authorities must aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity and that opportunities to incorporate

biodiversity in and around developments should be encouraged (Paragraph 179). This is underpinned by Paragraph 8 of the Framework, which details the three overarching objectives that the planning system should try to achieve, and it is here that the Framework indicates that planning should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment. At a local level, this requirement is reflected through policies SP8 and DM44.

- 5.5.2 Accordingly, the application is supported by a phase 1 Habitat Survey and Ecological Impact Assessment dated February 2022, which suggests that there is insufficient evidence to suggest that the main block of woodland is of ancient origin. The Survey and Assessment considers the potential impact of the development upon a range of species and in particular it focuses on breeding/nesting birds, badgers, otters, brown hares, bats and newts.
- 5.5.3 There were no conclusive signs of protected species such as badger within the woodland or other parts of the site though this species is known to occur within the wider area, albeit relatively sparsely. There are no water courses within 100m of the site that are suitable for water vole or otter, so no impact is reasonably likely. Likewise, there are no ponds on site or within 250m of the site boundaries where there is direct habitat linkage so the presence and likelihood of any adverse impact upon great crested newts and common toad is also highly unlikely.
- 5.5.4 The Survey sets out that the large mature, broadleaved trees within the woodland have bat roosting potential which ranges from moderate to high, though no conclusive signs of roosting were found during the night-time emergence surveys, nor were any conclusive signs of roosting found during the daytime inspection. Although the Survey advises that there will be no loss of roosting potential, it goes on to say that to ensure there is no impact upon foraging bats, the site should be designed to ensure that no lighting falls on adjacent habitat such as trees, woodland and mature shrubs. Given the position of the proposed caravans it is considered that it would be difficult to avoid light spill towards the adjacent woodland.
- 5.5.5 The survey concludes that with a suitable package of mitigation measures (predominately related to nesting and breeding birds) the scheme would not be harmful to the site's ecological credentials. The LPA's ecological advisor (GMEU) have raised no objection or concern over this broad conclusion subject to conditions but has highlighted an inconsistency between the Habitat Survey & Ecological Impact Assessment and the Arboricultural Assessment. The Habitat Survey & Ecological Impact Assessment references that only two trees are proposed for removal, however the Arboricultural Assessment identifies 4 trees to be felled. From the Arboricultural Assessment some of the features described on the trees for removal, such as pruning wounds and deadwood can (but don't necessarily) provide potential roost features. The agent has confirmed that there are four trees proposed for removal as per the AIA. Where the Habitat Survey and Ecological Impact Assessment refers to two trees being removed it means the number of trees being removed that are suitable for bat roosting. The other two trees identified for removal were found to not be suitable for bat roosting. The agent has also advised that all trees on site were checked during the preliminary bat survey and were either dismissed as being unsuitable for bat roosting or checked for signs of bats. Furthermore, despite a number of the trees on site having potential for roosting, none had any conclusive signs of roosting such as staining around potential access points or droppings. No bats were recorded emerging or returning to any of the trees during any of the nighttime emergence or roost return surveys (both retained trees or those proposed for removal).

The GMEU consultee has advised that further clarification is still required. For example, in section 4 of the executive summary, which is discussing the impact of the proposal on the plantation (rather than bats) the loss of two non-native trees is mentioned as an impact, and in paragraph 7 of this summary, the two non-native trees proposed for felling are again referenced but it states that these have limited potential to support roosting bats. No mention of additional trees proposed for felling which had moderate/high bat roost potential is made here. The residual impact table for bats in section 4.2.4 also states that 'there will be no loss of roosting potential' implying that no trees with bat roost potential will be lost as part of the proposal. Where moderate/high potential trees will be impacted, clarification and the results of appropriate further survey work for these trees should also be provided, followed by emergence/re-entry surveys to ensure that sufficient survey work has been undertaken. Locations of surveys will also need to be provided.

In order to provide clarity and ensure that sufficient survey information has been provided for each tree that will be impacted by the proposals, the GMEU consultee has advised that the ecology report should be updated with sufficient information for the 4 trees that are proposed to be felled, as per the Bat Conservation Trust guidelines.

5.5.6 Notwithstanding the above, the GMEU consultee has suggested that in the event of the application being approved a condition should be used to secure an appropriate lighting scheme, along with a light spill plan, in order to demonstrate that the woodland edges and areas used by foraging bats will not be adversely impacted by lighting. The Habitat Survey and Ecological Impact Assessment outlines a precautionary activity survey for bats, to be carried out prior to felling of trees within the active bat season, which could be secured through a suitable condition. A scheme for artificial bat boxes to be placed within the retained trees on the site could also be conditioned. The GMEU consultee has also advised that a condition should be used to ensure that no site clearance, tree or vegetation removal (including of undergrowth/bramble) is undertaken in the main bird nesting season (March – August inclusive) and a compensatory nest box scheme should be secured to ensure no negative impact on nesting birds due to the loss of the trees on the site. The GMEU consultee goes on to advise that if planning permission were to be granted, then a condition should be used to secure a pre-commencement badger survey to ensure no change in the status of badgers on the site. Appropriate mitigation measures to reflect the updated badger survey results will also be required. A method statement for reasonable avoidance measures (RAMMS) for terrestrial mammals (e.g. badgers and hedgehogs) should also be secured during work on the sites, for example, to ensure no trenches or excavations are left open over night without a ramp or other suitable means of escape are provided.

5.5.7 Some areas of the landscaping do not appear to be appropriate for the site. For example, the area indicated as wildflower grassland creation at the north of the site is currently where there are large areas of woodland ground flora. Also, some of the species included with the proposed planting mix are not locally native (for example dog wood and field maple) and should therefore not be included with the scheme, given the proximity to ancient woodland. In the event of an approval, a revised landscaping scheme could be conditioned.

5.5.8 Whilst it is accepted that mitigation measures could be relied upon as suggested in the report with respect to the protection of nesting and breeding birds, the ecological survey does not adequately consider the potential impact upon bats (which are an EPS) due to the conflict with the submitted Arboricultural Assessment. As such, it is concluded that based on the submitted information the LPA cannot be satisfied that there would be no undue impact on protected species. This therefore prevents the scheme being able to adequately satisfy the advice contained within the NPPF, policy SP8, DM44 and DM52.

5.6 **Drainage: NPPF paragraphs: 159-165, 167 and 169 (Planning and Flood Risk); Development Management (DM) DPD Policies DM33 (Development and Flood Risk), DM34 (Surface Water Run-off and Sustainable Drainage) and DM35 (Water Supply and Wastewater).**

5.6.1 In accordance with DM34 Surface water should be managed sustainably within all new developments. The Council expects that proposals for all new development will use Sustainable Drainage Systems in accordance with the Surface Water Drainage Hierarchy. Proposals for all new development are expected to implement sustainable drainage systems and alternatives will only be permitted where it has been demonstrated to be inappropriate or impracticable. The Surface Water Drainage hierarchy for new development is as follows:

1. Into the ground (infiltration at source);
2. Attenuated discharge to a surface water body, watercourse or the sea;
3. Attenuated discharge to surface water sewer, highway drain or another drainage system; and as a last resort
4. Attenuated discharge to a combined sewer (only in exceptional circumstances where it can be demonstrated that no other options higher up the hierarchy are feasible).

5.6.2 The submitted drainage report confirms that percolation testing was undertaken in 2022 to confirm whether the site would be suitable for infiltration. Based on the poor drainage results obtained, the submitted drainage strategy concludes that the site is not appropriate for the use of soak-away

systems for the disposal of surface water run-off or the dispersal of foul effluent from a new sewage treatment plant. Accordingly, the scheme intends to rely upon the 2nd option in the hierarchy of attenuated discharge into the River Lune via an existing outfall located to the east of the application site. The rate of discharge into the water course will equate to an attenuation rate of 4.6l/s. It is proposed that foul drainage will be served by a new sewage pumping station that will discharge into the existing foul drainage serving the existing park lodges. Although the Lead Local Flood Authority have raised no objections in respect of the latest submitted Drainage Strategy, they have raised concerns that it appears to contradict all previous versions of the strategy. As such, while the Lead Local Flood Authority is satisfied that their previous concerns regarding a suitable outfall location have now been addressed, they require evidence of the dye testing and CCTV surveys as suggested that have been carried out within the Drainage Strategy in order to ensure robust evidence is provided to clarify the consistent contradictions between the various versions of the drainage strategy to date.

5.6.3 In response to the submitted planning application, queries have been raised regarding the capacity and locations of parts of the proposed drainage systems that will serve the new caravans post development. Concerns specifically relate to the attenuation capacity of the surface water system and foul drainage and the potential for the proposed development to exacerbate these concerns. The Environment Agency have raised no objections to the proposed foul drainage infrastructure, and how it will relate to the existing infrastructure on site. The proposed new development will connect to the existing sewage treatment plant located in Queens Well Wood. However, due to ongoing concerns raised by a nearby resident the site was visited by the LPA's Drainage Engineer who met with the agent. The Drainage Engineer advises that although the proposals for the surface water are acceptable and can be dealt with through suitable conditions, there are concerns in relation to the foul drainage as the most recent version Drainage Strategy does not accurately represent the existing systems. Although a new system from the proposed development is proposed, this would rely on the existing system within Crook O Lune Holiday Park to convey foul water to the discharge point. It is specifically this existing system that needs to be investigated to ensure that it is fit for purpose, in size and condition to ensure that no water will be lost from the system (which would increase flood risk). The agent is seeking to investigate and address these concerns but at the time of writing this report the LPA is not confident that foul drainage can be dealt with satisfactorily.

5.7 **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).

5.7.1 In conjunction with the National Planning Policy Framework, the development plan (DM29 in particular) requires proposals to protect existing levels of amenity whilst ensuring the amenity of those who may also use the new development.

5.7.2 The site lies adjacent to an existing residential property known as Scarthwaite Lodge. The existing dwelling sits at the entrance to the main site and all vehicular traffic entering the complex is routed to the immediate north of the dwelling. However, the dwelling benefits from a good degree of screening and boundary treatments to mitigate against disruption, noise and head light glare. In this regard, although the applicant has not provided any information with respect to likely traffic volumes, the additional movements created by 19 caravans within the context of the wider site is not judged to be significant. There may be occasions when vehicle noise and activity associated with the site is audible given the low background noise levels but due to the extension only relating to 19 units, this impact is not judged to be significant or so detrimental that the LPA would wish to refuse the application on this basis.

5.7.3 It is suggested by objectors that the use of the units will be harmful to the existing levels of amenity enjoyed by the property (Scarthwaite Lodge) adjacent to the site which is approximately 16 metres to the east of the site boundary. However, as noted above, the objecting property benefits from existing boundary treatments that appear to be in a good state of repair and the eastern flank of the application site benefits from a large degree of mature, verdant screening. These features will serve to reduce potential noise disruption and preserve existing levels of amenity. It is noted that no objective noise data has been provided but given the nature of the site, whilst there may be some noise emanation from the use of 19 caravans (particularly during arrival and departure), this is not likely to be excessive during occupation. Such sites rely on the attractive qualities of tranquillity and

the open countryside; users will typically spend time walking or relaxing as opposed to engaging in disruptive or anti-social behaviour that may otherwise be harmful to amenity. Of course, the management of guest behaviour is beyond the remit of the planning system's jurisdiction but on balance, given the site's facilities, a significant and demonstrably adverse impact upon the existing amenity enjoyed by Scarthwaite Lodge is not considered likely.

5.8 **Highways:** NPPF paragraphs: 104-106 and 110-113 (Promoting Sustainable Transport); Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policy: SP10 (Improving Transport Connectivity); Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM29 (Key Design Principles), DM57 (Health and Well-being), DM60 (Enhancing Accessibility and Transport Linkages), DM61 (Walking and Cycling) and DM62 (Vehicle Parking Provision).

5.8.1 From a National Planning Policy perspective, paragraph 110 of the NPPF advises that where appropriate, schemes should secure safe and suitable access to the public highway for all applicable users. The NPPF further advises that sustainable transport modes should, where possible and relevant, be taken up and encouraged although this will of course depend on the type of development and its location. This requirement is reflected in policy DM29 (Key Design Principles) which requires proposals to deliver suitable and safe access to the existing highway network whilst also promoting sustainable, non-car dominated travel where possible.

5.8.2 The proposed development will utilise an existing vehicle access point onto A683 which has a 50mph speed limit. As demonstrated through the comments from the County Highway consultee, they have raised no objection or cited any concern over the safe operation of the existing Highway network and are satisfied with the proposed internal layout (including vehicle parking) as shown on the submitted plans.

5.8.3 Whilst the public objections relating to perceived highway safety issues are noted, it must be noted that this scheme is only for 19 caravans and a significant increase in traffic is not therefore likely to arise. Officers accept that local residents benefit from local knowledge and that users of the vicinity may notice a minor increase in traffic volume, but this is not judged to be so significant or adverse that a refusal could be defended on highway grounds. This is verified through the lack of an objection from the Highway Authority.

6.0 Conclusion and Planning Balance

6.1 This application proposes a modest extension to an established caravan park within the Forest of Bowland AONB. As set out above, given the degree of compliance with policy DM47 and DM52 and the lack of an adverse visual impact, the principal of development is established as being something which can be supported. Although the proposal suggests the potential for the management of the ancient woodland within the redline boundary, this does not form part of the considerations of wholly exceptional reasons as to why development should be permitted within the 15-metre buffer zone which is contrary to the standing advice provided by Natural England.

6.2 It is acknowledged that the proposal would support a rural enterprise and has the potential to benefit additional local businesses too. However, weighing against the proposal is the harmful impact of the development upon existing, ancient woodland through the lack of an appropriate separation buffer. In addition, the scheme fails to adequately address foul drainage.

6.3 Accordingly, when the support offered to the scheme is balanced against the degree of policy conflict identified, the application is recommended for refusal.

Recommendation

That Planning Permission BE REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. The application site includes an area of ancient woodland. The standing advice offered by Natural England with respect to ancient woodlands advises that a buffer of at least 15 metres should be installed between development and ancient wooded areas. In addition, paragraph 180c of the NPPF states that where the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats such as ancient woodland may arise, development should be refused. In this instance, the application proposes to site nine caravans

on associated hardstandings within 15 metres of the ancient woodland. The scheme layout fails to incorporate a suitable buffer between the proposed development and the existing woodland as required by the standing advice offered by Natural England. Given their contribution towards the landscape, their amenity value and their remaining lifespan, inflicting harm upon trees believed to comprise ancient woodland is not acceptable and represents a material conflict with policy SP8 of the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD and policy DM45 of the Development Management DPD, paragraph 180c of the NPPF and the standing advice offered by Natural England.

2. Policies SP8 of the SPLA DPD and DM44 of the DM DPD seek to ensure undue ecological harm is avoided and mitigated where appropriate. The application does not provide sufficient information within the Habitat Survey & Ecological Impact Assessment regarding the 4 trees that are proposed to be felled. As such the LPA cannot reasonably conclude that harm to bats has been sufficiently avoided or mitigated. Accordingly, the scheme fails to satisfy the advice within the NPPF at paragraphs 8c, 174 and 179 whilst also representing a material conflict with policies SP8 of the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD and policies DM44 and DM52 of the Development Management DPD (insofar as ecology and species impact is concerned).
3. The application fails to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the LPA that foul water arising from the development can be adequately managed as required by the development plan. Consequently, the LPA cannot be satisfied that the provisions of policy DM35 (wastewater) of the Development Management DPD can be adequately achieved, and this also conflicts with paragraph 169 of the NPPF.

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

Lancaster City Council takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals, in the interests of delivering sustainable development. As part of this approach the Council offers a pre-application service, aimed at positively influencing development proposals. Although the applicant has failed to take advantage of this service, they have previously been made aware of the issues of concern regarding the proposal which the submission does not satisfactorily address. Consequently, the resulting proposal is unacceptable for the reasons prescribed in the Notice. The applicant is encouraged to utilise the pre-application service prior to the submission of any future planning applications, in order to engage with the local planning authority to attempt to resolve the reasons for refusal.

Background Papers

None

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Agenda Item | A6 |
| Application Number | 23/00567/OUT |
| Proposal | Outline application for erection of 7 dwellings with associated access and landscaping |
| Application site | Land South Of Aldcliffe Hall Lane Aldcliffe Hall Lane Aldcliffe Lancashire |
| Applicant | Mr M Mister |
| Agent | Mr Jake Salisbury |
| Case Officer | Mr Robert Clarke |
| Departure | No |
| Summary of Recommendation | Refusal |

(i) **Procedural Matters**

This application would normally be determined under delegated powers. However, an employee of the Planning and Climate Change Service holds an interest in this development proposal. For this reason, in the interests of transparency, the application is reported to Planning Committee for determination.

1.0 Application Site and Setting

1.1 This application relates to parts of two large agricultural fields situated to the southern side of Aldcliffe Hall Lane on the periphery of the small settlement of Aldcliffe, which is situated to the south west of Lancaster. The site is located opposite existing residential development on Oaklands Court and Craiglands Court. The site as defined by the red edge development area is just under 0.5 hectares in area, however, the blue edge is larger and includes the surrounding agricultural fields. There is a significant change in levels across the site, rising from around 9m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD) where the current field gate is located. Levels increase in an east-southeast direction from this lower part of the site rising up the drumlin first gently and then more steeply in the south eastern corner which sits at a height of approximately 16.2mAOD. Levels continue to increase outside of the red edged area as the drumlin increases in height. The top of this drumlin is situated at approximately 22mAOD. At the higher parts of Aldcliffe Hall Lane to the east and near Ivy Cottage, the boundary between the field (edged blue) and the lane is formed by a notable level change and a tall stone retaining wall, a row of mature trees (protected by a Tree Preservation Order) line the boundary. In the eastern part of the site, the level change between the development site and Aldcliffe Hall Lane continues for a short time though is much reduced until the lowest part of the development site becomes approximately level with the lane.

1.2 Tall mature hedgerows form this part of the northern boundary with the lane. These hedgerows continue towards the west and are interrupted by a double width field gate. Following this, hedgerows line the length of the lane down to the estuary footpath. Within the site and close to the field gate is an electricity substation and United Utilities pumping station and sewer. A hedgerow extends through the site from north to south separating the agricultural fields. This hedgerow features gaps allowing access between the two fields. The southern boundary of the development

site remains open. A small area of marsh like grasses is located within a small depression in the southern area of the site which corresponds with an area identified as being susceptible to surface water flooding (medium risk (1 in 100)). The site is clearly viewed from Aldcliffe Hall Lane. Furthermore, to the east of the site is a public footpath which provides a link between Aldcliffe Hall Lane and the Lune Estuary footpath. Both footpaths provide wider reaching landscape views of the development site.

- 1.3 To the north of the site are some detached properties, mainly fronting onto Oaklands and Craiglands Court but also two fronting onto Aldcliffe Hall Lane. These are at a lower level than most of the site. West Lodge which is located opposite the current field gate and Ivy Cottage located opposite the tall stone retaining wall are both identified as a non-designated heritage assets (NDHA) within the Aldcliffe with Stodday Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP). To the east, beyond the blue edged area and public footpath, is a group of detached dwellings on Aldcliffe Mews which has access onto Aldcliffe Hall Lane. To the south and west is the remainder of the field with further agricultural land beyond this up to the Lune Estuary footpath approximately 410 metres to the west and a farm, approximately 600m to the south.
- 1.4 The site is located within the boundary of the Aldcliffe with Stodday Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP). The NDP and associated Design Code document identifies a series of important views (figure 39), one being 'View 2' located along Aldcliffe Hall Lane. The site lies within the Low Coastal Drumlins Landscape Character Area as identified within Map 3 of the NDP. It is located within the Open Countryside Area, as identified within the Local Plan Proposals Map and within a Mineral Safeguarding Area. The site also falls within the Article 4 Direction area controlling the provision of Houses in Multiple Occupation. Aldcliffe Hall Lane is an adopted unclassified 30mph road. Trees within the wider site and located on the opposite side of Aldcliffe Hall Lane are subject to a Tree Preservation Order. A public right of way extends around the south-southeast of the wider site and connects with Lune Estuary path. The site lies within flood zone 1, however, there is a small pocket of medium surface water flood risk within the southern area of the development site. The Lancaster Canal is designated as a Biological Heritage Site (BHS) and is approximately 450m to the east. The Lune Estuary is located approximately 440m to the west and is designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The Estuary is also covered by the Morecambe Bay Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Ramsar designations.

2.0 Proposal

- 2.1 This planning application relates to an outline proposal for the erection of 7 dwellings. An amended planning application form was received during the determination period which sets out that this outline application also includes approval for access and landscaping. It is on this basis that this application is being determined. The proposed access to the site from Aldcliffe Hall Lane is situated in the approximate location of the current double field gate access. The proposal also involves the creation of a footway to part of the frontage with Aldcliffe Hall Lane.
- 2.2 The proposal also seeks approval for landscaping. However, no specific details of landscaping have been provided as part of the application. Some very basic landscaping details are contained on the Indicative Site Layout Plan.

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 |
|--|--|------------------|
| 14/00626/OUT | Outline application for the erection of up to 12 dwellings | Refused |
| 15/00009/REF (APP/A2335/W/15/3033373) | Outline application for the erection of up to 12 dwellings | Appeal dismissed |

| | | |
|--------------|---|---------|
| 16/01226/OUT | Outline application for erection of up to 11 dwellings with associated access | Refused |
|--------------|---|---------|

4.0 Consultation Responses

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

| Consultee | Response |
|------------------------------|--|
| County Highways | Concerns are raised with regards to the proposed access arrangements. The County Highways Officer requests that the visibility splays for the access be determined by the 85 percentile speed based on a 7 day traffic count, that the developer provide a swept path analysis to ensure that larger vehicle can access the development, the proposal provide a 2m footway along Aldcliffe Hall Lane to provide a crossing point with tactile paving tiles to Craiglands Court and that should the additional footway narrow Aldcliffe Hall Road to less than 4.2m, a priority working scheme may be required. |
| Environmental Health Officer | No objections, conditions requested regarding contaminated land assessment and electric vehicle charging infrastructure. |
| Engineering Team | No response received. |
| Electricity North West | Identifies infrastructure within the development site. Standard guidance literature regarding working requirements close to electricity infrastructure is provided. |
| Fire Safety Officer | Advice provided regarding building regulation requirements. |
| Lead Local Flood Authority | Upon submission, the application was wrongly described as for the erection of 11 dwellings thereby defining the proposal as major development. To this proposal the LLFA raised an objection due to the lack of a site-specific flood risk assessment and surface water drainage strategy. The applicant has since reduced the quantum of development to 7 dwellings. The LLFA have not commented on this application as 'minor development' falls outside of their statutory consultation requirement. |
| Mineral Safeguarding | No response received. |
| Natural England | No objection subject to conditions requiring the agreement of a Homeowner Information Pack and Construction Environment Management Plan. |
| Parish Council | <p>Objection raised on the following summarised grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Aldcliffe is not a sustainable settlement. - The proposal does not comply with NDP Policy ASNP5 regarding housing provision. - The proposal conflicts with the requirements of Policy ASNP3, the proposal would result in significant harm to the special landscape character of Low Coastal Drumlins. - The proposal could result in harm to the Lune Estuary and the associated ecological designations. - The proposal would result in harm to or loss of lengths of hedgerow. - Development would have an adverse impact upon the setting and significance of NDHAs. - The proposal would result in highway safety concerns along Aldcliffe Hall Lane. - The site is subject to surface water flooding, not just in the location identified on the Flood risk maps for surface water. |

| | |
|------------------------------|---|
| Public Rights of Way Officer | No response received. |
| Ramblers Association | No response received. |
| Arboricultural Officer | Raises concerns regarding the loss of hedgerow H3 which should be incorporated into the development, the tree protection plan is based on the retention of the boundary hedgerows H1 and H2 which directly conflicts with the proposed entrance layout and the Arboricultural Implications Assessment (AIA) which requires their removal and relocation, the AIA also suggests that hedgerows H2 and H3 can be translocated, although it is not clear where these hedges would be translocated to, or if this is feasible given the distance they would have to be moved. |
| United Utilities | Raises concerns regarding the location of the development, including the access arrangement and the impacts upon United Utilities infrastructure. |
| Conservation Team | Objection, the development would result in harm to the setting of West Lodge, a non-designated heritage asset. |
| Cadent Gas | No objection, advice note relating to Cadent Gas Standard guidance literature is requested |

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

- 67 letters of objection have been received by the Local Planning Authority raising the following summarised concerns:
 - Access and highway safety concerns arising from increased traffic within the village
 - Flood risk and increased drainage issues arising from development of the site
 - Increased surface and ground water flood risk
 - Provision of 'Village Green' would give rise to impacts upon existing privacy levels
 - Risk of crime and antisocial behaviour
 - Impact of development upon electricity substation and pumping station
 - Lack of public amenities and transport within the village
 - Impact of residential amenity through overlooking
 - Conflicts with the Neighbourhood Development Plan
 - Visual harm to the character and appearance of the low coastal drumlin landscape
 - Highway safety concerns arising from the construction phase
 - Loss of land for agricultural purposes
 - Impact upon the setting of non-designated heritage assets
 - The proposal does not meet clearly identified local housing needs
 - Loss of biodiversity and impacts upon wildlife
 - Impacts upon the provision of services such as electricity
 - Harm to and loss of hedgerows

5.0 Analysis

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

- Principle of development
- Landscape and heritage impact
- Access and highway impacts
- Biodiversity
- Drainage and flood risk
- Impact on residential amenity
- Mineral Safeguarding

5.2 **Principle of development** (NPPF Section 2: Achieving Sustainable Development, Section 4: Decision-making and Section 5: Delivering a Sufficient Supply of Homes; 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; Review of the Development Management DPD (DM DPD) policies DM1: New Residential Development and Meeting Housing Needs, DM2: Housing Standards; DM4: Residential Development outside Main Urban Areas; Aldcliffe with Stodday Neighbourhood Development Plan (ASNDP) policy ASNP5: Housing; Aldcliffe with Stodday Housing Needs Assessment 2019, Meeting Housing Need Supplementary Planning Guidance (February 2022).)

5.2.1 The Local Plan requires development proposals to accord with the Councils identified settlement hierarchy set out in Policy SP2. Development outside of the main urban centres should preferentially be directed towards the identified rural settlements. Aldcliffe is not identified as a sustainable rural settlement and therefore falls into the category of a rural village. Policy SP2 states that these types of settlements will accommodate development that meets evidenced local needs only. Policy DM4 of the DMDPD expands on this and states: "Proposals for new housing in other settlements which have not been identified as sustainable settlements will only be supported if it can be demonstrated that the development will enhance the vitality of the local community and meet an identified and specific local housing need". Policy ASNP5 sets out that limited small-scale housing will be supported in the Parish where the development will enhance the vitality of the local community, meets the housing needs of the Parish, and where it is in accordance with other policies.

5.2.2 The site is outside the settlement boundary of Lancaster and as set out above can be defined as a rural village with respect to the settlement hierarchy. The edge of the urban area of Lancaster lies on the western side of the canal approximately 0.5 miles away. There is a clear distinction between the urban area of Lancaster and the small settlement of Aldcliffe which is separated by fields and tree lines on the western side of Aldcliffe Road. There are also groups of trees on the eastern side of the canal which provide some screening of the houses on the Haverbreaks estate.

5.2.3 The proximity to the urban area of Lancaster should however be acknowledged when assessing the sustainability credentials of the development site. There are no footpaths along Aldcliffe Hall Lane or Aldcliffe Road between the site and the canal. There is access along Aldcliffe Hall Drive, which is understood to be an unformalised right of way which provides a route down to the canal towpath on the opposite side of Aldcliffe Road, which then links with the Canal towpath and continues to the centre of Lancaster. The distance from the site to the nearest supermarket (Aldcliffe Road) is 1 mile. It is approximately 1.3 miles into the city centre (Penny Street). Other options for accessing the city centre would be via the Lune Estuary footpath/cycle path which connects from the bottom of Aldcliffe Hall Lane to New Quarry Road and St. Georges Quay, although this is a greater distance. The site does suffer from a lack of public transport, with the nearest bus stop which would most logically be utilised is located on the A6 in front of the hospital, approximately 1.3 miles from the site, although there is a bus stop on Willow Lane which can be accessed via public footpaths around Fairfield Nature Reserve 1 mile to the north. The train station approximately 1.5 miles from the site.

5.2.4 In terms of Lancaster City Councils housing land supply position, the November 2022 Housing Land Supply Statement illustrates that only 2.1 years of housing supply can be demonstrated. As such, a 5 year supply of housing land cannot currently be demonstrated. The NPPF sets out that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development and relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up-to-date if the Local Planning Authority cannot demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites. For decision making this means granting planning permission unless:

- Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against policies of the NPPF taken as a whole; or
- Specific policies in the NPPF which seek to protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed.

As a consequence, there is a clear expectation that unless material considerations imply otherwise, sites that offer the opportunity to deliver housing should be considered favourably.

- 5.2.5 Given the proximity of Aldcliffe to the built up area of Lancaster, the site cannot be deemed wholly geographically unsustainable. It is acknowledged that most journeys are likely to take place by car, however, there are opportunities available to walk or cycle to workplaces within the centre of Lancaster or to access public transport in the form of the train and bus from the city centre. In addition, the site is near main recreation routes along the River Lune Estuary and the Lancaster Canal.
- 5.2.6 The application does not specifically address the requirement for development to meet identified housing needs as set out in policy ASNP5. As identified within the NDP and the accompanying Aldcliffe-With-Stodday Housing Needs Assessment, development should respond to the identified need for smaller dwellings of up to 3 bedrooms. House types should prioritise terraced and semi-detached houses and bungalows suitable for smaller households and older people seeking to downsize. There is no evidence of need for larger, detached 4+ bedroom properties in the Parish from the recent housing needs assessment and household survey and these house types should be avoided in proposals. The indicative site plan provided does indicate the provision of larger detached dwellings, similar to those on the opposite side of the road, which would most likely fail to contribute positively towards meeting the identified need. However, as this is an outline application seeking approval for access and landscaping only, it would be for a reserved matters application to detail how this policy requirement would be satisfied. The fact remains, at this stage the development of this site for housing *could* contribute towards meeting identified local housing needs.
- 5.2.7 The proposal would provide a contribution towards housing supply within the District. It *could* also deliver housing which meets identified local housing needs. However, there are concerns with how the site and the proposed development relates to the existing settlement pattern and these are discussed further below. There are also deficiencies in terms of the sustainability of the location as set out above. The proposal does not demonstrate how it enhances or maintains the vitality of the local community and as evidenced by the number of objections received by the Local Planning Authority, it does not have local support. However, it is considered that the principle of development within the broader village of Aldcliffe cannot be disregarded. The location of development, in terms of its sustainability was not one of the reasons for refusal in relation to the previous two planning applications at this site. It was one of the issues considered by the Planning Inspector when assessing the appeal associated with application 14/00626/OUT. At this time, the Inspectorate agreed with the Council's approach and confirmed that Aldcliffe would be a sustainable location for smaller scale development, particularly considering the lack of a 5-year supply of deliverable housing land and the NPPFs presumption in favour of development. In fact, given the deterioration of the Council's 5-year housing land supply position since the previous applications and appeal, greater weight should be given to the provision of housing within this location. The Aldcliffe with Stodday NDP has also been recently adopted, however, there are no policies contained within the NDP which would necessarily alter the assessment of the principle of development in this settlement. It is therefore considered that the principle of smaller scale development within the broader location of Aldcliffe, in light of the lack of a 5-year supply of deliverable housing land, is considered acceptable.
- 5.3 **Landscape and heritage impact NPPF Section 12: Achieving Well-Designed Places, Section 15: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment, Section 16: Conserving and enhancing the historic environment; Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policies SP7: Maintaining Lancaster District's Unique Heritage, SP8: Protecting the Natural Environment, EN3: The Open Countryside; Review of the Development Management DPD (DM DPD) policies DM29: Key Design Principles, DM30: Sustainable design, DM41: Development Affecting Non-Designated Heritage or their Settings, DM45: Protection of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland, DM46: Development and Landscape Impact; Aldcliffe with Stodday Neighbourhood Development Plan (ASNDP) policies ASNP2: Supporting Walking and Cycling, ASNP3: Protecting and Enhancing Local Character and Landscape, ASNP4: Promoting High Quality and Detailed Design, ASNP5: Housing, ASNP7: Sustainable Design; A Landscape Strategy for Lancashire Landscape Character Assessment.**
- 5.3.1 This application is described within the application form as a resubmission of the refused 2014 outline application reference: 14/00626/OUT, however, there are clear differences between these development proposals. The application now being considered is of a reduced scale with respect to development site area which is confined to the west opposite West Lodge and the access into Craiglands Court. The quantum of development has also been reduced from 11 dwellings to a total of 7 dwellings. Although the proposal only seeks approval of the access and landscaping at this

stage, an indicative layout has been provided to show how 7 dwellings could be accommodated. This shows 7 dwellings on either side of a single access road through the site and extending to the east. The Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment which accompanies the application sets out that the proposed houses would be two storey detached houses with garages and with maximum roof ridge heights of 8 metres, although the matters of scale, layout and design are reserved for later consideration. Access to the site would be taken from the location of the current field gates and would include a width of 6.6 metres to the road with 2 metre pavements either side. Pavements would also extend along the frontage of the site along Aldcliffe Hall Lane.

- 5.3.2 It is acknowledged that the development area has been reduced in overall size and now no longer includes development on land located on the highest points of the drumlin landscape, however, there is still a significant change in levels across the proposed development site. As previously described, rising from the lowest point of the site near the field gates which sits at around 9mAOD the levels increase towards the east, up to the highest point within the site of approximately 16.2mAOD. Levels continue to increase outside of the red edged area as the drumlin increases in height. The top of this drumlin is situated at approximately 22mAOD. A number of the dwellings are shown on the indicative site plan as being located in the lower parts of the site, however, the easternmost plots would extend up the lower slopes of the drumlin and would be seen at a notably higher level relative to the lower-level plots.
- 5.3.3 The development site and the village of Aldcliffe is located within the Low Coastal Drumlins landscape character area. This landscape area is defined by its relationship to coastal environments including the nearby Lune Estuary. The distinctive undulating drumlins in this area appear as low rounded hills surrounded by flat lowlands and shallow watercourses. The baseline description for the landscape character area states, amongst other things, that it encompasses areas of high tranquillity, particularly around the Lune Estuary.
- 5.3.4 The NPPF states that the principle of the planning system is to take account of the varying roles and character of different areas, including recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. This is reflected within Policy DM46 of the DM DPD which seeks to protect locally important landscapes, which also makes specific reference to the Lune Estuary coastal environment, by supporting developments which are in scale and keeping with the landscape character. In addition to this, policy ASNP3 sets out various design codes (detailed within the Aldcliffe Design Codes document) which must be addressed. This policy also states that new buildings should be in harmony with their setting. Design Code 4 requires that development does not interrupt any long distance views and sets out that topography should be considered in the positioning and layout of buildings and, rather importantly, that the distinctive drumlin landscape should be protected.
- 5.3.5 The village of Aldcliffe is for the most part nestled within a fold in the drumlin topography and is also largely within the former grounds of Aldcliffe Hall. This setting is such that most development within the village including the more recent development at Craiglunds Court and Oaklands Court opposite the site are largely enveloped by landform and vegetation. This serves to anchor the lower areas of the village into the landscape such that they are not prominent nor obtrusive within wider views. The older elements of the village such as the development around Bank Farm but also some of the newer development along Aldcliffe Hall Drive is on higher land, however, these higher dwellings are largely filtered through the mature wooded landscape which encompasses and extends through the village.
- 5.3.6 The application is supported by a Landscape and Visual Impact Appraisal (LVIA) which sets out that the effects of the development on the key physical features and characteristics of the site would be limited. It goes on to say that adverse visual effects would result from the development but these would be limited to those living immediately adjacent to the site, and users of the Lune Valley Footpath (assumed Lune Estuary Footpath). The LVIA ultimately concludes that a development of 7 dwellings on this site would be in scale and keeping with the low coastal drumlins landscape character area and appropriate to its surroundings in terms of siting, scale, massing, design, materials, external appearance and landscape treatment.
- 5.3.7 However, the Local Planning Authority disagrees with the finding of this LVIA. The development site occupies open rising pastureland which extends to the south of Aldcliffe Hall Lane and expands outwards from the villages enclosed wooded setting. It is conspicuously open and the landform is such that the site is clearly visible in views from various points along Aldcliffe Hall Lane, from various

points along the former railway line which now forms part of the River Lune Millennium Park Multi-use Path (which forms part of National Cycle Route 6), from the elevated public footpath along the embankment to the River Lune (FP31) and from sections along public footpath (FP 50) to the south and east of the site.

- 5.3.8 Whilst the development proposal has been reduced in area relative to the previously refused schemes, the fact remains that the lower areas of the drumlin landform are still evident within the wider landscape views mentioned. The proposal would result in 7 dwellings protruding from the existing southern edge of the settlement which at present is anchored by vegetation and hunkers down into the contours of the landscape. This protrusion of development would be significantly obtrusive within the wider landscape setting to the village. It would introduce an inappropriate spur of development isolated along the southern edge of Aldcliffe Hall Lane and which poorly relates to the settlement pattern and would conflict with the present extensively filtered and screened edge to Aldcliffe from these perspectives.
- 5.3.9 In light of level changes, it is also clear that some of the dwellings within this site would be elevated above the existing housing at Oaklands Court and Craiglunds Court. Particularly given the highlighted intention for two storey dwellings with up to 8 metre high ridges as set out in the LVIA. The spur of development would appear stark upon the lower and mid slopes of the drumlin landform. This would harm the character of this landscape feature which is characterised by rolling open pastureland topped by small groups of trees/hedges. It is this undulating drumlin terrain which is so important to the setting of the village when viewed from the south and west. The proposal would conflict significantly with the requirement for development to consider topography and ensure that the distinctive drumlin landscape is protected.
- 5.3.10 This outline proposal also includes the landscaping of the site. The landscaping indicated on the indicative site plan appear to be indicative only, no other information with respect to landscaping has been submitted. The ability to determine landscaping at this stage given the restricted detail provided is limited. However, what is clear is that the site area as defined by the red edge is much reduced relative to previous applications. Moreover, the indicative site plan exemplifies the way in which development would for the most part fill the development site with only limited space retained for landscaping beyond boundary hedgerows and perhaps individual trees within domestic gardens. Whilst it appears the applicant owns greater areas of land around the site in which landscaping could be located, the effect of providing landscaping around what has already been determined to be an inappropriate spur of development would have the effect of eroding the sense of openness of the drumlin terrain which characterises the southern boundary of the village. It would also serve to draw attention to this inappropriate and isolated southerly protrusion form Aldcliffe Hall Lane and highlight the fact that the landscaping is trying to hide or filter views of development which essentially conflicts with the prevailing settlement pattern and topography. It is also clear that any landscaping would take a significant period of time, particularly in this rather exposed estuarine environment, to establish.
- 5.3.11 The proposed access arrangements into the site from Aldcliffe Hall Lane also raise significant concerns. Whilst it is acknowledged the field gates are already present, along with a substation and pumping station, the current character of Aldcliffe Hall Lane is one of rurality. This is principally a result of the narrow nature of the lane and sense of enclosure formed by the level changes, retaining walls, tree lines and hedgerows. The entrances to Craiglunds Court and Oaklands Court do have a suburban character, however, along the southern edge of the lane, the rural character is unaltered. The proposed access replicates this access arrangement including a dual lane road along with pavements extending for a short length across the frontage of the site in both directions. The installation of this point of access would implicate lengths of hedgerow, creating a further widening of the lane and introduce urbanising features such as pavements which would be at odds with the character of the lane taken as a whole. It is considered that the location and scale of the proposed site access would harmfully erode the rural character and appearance in this part of Aldcliffe Hall Lane.
- 5.3.12 The Aldcliffe with Stodday Neighbourhood Development Plan identifies West Lodge as a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA) due to its historical significance contributing to the “collective memory” of the area. The building dates from 1887 and was the westernmost lodge building for the former Aldcliffe Hall. It is built utilising materials typical of the village and has associations with E.B. Dawson a person of some importance in Lancaster. Relative to the previously refused applications,

this proposal would now include development in the form of a sub-urbanising access arrangement and dwellings located directly in front of this locally significant building. To a certain extent the setting and significance of this building as a lodge house for the former Aldcliffe Hall has been diminished by the recent development of Craiglunds and Oaklands Court which, in heritage terms, was a fairly insensitive housing development. However, West Lodge is still located on the western periphery of the village and of the former Aldcliffe Hall estate. It also still benefits from views overlooking the open fields and undulating terrain which encompasses the village. The presence of the development proposed located in front of the NDHA would undoubtedly be within its setting.

- 5.3.13 Policy DM41 of the DMDPD states that proposals affecting the setting of a NDHA will be required to give due consideration to its significance and ensure that this is protected or enhanced where possible. It further states that new buildings in close proximity to NDHA should ensure that the setting is not compromised. Policy ASNP3 sets out that designs should be sensitive to the character and significance of any nearby heritage assets, including the identified NDHAs.
- 5.3.14 Layout is a reserved matter, however, the indicative layout shows large, detached properties enclosing the eastern and southern aspect of West Lodge. It is clear to see that development of this site would inevitably enclose West Lodge from the east and south. It would sever this properties relationship with the wider open drumlin terrain and would interrupt views of the asset. This would harm the appreciation of the importance of this building in historical and aesthetic terms, and would undermine its function as a former peripheral lodge building and a local landmark on the edge of the village. Given the position and confines of the development site, it is difficult to envisage an alternative layout that would not compromise the NDHA in this manner. On this basis, it is considered that the development would significantly harm the setting of West Lodge. It would therefore be contrary to policy DM41 and ASNP3.
- 5.3.15 Overall, the development would result in the inappropriate and harmful expansion of development that would appear as an isolated and incongruent spur of development expanding southwards into what is considered a locally important and distinctive landscape of coastal drumlins along the Lune Estuary. The loss of openness and erosion of the drumlin landform along the village edge would have a significant and demonstrable adverse impact on the wider landscape and the localised character of Aldcliffe Hall Lane. This notable level of harm would be experienced from numerous public vantage points within an otherwise tranquil estuarine environment. There is relatively limited scope for mitigation given the reduced area of the site and the likely scale of development to follow indicated by the site plan. The presence of landscaping could also have the effect of highlighting the inappropriateness of scheme rather than complementing well-designed development. It is concluded that the proposal would result in significant and demonstrable harm to the character and appearance of Aldcliffe Hall Lane and the surrounding area.
- 5.4 **Access and highway impacts** NPPF Section 9: Promoting Sustainable Transport; Review of the Development Management DPD (DM DPD) policies DM29: Key Design Principles, DM61: Walking and Cycling, Aldcliffe with Stodday Neighbourhood Development Plan (ASNDP) policies ASNP2: Supporting Walking and Cycling.
- 5.4.1 The application seeks consent for a vehicle access onto Aldcliffe Hall Lane, in the location of the current double field access gates and opposite West Lodge. The access would be wider than the current field gate arrangement to incorporate a splayed entrance and associated visibility splays. The access would consist of a 6.6 metre wide road with 2 metre wide pavements either side. The 2 metre pavements would also extend across the frontage of the site. Aldcliffe Hall Lane is an adopted road subject to a speed limit of 30mph and other than the splayed accesses into Craiglunds and Oaklands Court, does not benefit from footways, is bounded by large retaining walls, mature hedgerows, trees and private property boundaries.
- 5.4.2 County Highways have provided a consultation response stating that they do not raise an objection to the principle of the application. However, they go on to highlight a number of concerns regarding the proposed access arrangement. In the first instance, the Highways Officer states that the visibility splays for the access should be determined by the 85-percentile speed based on an appropriate 7-day survey. Such a survey does not accompany the application, instead an access plan has been provided indicating that visibility splays of 2.4 metres x 30.8 metres to the east and 2.4 metres x 27 metres to the west can be achieved. It is not apparent as to what assessment has informed these splays, whilst the splay (y-distance) falls below the recommended distance for a 30mph road of 43

metres set out in Manual for Streets. Furthermore, the splay extends out into the centre of the carriageway to the east and partly into the carriageway to the west. This is not usual practice as in most cases, unless advised otherwise by the Highways Officer, the splay should remain on the highway verge. Furthermore, the ability to achieve these visibility splays is also questionable in light of the position of the electricity substation. The indicative site layout plan shows the location of this building approximately 6.9 metres from the highway verge, however, it is clear that the current building is located hard against the rear of the highway boundary hedge and approximately only 1 metre from the highway verge. The location of the building onsite would highly likely prevent visibility to the east in its current position. The application does not make clear whether or not the developer intends to relocate the substation building and adjacent pumping station, which would entail significant cost and permission may not be forthcoming from the operators of this infrastructure. It is also clear that the provision of an access in this location would require the removal or translocation of lengths of field boundary hedgerow which are typical of the locality and form a fundamental component of the character of Aldcliffe Hall Lane, the loss or significant alteration of which would not be supported in landscape terms.

5.4.3 Within the area where the access road into the site is proposed is also a United Utilities high pressure rising main sewer and an associated pumping station. United Utilities have provided a consultation response stating that the layout included on the indicative site layout drawing, including the location of the access arrangement, would not be acceptable to them without the diversion of their assets. United Utilities also request further detailed information pertaining to drainage strategies and site levels to understand the impact of development upon their assets. This raises further questions over the deliverability of the proposal given the significant costs that would be incurred through having to divert the various pieces of above and below ground infrastructure which cross the site. It is unclear from the submission before the Council as to whether consideration has been given to the implications that this infrastructure could have upon the deliverability of the development as proposed.

5.4.4 The installation of the point of access as described above would result in harm to the character and appearance of Aldcliffe Hall Lane and for those reasons, the access arrangement is not supported in landscape terms. However, at present the application is not informed by any speed surveys to determine the 85th percentile speed which should then subsequently inform the required visibility splays to provide a safe point of access to the satisfaction of the County Highways Officer. On this basis, without detailed analysis and data on which to base the detailed design of the access and associated visibility splays, the application does not establish that a safe and suitable access can be provided. However, what is clear at this stage is that due to the presence of significant pieces of third party above and below ground electricity and drainage infrastructure, the ability to deliver the access as currently proposed, to the satisfaction of those third parties is unclear. Furthermore, the requirement to provide appropriate visibility splays would require the removal or reduction in height of significant lengths of hedgerow. This would significantly compound the landscape harm already identified for which, as set out above, the development is already considered to be unacceptable.

5.5 **Biodiversity NPPF Section 15: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment; Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policy SP8 (Protecting the Natural Environment and EN7 (Environmentally Important Areas); Review of the Development Management DPD (DM DPD) policies DM29: Key Design Principles, DM44 (The Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity), DM45 (Protection of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland); Aldcliffe with Stodday Neighbourhood Development Plan (ASNDP) policies ASNP1: Conserving and Enhancing Local Biodiversity.**

5.5.1 As set out above, a mature hedgerow forms the boundary between the development site and Aldcliffe Hall Lane. These boundary hedgerows are fundamental components of the character of the lane and are intrinsic to the character and appearance of the wider landscape. The application is supported by an Arboricultural Implications Assessment (AIA) which assesses the impact of development upon surrounding trees and hedgerows. Firstly, whilst layout of development within the site is a reserved matter, the AIA sets out that hedge H3 which forms the remnants of an historic field boundary would be translocated to facilitate development. This hedge appears to be in poor overall condition and is fragmented, however, it is not clear why development of this site could not be undertaken so as to enable the incorporation and enhancement of hedge H3 into the design. The fragmented nature of the hedgerow should be seen as an opportunity to enhance the hedgerow, not simply remove it as highlighted by the Council's Arboricultural Officer. The loss of this hedge, or its translocation if successful, would result in the loss of an historic field pattern which is identified as a

key feature of the local landscape character. Furthermore, other than a brief statement confirming the hedgerow could be translocated to 'form one side of an area of open space', the AIA provides no specific details as to where the length of H3 would be translocated to, or if this is feasible given the distance it would likely have to be moved.

- 5.5.2 The hedge to the east of the field gate is defined as hedge H1 and the hedge to the west of the field gate is defined as hedge H2 within the AIA. The AIA states that approximately five metres of hedgerow H2 will require removal to create the visibility splay to the east. The AIA does not discuss the impact of the visibility splay to the west upon hedge H1. However, the Tree Protection Plan provided in appendix 5 of the AIA is based on the retention of the boundary hedgerows H1 and H2 and does not detail the new access arrangement or its associated visibility splays. This conflicts with the proposed access shown on the site access plan and as detailed within the AIA. Given the historical, ecological, and landscape importance of these roadside hedgerows, it is essential that the full extent of removals is made clear at this stage. The actual visibility splays required to provide a safe and suitable access have not been determined, however, it is unlikely that such an access could be provided with only the removal of a 5 metre length of hedge H2 as detailed within the AIA. Given the height of hedges H1 and H2 and their location immediately adjacent Aldcliffe Hall Lane, it is highly likely that greater lengths of these hedgerows would require removal, translocation or a reduction in height. As previously discussed, the requirement to remove or relocate these hedgerows, which are inherent to the character and scenic beauty of the landscape would result in harm to the landscape character of the area, harm which is not supported.
- 5.5.3 The Lune Estuary is located approximately 440m to the west and is designated as a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). It is also covered by the Morecambe Bay Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Ramsar Site. The former is a national designation with the latter covered by European legislation. In order to comply with the Habitats Regulations, the local authority, in determining the proposal, must have regard to any potential impacts. It must be determined whether the proposal is likely to have a significant effect on any European site, proceeding to the Appropriate Assessment stage where significant effects cannot be ruled out. A Habitat Regulations Assessment has been undertaken and which is contained within a separate document. This Habitat Regulations Assessment concluded that mitigation in the form of Homeowner Information Packs and a Construction Environment Management Plan would be required in order to educate residents of the proposed dwellings as to the sensitivities of this protected environment and manage the impacts of the construction phase of the development upon it. Both the Homeowner Information Packs and Construction Environment Management Plan could be secured by condition should the application be approved. Furthermore, the Ecological Appraisal which accompanied this application concluded that given the small scale of this development, the intervening land-use and the poor suitability of the site for over-wintering birds, that the site does not represent functionally linked land. Natural England has been consulted on this Habitat Regulations Assessment and have confirmed that they are satisfied with the conclusion.
- 5.5.4 The Ecological Appraisal concludes that the site consists largely of agricultural improved grassland with bordering hedgerow in addition to some trees. The report sets out that the site is not diverse in terms of habitat types or characteristics and species diversity. The habitat with greatest ecological value is the hedgerow and trees. The hedges provide good bird nesting habitat and provide flight-lines for bats. The proposal would require the removal of hedges for the access and potentially layout of development within the site, however, at this stage, the exact nature of the hedgerow removal has not been fully established. The application makes reference to the inclusion of a 'Village Green' within the Ecological Design Strategy and there is mention of a 'Village Green' on the initial indicative site plan submitted to the Council, however, it was removed from later iterations. No details have been provided as to the 'Village Green'; it is not included within the application description nor does it fall within the red edge development site which would be required as it would represent a change of use of land. Accordingly, the Council has not included the 'Village Green' within the determination of this application. A biodiversity net gain calculation is contained within the Ecological Appraisal, however, this also is based on the incorporation of the 'Village Green' in order to provide habitat enhancement opportunities to result in the net gain of 31.74%. The Ecological Appraisal makes what are considered broad statements as to the way in which biodiversity net gain can be delivered, but no specific details of the habitat enhancement scheme have been provided at this stage. This could however be addressed by a planning condition which could include works within the blue edged area so long as the developer benefits from the control of this land to maintain the habitat enhancement works into the future.

- 5.6 **Drainage and flood risk** NPPF Section 14: Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change; Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policy SP8 (Protecting the Natural Environment); Review of the Development Management DPD (DM DPD) policies DM33 (Development and Flood Risk), DM34 (Surface Water Run-off and Sustainable Drainage), DM35 (Water Supply and Waste Water); Aldcliffe with Stodday Neighbourhood Development Plan (ASNDP) policies ASNP8: Surface Water Drainage.
- 5.6.1 United Utilities (UU) have provided a consultation response highlighting that they raise significant concerns with respect to the location of the access and the layout of development shown on the indicative layout plan. A UU rising main and associated pumping infrastructure is located within the site and UU have confirmed that they would object to the proposal if the layout was not amended to avoid this infrastructure or if this infrastructure was not diverted. It would be for the developer to ensure that the infrastructure is not implicated by the development proposed either through an appropriate layout agreed with UU or by diverting the UU infrastructure.
- 5.6.2 United Utilities has also requested additional information pertaining to drainage and level details and has asked for this to be provided prior to determination. This information is requested in order to determine the potential impact of development upon their assets. However, as the application is outline in form and layout is a reserved matter, a detailed drainage strategy has not been developed. UU are satisfied that this information could be secured by condition as a result. The outline drainage strategy provided sets out that foul water will discharge into the public sewer which passes through the site.
- 5.6.3 The site lies within flood zone 1, however, there is a pocket of medium risk surface water flooding within the southern area of the site which on site corresponds with a depression within the field which features a marshy appearance. The remainder of the site is not identified as being susceptible to flooding from any sources, although comments made by members of the public received by the Council suggest that most parts of the lower lying areas within the development site and along the lane are subject to surface water flooding during heavy rainfall events. However, the Council must determine the application in accordance with the data produced by the Environment Agency in this regard. The indicative site plan includes an indication as to the location of the medium surface water flood risk within the site, this seems to approximately correspond with the data provided on the Environment Agency surface water flooding map. The indicative site plan details how 7 dwellings could be provided within the site without hard development encroaching within this surface water flood risk area, which itself could remain as open space.
- 5.6.4 The surface water drainage strategy provided and soakaway tests undertaken so far indicate that drainage via infiltration could be feasible for this development. Drainage in this manner would be in accordance with the surface water drainage hierarchy. However, as a fall back, a combined sewer passes through the site into which surface water could be directed. Given the size of the site and the availability of drainage options, it is considered that appropriate measures could be incorporated to adequately deal with surface water drainage which can therefore be controlled by condition.
- 5.7 **Impact on residential amenity** NPPF Section 8: Promoting Healthy and Safe Communities, Section 12: Achieving Well-Designed Places, Section 15: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment; Review of the Development Management DPD (DM DPD) policies DM29 (Key Design Principles).
- 5.7.1 Given the difference in levels between some of the site and nearby residential properties, there is potential for overlooking. However, given the size of the site, the proposed development could potentially be accommodated without causing a detrimental impact on the amenity of the neighbouring properties or the dwellings within the site itself. There would be sufficient space within the development site to provide 7 dwellings as applied for which also meet requirements with respect to housing standards, such as the Nationally Described Space Standards, garden sizes and intervening separation distances.
- 5.8 **Mineral Safeguarding** (NPPF Section 17: Facilitating the Sustainable use of Minerals; Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan Policy: M2 Safeguarding Minerals and Guidance Note (December 2014)

- 5.8.1 The majority of the site is within a safeguarding area for minerals, development that is incompatible with mineral safeguarding (as set out in Policy M2 of the Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan) should not be supported. No consultation response has been raised in relation to the current application. The NPPF sets out that local authorities should not normally permit other development proposals in mineral safeguarding areas where they might constrain potential future use for these purposes. There is a considerable area to the north and south of Aldcliffe which is identified for mineral safeguarding.
- 5.8.2 Policy M2 of the Minerals and Waste Local Plan sets out that planning permission will not be supported for any form of development that is incompatible by reason of scale, proximity and permanence with working the minerals, unless the applicant can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the local planning authority that:
- The mineral concerned is no longer of any value or has been fully extracted.
 - The full extent of the mineral can be extracted satisfactorily prior to the incompatible development taking place.
 - The incompatible development is of a temporary nature and can be completed and the site returned to its original condition prior to the minerals being worked.
 - There is an overarching need for the incompatible development that outweighs the need to avoid the sterilisation of the mineral resource.
 - That prior extraction of minerals is not feasible due to the depth of the deposit.
 - Extraction would lead to land stability problems.

A mineral resource assessment has not been submitted with this application, however, such an assessment did accompany the previously refused application 16/01226/OUT. This document set out that the subject site, in the context of the amount of land safeguarded for potential mineral extraction within Lancaster District, is insignificant. Given the nature of land uses within this area around, it is highly unlikely that extraction would ever occur, given the potential harm to amenities of residents. The mineral resource assessment also concluded that the clear and demonstrable evidence within the Council's 2014 Housing Land Monitoring Report (HLMR) which identified an 'overarching need' for housing in the District would also be a reason in its own right to set aside Policy regarding mineral extraction. In this regard, the Council's 5 year housing land supply has only deteriorated further. It is therefore considered, as was concluded in 2016, that the location of the site within a mineral safeguarding area would not be a reason to withhold planning permission for the development of this site.

6.0 Conclusion and Planning Balance

- 6.1 The Council cannot demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing sites. Footnote 8 of the NPPF means that the 'presumption in favour of sustainable development' at paragraph 11. d) of the NPPF requires consideration. As such, the most important policies should be deemed out of date and planning permission should be granted unless the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development proposed or any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole.
- 6.2 The site is not within a settlement which has been identified as being suitable for growth. However, it is close to the urban area of Lancaster with footpaths and cycle links. With respect to the economic benefits of the proposal, the scheme would result in employment during the construction phase of the development and residents would contribute to the local economy once the scheme has been delivered. The proposal would also provide housing which would to a small degree contribute towards meeting the district wide need. However, whether the proposal would meet the locally identified need for smaller dwellings has not been determined as part of this outline application.
- 6.3 In terms of the environmental dimension of sustainable development, the position of the proposal at the rural edge of Aldcliffe on land that is conspicuously elevated in a locally important and distinctive landscape of low coastal drumlins along the Lune Estuary would mean that the proposal would have a significant and demonstrable adverse impact on the wider landscape and the localised character of Aldcliffe Hall Lane. The harm would be experienced from numerous public vantage points within

a tranquil estuarine environment which is widely used for recreation purposes including the nearby River Lune multi-use path and a network of surrounding footpaths. As such, the incongruously exposed extension to the pattern of the settlement at Aldcliffe would result in demonstrable and unjustified harm to this distinctive landscape. In addition to this, the proposal would result in harm to West Lodge through inappropriate development within its setting. Furthermore, the design of the access into the development site is not based on any detailed site investigation to establish the nature of the highway and to inform a design which would be acceptable in highway safety terms. The requirement for visibility splays to provide safe access points would almost certainly require the removal of significant lengths of hedgerows along Aldcliffe Hall Lane and most likely the relocation of above and below ground infrastructure. No assessment has been undertaken to ascertain the appropriate visibility splays required nor their resultant impact upon the boundary hedgerows which are integral to the character of the lane.

- 6.4 It is therefore considered that that the adverse environmental impacts arising from the development on the character and appearance of the landscape, unjustified harm to the setting of West Lodge, failure to provide an access which would incorporate acceptable safe visibility splays and failure to determine the impact of the access upon the hedgerows significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits that have been identified, including the contribution to housing supply. It is therefore not considered that the proposal constitutes sustainable development.

Recommendation

That Outline Planning Permission BE REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. By reason of the sites elevated profile and position to the south of the existing settlement along Aldcliffe Hall Lane, the proposal will appear as an overly prominent and obtrusive spur of development extending into the open countryside and conflicting with the natural grain of the locally important low coastal drumlin landscape and ultimately poorly relating to the settlement of Aldcliffe, to the detriment of the character and appearance of the landscape. The proposal is found to contradict the provisions of Section 12 and 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy EN2 of the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD, Policies DM4, DM29 and DM46 of the Review of the Development Management DPD and Policy ASNP3 of the Aldcliffe with Stodday Neighbourhood Development Plan.
2. The loss of the site as open space would result in unjustified harm to the significance of West Lodge, a non-designated heritage asset, through the resulting impact upon its setting. The proposal would therefore fail to comply with the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular Section 16 and Policies DM29 and DM41 of the Review of the Development Management DPD.
3. The application fails to adequately demonstrate that the proposal would provide adequate visibility splays to achievable a safe and suitable vehicular access from Aldcliffe Hall Lane. Consequently, the proposed development represents an unacceptable risk to the health and safety of users of the highway network and the proposed access point. For this reason, the proposal is found to contradict the provisions of Section 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy DM29 of the Review of the Development Management DPD.
4. Insufficient information has been provided to enable the Local Planning Authority to determine the way in which the proposed development would impact upon existing hedgerows and subsequently the further wider landscape implications of the development. For this reason, the proposal is found to contradict the provisions of Section 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policies DM29 and DM45 of the Review of the Development Management DPD.

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

Lancaster City Council takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals, in the interests of delivering sustainable development. As part of this approach the Council offers a pre-application service, aimed at positively influencing development proposals. Regrettably the applicant has failed to take advantage of this service and the resulting proposal is unacceptable for the reasons prescribed in the Notice. The

applicant is encouraged to utilise the pre-application service prior to the submission of any future planning applications, in order to engage with the local planning authority to attempt to resolve the reasons for refusal.

Background Papers

None

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Agenda Item | A7 |
| Application Number | 23/00231/VCN |
| Proposal | Erection of a side extension and creation of an additional parking area to the rear (pursuant to the variation of condition 3 in relation to surface water drainage and maintenance regime on planning permission 22/01137/FUL) |
| Application site | Lancaster Brewery Lancaster Leisure Park Wyresdale Road Lancaster |
| Applicant | Phil Simpson |
| Agent | Mr Anthony Gilmour |
| Case Officer | Mr Sam Robinson |
| Departure | No |
| Summary of Recommendation | Approval, subject to conditions |

(i) Procedural Matters

This form of development would normally be dealt with under the Scheme of Delegation. However, as Lancaster City Council is a partial landowner, the application must be determined by the Planning Regulatory Committee.

1.0 Application Site and Setting

- 1.1 Lancaster Brewery is located within Lancaster Leisure Park on Wyresdale Road. The site is relatively well screened due to the band of mature trees that surround the site to the east, south and west. To the west of the site lies Burrow Beck. The current use of the building is thought to be a mixed use ranging from general industrial, storage and distribution and part drinking establishment.
- 1.2 The building sits to the south of a wider non allocated employment site which includes, but is not limited to, a factory outlet shop, antiques and farm shop whilst to the north west lies a housing a relatively new housing development.
- 1.3 The band of trees to the east and adjacent to the site are covered by a tree preservation order – 583(2016) this is also located within flood zone 2 and 3. The application site, however, lies outside these designations.

2.0 Proposal

- 2.1 Planning permission has been granted under the parent consent 22/01137/FUL for erection of a side extension and creation of an additional parking area to the rear. This is a Section 73 application to vary condition 3 on the parent application.

2.2 Condition 3 required the submission of a surface water drainage scheme including a maintenance regime prior to development commencing on site. This proposal is seeking to provide that information through this Section 73 application, rather than seeking approval for the details through the discharge of conditions process.

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 |
|--------------------|--|-----------|
| 22/01137/FUL | Erection of a side extension and creation of an additional parking area to the rear | Permitted |
| 22/00629/PLDC | Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a single storey side extension | Withdrawn |
| 19/00804/FUL | Erection of a single storey extension to the front and side | Refused |

4.0 Consultation Responses

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

| Consultee | Response |
|------------------------|--|
| Arboricultural Officer | No response |
| County Highways | No objection |
| Engineers | No objection (Subject to the works being carried out within the drainage strategy) |
| Environmental Health | No response |
| Fire Safety Officer | No response |
| Property Services | No response |
| United Utilities | No response |

4.2 No responses have been received by members of the public.

5.0 Analysis

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

- Principle of development
- Drainage

5.2 **Principle of development** (NPPF Sections 2 and 6, policies SP1 of the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD (SPLA DPD) and policies DM14 and DM15 of the Development Management DPD (DM DPD):

5.2.1 The application is made under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act to vary conditions imposed on the previous permission. One of the purposes of a Section 73 application is to seek minor material amendments to the permission where there are relevant conditions capable of being amended. Where an application under section 73 is granted, the effect is the issue of a new planning permission, sitting alongside the original permission, which remains intact and unamended.

5.2.2 Whilst a Section 73 application results in a new planning permission, it is not, however, an opportunity to re-examine the principle of the development and the merits of the original proposal unless such are affected by the amendments sought under the Section 73 application. The condition was imposed on the original application to ensure that the principle of the development was acceptable in terms of drainage and flood risk.

5.2.3 As mentioned earlier, this application is seeking to provide the drainage details requested by condition 3 on the parent 22/01137/FUL application. As such, only the drainage element will be

discussed as part of this application. As it will be discussed further in the subsequent report, as the issues of drainage have been fully considered and deemed to be acceptable, the proposed amendments do not have any adverse impact upon the principle of development being considered acceptable.

5.3 Drainage (NPPF Section 12 and policy DM34 of the DM DPD):

5.3.1 Policy DM34 requires surface water to be managed sustainably within new development. The Council will advocate the use of the surface water drainage hierarchy for new development in line with best practice.

5.3.2 The application has been submitted along with a drainage strategy, layout and details. Consideration has been given to the surface water drainage hierarchy with the drainage strategy outlining that infiltration is unfeasible due to the high clay content within the underlying soils. It is therefore proposed to discharge surface water into the Burrow Beck watercourse.

5.3.3 It is proposed that the roof area of the extension and car park will drain into subsurface storage crates which will discharge via a vortex type flow control device. This will attenuate the runoff so that discharge to Burrow Beck is restricted to not more than the calculated brownfield rate and provide an overall betterment. This will ensure that the site can adequately deal with surface water and that the proposal would not increase flood risk both on and off site.

5.3.4 The Council’s Engineers department have been consulted on the application and have raised no objection to the scheme subject to the works being carried out in accordance with the submitted details.

6.0 Conclusion and Planning Balance

6.1 In conclusion, this application does not prejudice the principle of development and the drainage details provided will ensure that surface water is dealt with in an appropriate way.

Recommendation

That Planning Permission BE GRANTED subject to the following conditions:

| Condition no. | Description | Type |
|---------------|---|----------|
| 1 | Timescales | Standard |
| 2 | Development to accord with plans | Standard |
| 3 | Development to accord with drainage details | Control |
| 4 | Implementation of AIA | Control |

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

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

Background Papers

None

| | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| Agenda Item | A8 |
| Application Number | 23/00637/LB |
| Proposal | Listed building application for the installation of a new rear service door including a roller shutter, replacement windows and door, alterations to courtyard windows and internal alterations including alterations to doors, new partitions, new ramp and freestanding booth |
| Application site | Palatine Hall Dalton Square Lancaster Lancashire |
| Applicant | Mr David Hammond |
| Agent | HPA Architects |
| Case Officer | Mr Patrick Hopwood |
| Departure | No |
| Summary of Recommendation | Approval |

(i) **Procedural Matters**

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

1.0 Application Site and Setting

1.1 The site to which this application relates is Palatine Hall, at the north end of Dalton Square in Lancaster city centre. The property is a three-storey sandstone hall building with attached townhouse, originally a church, later becoming a public hall, then a music hall, then a cinema, and most recently council offices.

1.2 The site is Grade II listed, within the setting of numerous other Grade II and II* listed buildings, including the Grade II* Queen Victoria Statue. The site also lies within Lancaster Conservation Area.

2.0 Proposal

2.1 This application seeks listed building consent for the installation of a new rear service door including an internal roller shutter, replacement windows and door, alterations to courtyard-facing windows, and internal alterations including alterations to doors, new partitions, a new ramp and a freestanding booth. The works are detailed on the submitted plans and are required by the new tenant to improve the building's current function as office space and suit the applicant company's operational needs. The applicant engaged with the Council's Conservation Team via the specialist heritage advice service prior to the submission of this application.

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 |
|--------------------|--|----------|
| 80/0979 | Conversion of premises into offices | Approved |
| 01/01332/DPA | Construction of disabled access ramp and step with railings to fire exit door | Approved |
| 01/01333/LB | Listed Building application to form a new step and ramp from emergency exit door including new railings | Approved |
| 09/00544/LB | Listed building application for the installation of CCTV cameras to the front and rear, and installation of a door entry system to the front entrance door | Approved |
| 22/00481/FUL | Installation of air source heat pumps | Approved |

4.0 Consultation Responses

4.1 At the time of writing this report, the following responses have been received from statutory and internal consultees:

| Consultee | Response |
|-------------------|---|
| Conservation Team | No objection, subject to conditions to secure details of replacement windows, details of internal partitions, and final details of courtyard alterations. |

4.2 At the time of writing this report, 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:

- Heritage

5.2 **Heritage** (NPPF Sections 12 and 16; Policies DM29, DM37, DM38 and DM39 of the Development Management DPD; Policy SP7 of the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD)

5.2.1 In accordance with the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, when considering any application that affects a Listed Building, Conservation Area or their setting the local planning authority must pay special attention to the desirability of persevering or enhancing the character or appearance of the heritage asset or its setting. This is reiterated by the heritage policies of the Local Plan. Section 16 of the NPPF seeks to conserve and enhance the historic environment; with Paragraph 199 affording 'great weight' to a designated heritage asset's conservation; Paragraph 200 requiring clear and convincing justification for any harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset; and Paragraph 202 requiring decision makers to weigh 'less than substantial' harm against the public benefits of the proposal.

5.2.2 In terms of the external works, the new rear door is required to provide a delivery entrance from the rear yard. Originally, this was to feature an external roller shutter, however amended plans have been sought by the council and the door will now comprise of folding timber doors with the security shutter housed internally. This element will be located on the 1980s extension and partially visible from Friar's Passage. Given the location on the rear of the modern extension, and the improvements made with the amended plans, this is acceptable. Alterations to the courtyard-facing windows on the modern extension are also proposed, to board over sections of the glazing and adjust door positions. This is required as the rooms behind will be used as storage, and window provision is not required by the applicant. The justification here is somewhat lacking, however as the works are reversible and on the 1980s section of the building, and subject to an appropriate external finish, design and method of fixing being agreed, can be accepted in this instance. A 1980s era door with diagonal panelling facing the courtyard is also proposed to be replaced with a glazed alternative. This will have a neutral impact on the significance of the building.

- 5.2.3 The main doors and a number of windows on the side elevations are proposed to be repaired. This does not require listed building consent so is not considered further. The submitted plans indicate that all of the windows on the front elevation are to be replaced. The Conservation Team are satisfied that the front-facing windows have little significance beyond that they are well detailed and contribute to the aesthetic significance of the building, and likely date to a late 20th century restoration. It is also acknowledged that some of these windows are in a relatively poor condition. As such, replacement of these windows can be supported subject to further details of the replacements to ensure that they are well detailed and acceptable.
- 5.2.4 Internally, glazed partitions are to be fitted behind the balustrades on the mezzanine levels to improve the acoustics and thermal efficiency of the office space, which are both currently poor. The use of glazed walls will retain the openness of the building and a new bulkhead to house the glazing will be scribed to the existing cornicing to ensure the cornicing is undamaged. Other partitions to form meeting rooms are also considered acceptable and will have a neutral impact on the building's significance. A condition of further details of the internal partitions is not recommended given the satisfactory level of detail already described on the submitted amended plans. The justification in improving acoustic and thermal properties, and creating more usable office space is acceptable and supported. The freestanding booth will not affect any historic fabric, and although marginally impinging on the internal openness is fully reversible and raises no significant concerns. A ramp is proposed on the ground floor to allow wheeled access between the ground and lower ground floors. This will have a low level impact and is justified as there is currently only stepped access between these floors.

6.0 Conclusion and Planning Balance

- 6.1 Overall, the internal and external works are acceptable, with the less than substantial harm outweighed by the public benefits in improving the thermal, acoustic, and operational properties of the listed building as a large-scale office space, which is seen as the most viable use. Subject to conditions securing further details of replacement windows and works to the courtyard-facing elevations, the scheme complies with the local and national development plan when read as a whole, and as such is recommended for approval.

Recommendation

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

| Condition no. | Description | Type |
|----------------------|---|-------------------------|
| 1 | Standard Listed Building Consent Timescale | Control |
| 2 | Works in Accordance with Approved Plans and Details | Control |
| 3 | Details of external works | Prior to relevant works |
| 4 | Window condition survey and replacement detail | Prior to relevant works |

Background Papers

N/A

LANCASTER CITY COUNCIL

| APPLICATION NO | DETAILS | DECISION |
|----------------|---|-----------------------|
| 22/00469/FUL | Kingfisher Lodge, Featherbed Meadow, Borwick Lane Demolition of existing holiday lodge and raised decking area, erection of new holiday lodge with raised decking and installation of a package treatment plant for Mr M Austin (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 22/01005/CU | Wennington Hall School, Lodge Lane, Wennington Change of use of residential school and ancillary buildings (C2) to hotel (C1), and installation of EV charging points for Mr James Warburton (Upper Lune Valley Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 22/01085/FUL | 1 Deansgate, Morecambe, Lancashire Change of use from commercial photography studio (E(g)) to dwellinghouse (C3) for Mr Andrew Clarke (Poulton Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 22/01086/LB | 1 Deansgate, Morecambe, Lancashire Listed building consent for the conversion of commercial photography studio to a dwellinghouse, alterations including removal and insertion of internal walls, and installation of secondary glazing, central heating and multi fuel stove for Mr Andrew Clarke (Poulton Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 22/01161/FUL | A1 Cold Stores, Whams Lane, Bay Horse Erection of a building to provide a cold store for Mr. Stephen Smith (Ellel Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 22/01216/FUL | Forgewood Cottage, Low Road, Halton Retrospective change of use of domestic garage to personal training studio (sui generis) with associated parking for Mr A Shaw (Halton-with-Aughton Ward 2015 Ward) | Application Refused |
| 22/01271/FUL | Ty Nant, Wyresdale Road, Quernmore Installation of solar panels to south roof slope for Dr T Dawson (Lower Lune Valley Ward Ward) | Application Refused |
| 22/01272/LB | Ty Nant, Wyresdale Road, Quernmore Listed building application for the installation of solar panels to south roof slope for Dr T Dawson (Lower Lune Valley Ward Ward) | Application Refused |
| 22/01358/FUL | 10 Alice Street, Morecambe, Lancashire Demolition of existing warehouse (retrospective) and erection of 5 dwellings (C3) for Mr B Long (Poulton Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 22/01414/FUL | Lune Garth, The Hermitage Estate, Low Road Change of use from workshop to 3 bed holiday let, including the erection of a first floor extension and single storey extension, erection of sunken games room with green roof to provide garden/amenity space with balustrade, installation of timber cladding, new windows and doors, and juliet balcony to the south elevation for Mr. Jerry Huppert (Halton-with-Aughton Ward 2015 Ward) | Application Permitted |

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

| | | |
|--------------|--|-----------------------|
| 22/01430/FUL | 4 Needham Avenue, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of a single storey side extension and part retrospective application for the garage conversion with installation of windows for Mr D. Knowles (Harbour Ward 2015 Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 22/01434/FUL | Thwaite End Barn, Main Road, Bolton Le Sands Change of use of agricultural building and land to 2 dwellings (C3), creation of a parking and garden area, installation of replacement windows and doors and installation of a package treatment plant for Mr Mason (Bolton And Slyne Ward Ward) | Application Refused |
| 22/01437/FUL | Thwaite End Barn, Main Road, Bolton Le Sands Change of use of existing ancillary living accommodation to 3 dwellings (C3), creation of a parking and garden area, installation of replacement windows and doors and installation of a package treatment plant for Mr Mason (Bolton And Slyne Ward Ward) | Application Refused |
| 22/01502/REM | Land West Of Castle Hill, Wagon Road, Dolphinholme Reserved matters application for the erection of 1 dwelling and detached garage for Mr & Mrs Troughton (Ellel Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 22/01504/FUL | Holly Bank, Melling Road, Melling Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of a single storey dwelling with associated parking and erection of detached garage to the rear elevation for Mr Steve Sutton (Upper Lune Valley Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 22/01589/FUL | Land At Grid Reference E350941 N468518, Laithbutts Lane, Nether Kellet Erection of a detached dwelling with a detached garage, associated landscaping and package treatment plant for Astin + Ellison (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00024/VCN | Land At Grid Reference E350582 N467845, Hill Lane, Nether Kellet Erection of a 1.5 storey dwelling with associated access and alterations to land levels (pursuant to the variation of conditions 2 on planning permission 19/00088/FUL to alter the footprint and design of the dwelling) for Mr and Mrs Andrew Foley (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00025/FUL | 1 Tithebarn Hill, Glasson Dock, Lancaster Raise the height of the existing boundary wall to 2.2m for Mr Simon Bibby (Ellel Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00034/DIS | Yealand Hall, Silverdale Road, Yealand Redmayne Discharge of conditions 5 and 6 on approved application 22/00913/FUL for Mr & Mrs Lock (Silverdale Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00035/FUL | 29 Thornfield , Ashton Road, Lancaster Creation of an access and dropped kerb for Michael Bell (Scotforth West Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00038/DIS | 9 St Johns Avenue, Silverdale, Lancashire Discharge of conditions 4, 5 and 6 on approved application 22/00072/VCN for Mr John Burrow (Silverdale Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00048/DIS | 1 Low Road, Middleton, Morecambe Discharge of condition 4 on approved application 19/01481/LB for Jonathan Hodgson (Overton Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

| | | |
|--------------|---|-----------------------|
| 23/00057/VLA | Ward Field Farm, Main Road, Galgate Variation of legal agreement attached to planning permission 17/00944/OUT to modify the affordable housing provisions in relation to affordable tenures, the definition of proven need for accommodation, the definition of chargee and amendments to education provisions for Hollins Homes (Ellel Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00065/DIS | Land West Of 110, High Road, Halton Discharge of conditions 3,4,5 and 6 on approved application 22/00040/FUL for Mr A Wishart (Halton-with-Aughton Ward 2015 Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00068/EIR | Land North West Of, Newlands Road, Lancaster Screening opinion for an outline planning application for the erection of up to 120 dwellings with associated access for Oakmere Homes (John O'Gaunt Ward Ward) | ES Not Required |
| 23/00079/DIS | 13 - 15 Sun Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Partial discharge of condition 3 on approved application 22/01476/LB for Mr R Braithwaite (Castle Ward Ward) | Split Decision |
| 23/00081/DIS | Site Of Former Sports Centre, Farrer Avenue, Lancaster University Discharge of condition 9 on approved application 19/00918/FUL for Mr Guy Constantine (University And Scotforth Rural Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00083/DIS | Land East Of Christie Way, Christie Way, Morecambe Discharge of condition 3,4,5,6,7,8,9,11 and 12 on approved application 22/00372/FUL for Mr Jake Salisbury (Westgate Ward Ward) | Split Decision |
| 23/00084/DIS | Lancaster Castle, Castle Park, Lancaster Discharge of conditions 3 and 4 on approved application 22/01212/FUL for Ms Vicki Mathews (Castle Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00085/DIS | Lancaster Castle, Castle Park, Lancaster Discharge of conditions 3 and 4 on approved application 22/01213/LB for Ms Vicki Mathews (Castle Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00085/FUL | Low Hall Farm, Main Street, Whittington Change of use and conversion of agricultural building into 2 dwellings (C3), change of use of agricultural land to domestic gardens and car parking, demolition of existing agricultural buildings to rear and alterations to access for Mr and Mrs Rob and Helen Mackereth (Upper Lune Valley Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00086/LB | Low Hall Farm, Main Street, Whittington Listed building application for the demolition of existing lean to and cattle building, partial rebuild of external walls, installation of a replacement roof, new rooflights, flues to roof, insertion of new window openings, installation of cladding to part of rear and side elevation and internal alterations to include construction of floors and alterations to internal walls for Mr and Mrs Rob and Helen Mackereth (Upper Lune Valley Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00087/DIS | Fuel Proof Limited, Middleton Business Park, Middleton Road Discharge of conditions 3, 4, 5 and 6 on approved application 22/00868/FUL for Fuelproof Ltd (Overton Ward Ward) | Split Decision |

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

| | | |
|--------------|---|-----------------------|
| 23/00088/DIS | Lancaster Girls Grammar School , Regent Street, Lancaster Discharge of conditions 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 on approved application 20/01448/LB for Mr Stephen Sharp (Castle Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00089/DIS | 29 Queen Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 22/00454/LB for Ms Gisela Renolds (Castle Ward Ward) | Split Decision |
| 23/00091/DIS | Fuel Proof Limited, Middleton Business Park, Middleton Road Discharge of conditions 3,4,5 and 6 on approved application 22/00870/FUL for Fuelproof Ltd (Overton Ward Ward) | Split Decision |
| 23/00092/DIS | Land Southwest Of Springfield House, Ball Lane, Caton Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 18/01596/REM for Mr Mark Pye (Lower Lune Valley Ward Ward) | Application Refused |
| 23/00094/DIS | Wyreside Lodge, Chipping Lane, Dolphinholme Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 22/00728/LB for Wyreside Leisure Ltd (Ellel Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00095/DIS | Coach House To Rear Of Mansergh House, Borwick Lane, Borwick Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 21/00415/LB for Mr Ken Howson (Warton Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00096/DIS | Mellishaw Park , Mellishaw Lane, Heaton With Oxcliffe Discharge of conditions 3 and 4 on approved application 22/00519/FUL for Mr Tom Greenwood (Overton Ward Ward) | Split Decision |
| 23/00105/DIS | Land North Of Lentworth Drive, Lancaster, Lancashire Discharge of conditions 6, 7 and 8 on approved application 23/00222/FUL for Mr Ben Deegan (Scotforth East Ward Ward) | Split Decision |
| 23/00107/DIS | Old Hall Farm, Kirkby Lonsdale Road, Over Kellet Discharge of part of condition 5 on approved application 21/00358/LB for Mr Mark Drinkall (Halton-with-Aughton And Kellet Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00108/DIS | Lancaster Quaker Meeting House, Meeting House Lane, Lancaster Discharge of condition 4 on approved application 22/01281/LB for Jim Bennetts (Castle Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00113/DIS | Lakeland Fells View, Kirkby Lonsdale Road, Over Kellet Discharge of conditions 8 and 9 on approved application 22/00177/FUL for Mr Colin Nichol (Halton-with-Aughton And Kellet Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00114/DIS | Ellel Hall, Ellel Hall Gardens, Galgate Discharge of condition 2 on approved application 23/00459/VCN for Mr Craig Smith (Ellel Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00115/DIS | 28 Corless Cottages, Dolphinholme, Lancaster Part discharge of condition 3 on approved application 23/00335/LB for Mrs Laura Airton (Ellel Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

| | | |
|---------------|--|--|
| 23/00125/DIS | 1A Alder Grove, Lancaster, Lancashire Discharge of condition 3,4,5,7,8 and 9 on approved application 21/01522/FUL for Mr T Greenwood (Marsh Ward Ward) | Split Decision |
| 23/00128/DIS | Furnace Barn, Foundry Lane, Halton Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 23/00414/FUL for Mrs Louise Morris (Halton-with-Aughton And Kellet Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00129/DIS | Fuel Proof Limited, Middleton Business Park, Middleton Road Discharge of condition 5 on approved application 22/00870/FUL for Fuelproof Ltd (Overton Ward Ward) | Split Decision |
| 23/00129/FUL | Plantopia Nurseries, Stoney Lane, Galgate Construction of car parking area, a path and provision of a disabled parking bay for Charles Newhouse (Ellel Ward Ward) | Application Refused |
| 23/00132/DIS | Fuel Proof Limited, Middleton Business Park, Middleton Road Discharge of condition 5 on approved application 22/00868/FUL for Fuelproof Ltd (Overton Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00177/FUL | 263 Marine Road Central, Morecambe, Lancashire Change of use of commercial building (Class E) to bar/restaurant (Sui Generis) and removal of access ramps to the front for Anthony Gregson (Poulton Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00207/FUL | 6 Thurnham Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Change of use of office to a 1 bed studio flat for student accommodation and installation of timber fence for Amaren Ltd (Castle Ward Ward) | Application Refused |
| 23/00208/LB | 6 Thurnham Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Listed building consent for the fixing of a fence to the rear wall, removal of timber box cover to existing basement opening and installation of a glazed frame for Amaren Ltd (Castle Ward Ward) | Application Refused |
| 23/00214/PLDC | 48 Dennison Close, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for a loft conversion for Mr & Mrs German (Bulk Ward Ward) | Lawful Development Certificate Granted |
| 23/00229/FUL | 40 Hornbeam Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of two storey building to form three industrial units comprising one self-storage facility (Use Class B8) and two general industrial units (Use Class B2) for Mr Andy Sailor (Marsh Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00238/VCN | Thwaite Moss And Thwaite Moss Cottage, Thwaite Lane, Tatham Listed building application for erection of single storey porch extension to west side elevation, erection of replacement dormers to the north elevation, installation of patent glazing to the north and south roof elevations, installation of replacement rooflights to south elevation, replacement of glazed link, extension to existing outbuilding, installation of rooflights to stables, alterations to some windows and doors and internal reconfiguration at Thwaite Moss and Thwaite Moss Cottage (pursuant to the variation of condition 2 on approved application 22/00844/LB due to alteration of plans to incorporate new windows) for Mr Grant Meldrum & Mr Andrew Walker (Lower Lune Valley Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

| | | |
|--------------|---|-----------------------|
| 23/00244/FUL | 31 Vernon Crescent, Galgate, Lancaster Demolition of existing side extension and erection of a two storey side extension for Mr S. Cottam (Ellel Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00295/FUL | 22 Fern Bank, Lancaster, Lancashire Demolition of rear conservatory and erection of a single storey extension and two storey side and rear extension for Messrs Udall and Draycott (Scotforth West Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00300/FUL | Hawthorn Bank Cottage, Cove Road, Silverdale Erection of a single storey extension to the southeast elevation and installation of a sewage treatment plant for Ms Hallam (Silverdale Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00315/FUL | Batty Hill Farm, Lancaster Road, Cockerham Use of building and agricultural land for 4 dwellings for holiday use (C3) and installation of a package treatment plant for Mr P Hewitt (Ellel Ward Ward) | Application Refused |
| 23/00317/FUL | 2 Croft View, Main Street, Whittington Erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr G Bennion (Upper Lune Valley Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00328/CU | 57 Slyne Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Change of use of Public House (Sui Generis) to a place of worship (F.1) for Mr Sanmi Adelabu (Skerton East Ward 2015 Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00335/LB | 28 Corless Cottages, Dolphinholme, Lancaster Listed building application for external and internal alterations including isolated repairs and repointing of stonework, repairs and redecoration to windows, replacement of external doors, internal damp remediation, asbestos removal, new internal solid wall insulation, new floor coverings to ground floor, replacement of the heating system, kitchen, bathroom sanitaryware and log burner, and internal repainting for Mrs Laura Airton (Ellel Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00342/FUL | 7A First Terrace, Sunderland Point, Morecambe Installation of new window opening to the side, new and replacement windows to front/side/rear elevations, solar panels and rooflights to the south facing (front) roof slope, installation of roof to existing side outrigger for Mr & Mrs Brokenshire (Overton Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00343/LB | 7A First Terrace, Sunderland Point, Morecambe Listed building application for the installation of new window opening to the side, new and replacement windows to front/side/rear elevations, solar panels and rooflights to the south facing (front) roof slope, installation of roof to existing side outrigger and internal alterations including removal of ceilings, insulation to roof/walls, new partitions, infill of doorway and repointing works for Mr & Mrs Brokenshire (Overton Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00346/FUL | Former West Bank Outbuilding, Greaves Road, Lancaster Change of use of former stable to dwelling (C3), construction of external steps and installation of doors and windows for Miss O. Hartley (Scotforth West Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

| | | |
|---------------|---|--|
| 23/00351/FUL | Land At Grid Reference 346637 452376, Willey Lane, Cockerham Erection of two storey dwelling with associated access for Ms Loates (Ellel Ward Ward) | Application Withdrawn |
| 23/00364/FUL | Sellet Mill Cottage, Mill Lane, Whittington Demolition of existing porch and car port, erection of a two storey side extension, erection of a single storey rear extension, erection of a single storey detached garage, installation of a package treatment plant, re-grading of land and alterations to existing access for Mr & Mrs P Haslam (Upper Lune Valley Ward Ward) | Application Refused |
| 23/00366/PLDC | Former Lancashire Councy Council Surveyors Office, Hampson Lane, Hampson Proposed Lawful Development Certificate for the siting of 3 storage containers for Mr Alex Cooper (Ellel Ward Ward) | Lawful Development Certificate Refused |
| 23/00403/FUL | Cinderbarrow Cottage, Cinderbarrow Lane, Yealand Redmayne Demolition of existing conservatory, sun room, detached garage and sheds and erection of extension to north/east elevation and erection of a two storey detached outbuilding for use as a garage/workshop for Mr & Mrs David & Gill Lumb (Silverdale Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00404/NMA | 2 Main Street, Overton, Morecambe Non-material amendment to planning permission 19/01376/FUL to alter window and rooflight position to rear side extension, and to amend wall and column to rear windows to extension for Mr & Mrs Williams (Overton Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00412/FUL | 31 Leachfield Road, Galgate, Lancaster Erection of a part two storey part single storey rear extension for Mr Phil Chadwick (Ellel Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00414/FUL | Furnace Barn, Foundry Lane, Halton does he have an email address too_ Erection of 2 outdoor classrooms for Mrs Louise Morris (Halton-with-Aughton Ward 2015 Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00419/FUL | Knowsly Farm, Procter Moss Road, Abbeystead Demolition of existing building and erection of extensions to existing front and rear agricultural building for Mr David Townley (Ellel Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00424/CU | 114 Kellet Road, Carnforth, Lancashire Change of use of ground floor shop/takeaway (Sui Generis) to residential flat (C3) for Mrs Deborah Buckley (Carnforth And Millhead Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00437/FUL | 334 Marine Road Central, Morecambe, Lancashire Reconfiguration and conversion of 4 flats to one dwelling, demolition of existing lean-to, erection of single storey rear extension, replacement of existing windows to first/second floor front elevation and installation of rooflights to the rear for Mrs Jenny Natusch (Poulton Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

| | | |
|--------------|--|-----------------------|
| 23/00438/LB | 334 Marine Road Central, Morecambe, Lancashire Listed building application for the demolition of existing lean-to, erection of single storey rear extension, replacement of existing windows to first/second floor front elevation, installation of rooflights to the rear, repointing works, masonry repairs, replacement of rainwater goods and internal alterations including works to partition walls, creation of new openings, new stud wall and removal of doors/WC/kitchenette for Mrs Jenny Natusch (Poulton Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00448/OUT | Land North Of Number 41, Thornton Road, Morecambe Outline application for the erection of a dwelling (C3) for Mr Paul Harrison (Poulton Ward Ward) | Application Refused |
| 23/00449/FUL | 30 Portland Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr T Dola (Castle Ward Ward) | Application Refused |
| 23/00459/VCN | Ellel Hall, Ellel Hall Gardens, Galgate Construction of piers and gates and creation of a hot tub, erection of a two storey timber building with basement which includes ancillary accommodation, balcony, external staircase, garage/workshop and a glazed link to the main dwelling, construction of a new access, gate, driveway, railings and landscaping, installation of a solar array to the SE ground of the dwelling (pursuant to the variation of condition 1 on planning permission 22/01023/VCN to alter approved outbuilding to form outdoor kitchen area) for Mr Craig Smith (Ellel Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00478/CU | Parkfield, Greaves Road, Lancaster Retrospective application for change of use of office (E) to a 1 bed studio flat for student accommodation (C3) for Mr Michael Mayar (Scotforth West Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00486/VCN | Land Adjacent, 26 Moorside Road, Brookhouse Erection of a detached dwelling (C3) and creation of a new vehicular access (pursuant to the variation of condition 2 on planning permission 21/01552/FUL to amend the dwelling footprint and design) for Mr Brian Pinington (Lower Lune Valley Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00500/FUL | Ellel Hall, Ellel Hall Gardens, Galgate Installation of bay window to the eastern elevation for Mr C Smith (Ellel Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00501/LB | Ellel Hall, Ellel Hall Gardens, Galgate Listed building application for the installation of bay window and rainwater goods to the eastern elevation for Mr C Smith (Ellel Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00506/LB | 4 Victoria Wharf , St Georges Quay, Lancaster Listed building application for the installation of an extractor fan to the rear elevation for Thomas O'neill (Castle Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00507/FUL | Pennine , Littlefell Lane, Lancaster Part retrospective application for the erection of an outbuilding to the rear for Mr David Hargreaves (University And Scotforth Rural Ward) | Application Permitted |

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

| | | |
|---------------|--|-----------------------|
| 23/00509/FUL | Old Watermill, Capernwray Road, Capernwray Erection of two storey side extension, construction of hip to gable extension, construction of raised decking, installation of external steps, erection of a carport and erection of an erection of outbuilding to create ancillary accommodation in association with Old Watermill for Dr D & Dr Y Precious (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward) | Application Withdrawn |
| 23/00517/FUL | Lancaster And Morecambe College , Morecambe Road, Lancaster Demolition of existing prefabricated building and installation of replacement windows and doors, new curtain glazing and paving to area of courtyard for Mr Peter France (Torrisholme Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00521/FUL | Deep Clough, Roeburndale Road, Littledale Change of use of land for the siting of a caravan with associated track, hardstanding and parking and the installation of a package treatment plant for Mr John Hill (Lower Lune Valley Ward Ward) | Application Withdrawn |
| 23/00535/VCN | Cantsfield Grange, Cantsfield Road, Cantsfield Demolition of detached garage, replacement of existing front porch, erection of a first floor side extension and erection of a single storey rear extension (pursuant to the variation of condition 2 on planning permission 21/00684/FUL to increase the height of the single storey rear extension, alter the windows, doors and internal layout) for Mr Adrian Cresswell (Upper Lune Valley Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00537/PLDC | Woodfield Lodge, Moorside Road, Brookhouse Proposed Lawful Development Certificate for the use of property as Air BnB/Holiday Let for Mrs Sarah Bainbridge (Lower Lune Valley Ward Ward) | Application Withdrawn |
| 23/00539/FUL | 20 Oakville Road, Heysham, Morecambe Erection of single storey detached dwelling for Mr Lewis O'Connor (Overton Ward Ward) | Application Refused |
| 23/00540/FUL | 9 Market Street, Carnforth, Lancashire Installation of solar panels to the south facing roof slope for Benjamin Fell (Carnforth And Millhead Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00554/FUL | 21 Sulby Grove, Morecambe, Lancashire Demolition of rear extension and garage block and erection of single storey extensions to the front, side and rear and erection of a first floor rear extension for Mr A Stanyon (Bare Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00559/FUL | Hunting Hill Lodge , Hunting Hill Road, Carnforth Erection of a dwelling with associated access for Mr & Mrs Taylor (Carnforth And Millhead Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00566/ELDC | 11 Prospect Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Existing lawful development certificate for the use of the property as HMO (C4) for Ms Danielle Frazer (John O'Gaunt Ward Ward) | Application Withdrawn |

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

| | | |
|---------------|---|--|
| 23/00568/LB | Three Mariners, Bridge Lane, Lancaster Listed building application for partial removal of internal wall and installation log burner, removal of existing fixed seating area, removal and replacement of door, installation of glazed screen and alterations to male and female wc for Robinsons Brewery (Castle Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00570/FUL | Havelock House, Borwick Road, Capernwray Demolition of existing rear extension and erection of two storey rear extension with construction of dormer extension to the side, erection of single storey extensions both side elevations, creation of a flue, creation of additional hard standing and landscaping, installation of a sewage treatment plant for Mr & Mrs H Wild (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00581/ADV | Dunelm Mill, Unit J, Sunnyclyff Retail Park Advertisement application for the display of a non-illuminated fascia sign, 5 internally illuminated flexface box signs, 5 poster frames and one window vinyl for Dunelm (Overton Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00589/FUL | Moorlands, Slaidburn Road, Lowgill Erection of a single storey rear extension, construction of a raised roof incorporating a balcony for Mr Andrew Illingworth (Lower Lune Valley Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00593/FUL | 211 Heysham Road, Heysham, Morecambe Erection of a single storey rear extension for Miss L. Goodall (Heysham North Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00594/CU | Eric's Cafe , 245 Marine Road Central, Morecambe Change of use from three flats above existing cafe to create four holiday accommodation units (Sui Generis) for Mrs. S. Hurst (Poulton Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00595/FUL | Time For Flowers, 408 Heysham Road, Heysham Change of use of flower shop (Class E) to cafe/wine bar (sui generis) with outdoor seating area and associated managers flat above (C3) for Mr.& Mrs. M. Kirkby (Heysham Central Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00597/FUL | 25 Bowfell Avenue, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of a front porch for Mr S. Jolly (Bare Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00604/FUL | Sofidel UK, 15 Lansil Way, Lancaster Modifications to existing highway, creation of a car parking area, HGV loading bays, new internal road layout, installation of a new weighbridge, signage, external lighting, CCTV systems, erection of perimeter fencing, access gates and alterations to drainage for Mr Alessandro Dinucci (Bulk Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00605/PLDC | Moss Side Racing Stables, Crimbles Lane, Cockerham Proposed lawful development certificate for the change of use from racing stables to agricultural use for Juliette Berry (Ellel Ward Ward) | Lawful Development Certificate Granted |

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

| | | |
|--------------|---|-----------------------|
| 23/00609/FUL | Bethel Barn, Main Road, Nether Kellet Demolition of existing conservatory, erection of a single storey side extension, enlargement of window to front elevation and insertion of patio doors to existing window opening to rear elevation for Mr Richard Birchall (Halton-with-Aughton And Kellet Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00612/LB | Crow Trees, Melling Road, Melling Listed building application for the installation of a stair lift to the rear stairs for Professor Peter Morgan Capner (Upper Lune Valley Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00617/FUL | Kings Arcade, King Street, Lancaster Replacement windows to first and second floor front elevation for Mr Edward Duckett (Castle Ward Ward) | Application Refused |
| 23/00618/FUL | 9 Dallas Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of a single storey extension to the rear for Mrs Z Patel (Castle Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00620/FUL | 28 Langdale Road, Carnforth, Lancashire Erection of a two storey side extension for Mrs Carol Sedgwick (Carnforth And Millhead Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00622/FUL | Agricultural Building North Of Borwick Lane, Borwick, Lancashire Relevant demolition of an agricultural building in Conservation Area for Mr W Barker (Warton Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00623/FUL | Lancaster Castle, Castle Park, Lancaster Change of use of the Workshops building former prison spaces (C2A) into two commercial lettable units (E), external alterations to provide access to two new WCs and alterations to first floor windows for Ms Vicki Mathews (Castle Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00624/LB | Lancaster Castle, Castle Park, Lancaster Listed building application for alterations to the Workshops building including; extending existing openings with new stone lintel over, masonry repairs and replacement of associated doors to provide entrance to new WCs, installation of two new WCs and associated new flooring, pipework and ventilation, alterations to first floor windows for Ms Vicki Mathews (Castle Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00626/VCN | The Owls Nest , Bare Lane, Morecambe Retrospective application for the erection of covered seating pods (pursuant to the variation of condition 1 on planning permission 23/00124/FUL remove the part of the condition relating to music) for Mr Barker (Bare Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00628/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 Ward) | Application Refused |
| 23/00631/FUL | 16 The Meadows, Yealand Redmayne, Carnforth Demolition of existing garage and erection of single storey extensions to the front, side and rear for Mr Stuart Metcalf & Miss Laura Wilson (Silverdale Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

| | | |
|---------------|--|--|
| 23/00632/FUL | Udale, Wyresdale Road, Quernmore Demolition of existing garage and outbuildings and erection of a single storey side/rear extension incorporating garage/utility/store/hobby garden room for Mr & Mrs J&R Greaves (Lower Lune Valley Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00633/FUL | North Bank House, Main Street, Hornby Erection of a single storey front extension front extension and construction of a canopy to front elevation for Mr & Mrs Crossley (Upper Lune Valley Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00638/FUL | Barn North Of, Back Lane Farm, Back Lane Retrospective application for the construction of an access track for Mr Ben Towers (Upper Lune Valley Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00639/FUL | 2 Chapel Lane, Overton, Morecambe Erection of a single storey wrap around extension to the side and rear, new front entrance, construction of dormer extensions to the front and rear elevation and balcony to the rear for Mr & Mrs Gargen (Overton Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00641/FUL | 5 Ascot Close, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a single storey extension to side for Dr & Mrs M. Sebba & Dexter (Scotforth East Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00643/FUL | 7 Trent Close, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr L. Rodgers (Scale Hall Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00644/PLDC | 75 Fairfield Road, Heysham, Morecambe Proposed Lawful Development Certificate for the erection of a single storey rear extension, construction of a hip to gable extension, erection of a dormer extension to the rear elevation and installation of new and replacement windows, doors and rooflights for Mr and Mrs Condon (Heysham North Ward Ward) | Lawful Development Certificate Granted |
| 23/00647/PLDC | 29 Patterdale Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for erection of single storey side extension with access ramp for Mr T Greenwood (Bulk Ward Ward) | Lawful Development Certificate Granted |
| 23/00650/ADV | John O Gaunt, 55 Market Street, Lancaster Advertisement application for the display of one externally illuminated hanging sign, one non-illuminated amenity board, one externally illuminated fascia sign and one non-illuminated wall mounted sign for Mr S. Wenman (Castle Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00651/LB | John O Gaunt, 55 Market Street, Lancaster Listed building application for the fitting of one externally illuminated hanging sign, one non-illuminated amenity board, one externally illuminated fascia sign, one non-illuminated access sign, replacement of associated lighting and repainting of the exterior for Mr. S. Wenman (Castle Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00652/FUL | Lancaster Castle, Castle Park, Lancaster Installation of a lightning protection system for Ms Vicki Mathews (Castle Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

| | | |
|---------------|--|--|
| 23/00653/LB | Lancaster Castle, Castle Park, Lancaster Listed building consent for the installation of a lightning protection system for Ms Vicki Mathews (Castle Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00660/FUL | Walker In The Field, Scriffen Lane, Ellel Erection of a part single part two storey side/rear extension and erection of detached double garage for Mr and Mrs Park (Ellel Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00662/PLDC | 18 Lathom Avenue, Morecambe, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr Andrew Frearson (Bare Ward Ward) | Application Withdrawn |
| 23/00664/FUL | 20 Hest Bank Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of first floor rear extension for Mr and Mrs Mike Newton (Bare Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00669/FUL | 2 Hala Crescent, Lancaster, Lancashire Demolition of the existing rear conservatory and construction of a single storey rear extension for Mr and Mrs Newton (Scotforth East Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00670/PLDC | 26 Hidings Court Lane, Morecambe, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr.& Mrs. M. Wilson (West End Ward Ward) | Lawful Development Certificate Granted |
| 23/00672/FUL | 2 Guidem Park, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a first floor side extension over existing garage for Mr K. Yazdani (Bulk Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00673/PLDC | Ryburn, Back Lane, Warton Proposed Lawful Development Certificate for the conversion of attic and installation of rooflights to the front and rear elevation for Mr.& Mrs. Thrift (Warton Ward Ward) | Lawful Development Certificate Granted |
| 23/00676/FUL | Cantsfield Grange, Cantsfield Road, Cantsfield Installation of solar panels to south facing roof slopes for Mr Adrian Cresswell (Upper Lune Valley Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00677/ADV | Starbucks, Asda, Overage Road Advertisement application for the display of one internally illuminated totem sign, two internally illuminated directional signs, four internally illuminated freestanding signs, two internally illuminated fascia signs, four internally illuminated wall mounted signs and vinyl window manifestation for EG Group (Westgate Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00680/FUL | St Marys Presbytery , Matthias Street, Morecambe Retrospective application for the replacement of timber windows with uPVC windows on all elevations for Fr. D Carden (Poulton Ward Ward) | Application Refused |
| 23/00681/FUL | 10 Villas Court, Lancaster, Lancashire Demolition of existing rear conservatory and erection of a single story rear extension for Mr M Khoda (Castle Ward Ward) | Application Refused |

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

| | | |
|---------------|---|--|
| 23/00682/FUL | 18 Hazelwood, Silverdale, Carnforth Demolition of existing attached garage and rear extension, erection of a single storey extension to the front and side, erection of a first floor to the rear and a covered veranda to the rear for Mr & Mrs Potter (Silverdale Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00685/PLDC | 8 Hala Crescent, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the construction of a hip to gable extension and construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation, installation of a rooflight to the front and window the side for Mr and Mrs McHugh (Scotforth East Ward Ward) | Lawful Development Certificate Granted |
| 23/00688/PLDC | 3 Kenwood Avenue, Morecambe, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the construction of a hip to gable extension, construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation, infilling of door to side elevation and replacement window to door to front elevation for Mr and Mrs James Tate (West End Ward Ward) | Lawful Development Certificate Granted |
| 23/00693/VCN | Land East Of Annie's Barn, Yenham Lane, Overton Erection of a dwelling and associated access (pursuant to the variation of condition 2 on allowed appeal APP/A2335/W/22/3305040 to relocate the dwelling north within the site) for Mr & Mrs Dobson (Overton Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00696/FUL | 8 Copy Lane, Caton, Lancaster Erection of a two storey side extension for Mr and Mrs Tony Edmondson (Lower Lune Valley Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00700/FUL | 12 St Johns Grove, Heysham, Morecambe Construction of external steps to the rear for Mrs. B. Catton (Heysham North Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00702/FUL | 27 Euston Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Change of use of upper floors (E) into first floor 1-bed flat (C3) and second and third floor into 1-bed maisonette (C3) for Mr Zahid Hafeez (Poulton Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00703/PLDC | 17 Lawnswood Avenue, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation and installation of a rooflight to front elevation for Mr and Mrs Hall (Scotforth East Ward Ward) | Lawful Development Certificate Granted |
| 23/00706/ADV | Wyreside Lodge, Chipping Lane, Dolphinholme Advertisement application for the retention of two flag poles for Wyreside Hall Ltd (Ellel Ward Ward) | Application Refused |
| 23/00707/EIR | Curwen Hill Farm, Hornby Road, Wray Screening opinion for the erection of an agricultural workers dwelling and installation of a package treatment plant for Mr F Towers (Lower Lune Valley Ward Ward) | ES Not Required |
| 23/00710/NMA | Sunacre Court, Maple Avenue, Heysham Non material amendment application to planning permission 16/00861/FUL to add solar PV panels to roof, amend external wall material to render, alter window positions, amend the floor plans and the rearrangement of parking, bin store and drying area for Mr K Wilson (Heysham North Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

| | | |
|---------------|--|--|
| 23/00716/PLDC | 16 Sunnyfield Avenue, Morecambe, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr and Mrs Wood (Bare Ward Ward) | Lawful Development Certificate Granted |
| 23/00719/PLDC | 1 St Michaels Close, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Proposed Lawful Development Certificate for the construction of dormer extension to the rear elevation for Mr.& Mrs. F. Smith (Bolton And Slyne Ward Ward) | Lawful Development Certificate Granted |
| 23/00720/PLDC | 24 St Annes Avenue, Morecambe, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation for Mr. & Mrs. Lockley (Torrisholme Ward Ward) | Lawful Development Certificate Granted |
| 23/00721/NMA | Brookside, Wyresdale Road, Quernmore Non-material amendment to planning permission 23/00217/FUL to re-tile existing roof using Marley modern interlocking roof tile for Mr & Mrs Gradwell (Lower Lune Valley Ward Ward) | Application Withdrawn |
| 23/00723/FUL | 83 Twemlow Parade, Heysham, Morecambe Erection of a first floor front extension incorporating dormer extension, construction of a porch to the front/side elevation, erection of a single storey rear extension with terrace above, construction of dormer extensions to the front and rear elevations for Mr & Mrs J Walden (Heysham Central Ward Ward) | Application Refused |
| 23/00725/FUL | Arnside Lodge, 1 Arnside Crescent, Morecambe Part demolition of existing extension, erection of single storey link extension and conversion of first floor of 5 Derwent Avenue to self-contained flat to use within existing care home (C2) for Arnside Lodge Care Home (Poulton Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00728/PAA | Hillam House Farm, Hillam Lane, Cockerham Prior approval for the change of use of an agricultural building into 2 dwellings (C3) for Mr Andrew Barker (Ellel Ward Ward) | Prior Approval Refused |
| 23/00729/LB | 2 Main Street, Overton, Morecambe Listed building application for the demolition of existing and erection of a replacement single storey side and rear extensions and demolition of structural walls for Mr & Mrs Williams (Overton Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00733/NMA | 71 Africa Drive, Lancaster, Lancashire Non-material amendment to planning permission 23/00298/FUL to amend the position of the front facing rooflight for Mr & Mrs Dzivulskij (Marsh Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00735/NMA | Westfield, Gaskell Close, Silverdale Non-material amendment to planning permission 07/00986/FUL to include the addition of a rooflight for Dr Stephen Rattenbury (Silverdale Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00737/EIR | Willodene, Shore Road, Silverdale Screening request for the construction of new access and dropped kerb and rebuilding of boundary wall for Ms S Crossley (Silverdale Ward Ward) | ES Not Required |

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

| | | |
|---------------|--|--|
| 23/00738/FUL | 17 Greenways, Over Kellet, Carnforth Construction of dormer extension to rear elevation, a hip to gable roof extension, rooflights to front elevation and alterations to windows for Mr & Mrs Harris (Halton-with-Aughton And Kellet Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00739/FUL | White Gables, 25 Lindeth Road, Silverdale Erection of a single storey side extension for Mr And Mrs J Calnan (Silverdale Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00740/PLDC | 33 Michaelson Avenue, Morecambe, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for erection of single storey rear extension for Mr A Helliwell (Torrisholme Ward Ward) | Lawful Development Certificate Granted |
| 23/00741/EIR | Escowbeck Farm, Quernmore Road, Caton Screening opinion for the demolition of existing steel/block agricultural buildings and re development of site to provide 5 residential dwellings, including conversion and extension of existing barn and outbuilding (to form 3 dwellings) and erection of 2 new dwellings with associated access (pursuant to the variation of condition 2 on planning permission 20/00047/FUL to remove the connection to the driveway to the north) for Mr Grant Parker (Lower Lune Valley Ward Ward) | ES Not Required |
| 23/00745/FUL | 2 The Croft, Caton, Lancaster Installation of solar panels to existing garage for Mr Ray Hampton (Lower Lune Valley Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00751/PLDC | 14 Wilson Grove, Heysham, Morecambe Proposed lawful development certificate for the conversion of existing loft space and installation of rooflights to the rear for Mr and Mrs Johnson (Heysham Central Ward Ward) | Lawful Development Certificate Granted |
| 23/00753/PLDC | 4 Gleneagles Drive, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr and Mrs Costello (John O'Gaunt Ward Ward) | Lawful Development Certificate Granted |
| 23/00754/VCN | Beckside, Back Lane, Wennington Erection of a two storey extension to the east elevation (Pursuant to the removal of condition 7 in relation to restriction on rainwater goods on planning permission 07/00125/FUL) for Mr And Mrs Roberts (Upper Lune Valley Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00757/AD | Laithwaite Farm, Crimbles Lane, Cockerham Agricultural determination for the creation of an earth banked slurry store for Mr Sutcliffe (Ellel Ward Ward) | Prior Approval Refused |
| 23/00761/FUL | 5 Meadow Drive, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Construction of hip to gable roof extension with front and rear dormers and erection of single storey link extension for Mr and Mrs Spurr (Bolton And Slyne Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00762/VCN | Beckside, Back Lane, Wennington Erection of a two storey extension to the east elevation (Pursuant to the removal of condition 7 in relation to restriction on rainwater goods on planning permission 07/00127/LB) for Mr And Mrs Roberts (Upper Lune Valley Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

| | | |
|---------------|--|--|
| 23/00764/FUL | 16 Hest Bank Lane, Hest Bank, Lancaster Erection of a single storey rear/side extension, installation of raised roof incorporating loft conversion, construction of dormer extensions to the front elevation, installation of first floor rear window and construction of raised patio area with balustrade for Mr Stuart Errington (Bolton And Slyne Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00765/FUL | Blackwood End, Bay Horse Road, Ellel Demolition of existing slurry tank and erection of an agricultural storage building for Mr John Fox (Lower Lune Valley Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00768/PLDC | 151 Bare Lane, Morecambe, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for conversion of garage into habitable room and store for Mr C Foot (Bare Ward Ward) | Lawful Development Certificate Granted |
| 23/00774/NMA | JD Wetherspoons, The Sir Richard Owen, 4 Spring Garden Street Non material amendment to planning permission 22/00894/FUL to amend the approved ground floor plans and elevations for JD Wetherspoon Plc (Castle Ward Ward) | Application Refused |
| 23/00778/PLDC | 7 Greenfinch Way, Heysham, Morecambe Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr And Mrs S McKenzie (Heysham South Ward Ward) | Lawful Development Certificate Granted |
| 23/00779/NMA | 20 Slyne Road, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Non-material amendment to planning permission 20/01411/FUL to reduce size of proposed extension for Mr. J. Cardwell (Bolton And Slyne Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00780/ELDC | 43 Earl Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Existing Lawful Development Certificate for use of property as HMO (C4) for Miss Lottie Randall (Skerton Ward Ward) | Lawful Development Certificate Granted |
| 23/00782/AD | The Hill, Fairheath Road, Tatham Agricultural Determination for erection of machinery storage building/workshop for Mr Andrew Staveley (Lower Lune Valley Ward Ward) | Prior Approval Refused |
| 23/00791/LB | 4 Hill Side, Lancaster, Lancashire Listed building application for the installation of two extractor fans to rear elevation, secondary glazing to all windows and replacement double doors to rear elevation for Ms J Samson (Castle Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00808/AD | Higher Moor Head Farm, Rakehouse Brow, Quernmore Agricultural determination for the construction of an agricultural access track and renewal of concrete yard for Mr Darren Atkinson (Ellel Ward Ward) | Prior Approval Not Required |
| 23/00815/AD | Holme Head, Melling Road, Hornby Agricultural determination for the replacement of existing concrete hardstanding for Mr Edward Towers (Upper Lune Valley Ward Ward) | Prior Approval Not Required |
| 23/00820/EIR | HM Prison Lancaster Farms, Far Moor Lane, Lancaster Screening opinion for the erection of 2 houseblocks, a workshop, a replacement Multi Use Games Area (MUGA) and associated ancillary development for Ministry Of Justice (Bulk Ward Ward) | ES Not Required |

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

| | | |
|---------------|---|--|
| 23/00821/EIR | Thwaite Moss, Thwaite Lane, Tatham Screening request for the erection of two ground mounted solar PV panel arrays and erection of detached greenhouse for Mr Grant Meldrum & Mr Andrew Walker (Lower Lune Valley Ward Ward) | ES Not Required |
| 23/00822/NMA | Land Adjacent To ISS Building And, Land Adjacent To Roundhouse Building, Lancaster University Non-material amendment to planning permission 22/01369/FUL to amend the location of the south turret for Lancaster University (University Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00829/FUL | 1 Roeburn Drive, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of a single storey rear extension, construction of a front porch and conversion of garage to games room/store for Dr I Zafar (Scale Hall Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00834/PLDC | 152 Albert Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation for Mr And Mrs K Kearns (West End Ward Ward) | Lawful Development Certificate Granted |
| 23/00840/AD | Gad House, Long Lane, Over Wyresdale Agricultural determination for an area of hardstanding for Mr Declan Hoare (Ellel Ward Ward) | Prior Approval Refused |
| 23/00857/EIR | Forgelands, Quernmore Road, Caton Screening request for the erection of agricultural building to cover existing midden for Mr C Jackson (Lower Lune Valley Ward Ward) | ES Not Required |
| 23/00880/NMA | 144 Greaves Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Non-material amendment to planning permission 22/00198/FUL to alter the floor layout for Mr B Cowan (Scotforth West Ward Ward) | Application Permitted |
| 23/00907/EIR | Swainshead Hall Farm, Waste Lane, Over Wyresdale Screening request for the retrospective application for the change of use of two agricultural buildings to a classroom and bunk barn, installation of septic tank with soakaway and erection of a composting toilet for Mr & Mrs K Leece (Ellel Ward Ward) | ES Not Required |