

Agenda Item	A8
Application Number	22/01353/FUL
Proposal	Erection of single storey rear extension
Application site	Tarnbrook Stores 8 Tarnbrook Road Heysham Morecambe
Applicant	Mr James Brown
Agent	Mr Philip Holt
Case Officer	Mrs Kim Ireland
Departure	No
Summary of Recommendation	Refusal

(i) **Procedural Matters**

This form of development would normally be determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, the hardstanding area to the rear of the property is in the ownership of Lancaster City Council and, as such, the application is referred to the Planning Regulatory Committee.

1.0 Application Site and Setting

1.1 The application site is located on the south west side of Tarnbrook Road within the urban area of Heysham. The building comprises of a fish and chip takeaway and a shop to part of the ground floor with the remainder of the ground floor and the first and second floors used as residential accommodation. To the rear of the property is a strip of hardstanding that runs the length of the building that is owned by Lancaster City Council. There is an access road that runs around the rear of the property that separates the strip of hardstanding and a detached block of six garages.

1.2 To the north of the property is a triangular shape of land that is identified as a greenspace, with Mossgate County Primary School further to the north of the site. The remainder of the surrounding area is characterised by residential properties. To the north of Tarnbrook Road is Sugham Lane and to the east of Tarnbrook Road is Kingsway, both of which are main bus routes that provide linkages to Morecambe and Lancaster.

2.0 Proposal

2.1 This application proposes to erect a single storey extension to the ground floor rear elevation of the existing shop. The proposed extension measures 2.9 metres in height, projecting 4.6 metres from the rear elevation at its furthest point and a maximum width of 9.5 metres. The development is proposed to be finished in dash rendered walls, with a red facing brick plinth and fibreglass flat roof.

- 2.2 The development is proposed to be finished in brick walls, white upvc windows and doors to match the existing building. The extended internal area is to be predominantly used as an additional studio and a store room with an external access. Eight concrete anti-ram bollards are to be installed to the south west of the proposed extension and three concrete anti-ram bollards are to be installed to the west of the proposed extension. All concrete anti-ram bollards will be a 0.9 metres in height. To the rear elevation of the proposed extension, it is proposed to install a perforated roller shutter door that will be 2.08 metres in width and 2.29 metres in height that will cover the only door and window to the rear elevation. In addition to the roller shutter to the rear elevation, there is a red facing brick detail to mimic a false window that is 1.6 metres in width and 1.1 metres in height. All gutters are to be visible and not hidden behind a parapet wall.
- 2.3 The proposed extension will provide additional shop floor space to the existing shop business, with the staff W.C and mess room being moved internally to be within the proposed extension. The bin storage is currently internally within the existing building, it has been agreed with the adjoining business of the fish and chip shop that they will share the bin storage that is to the rear area of the adjoining takeaway business.
- 2.4 The submitted proposal initially sought pre-application advice from Lancaster City Council. Advice was provided that the principle of an extension to expand an existing small business that serves the local community was acceptable. However, concerns were raised regarding the poor-quality design of the flat roof extension with numerous security measures included. The nature of the proposed dog-leg shaped extension reduced the natural surveillance that the rear of the building currently offers, as no solid structures exist and this could lead to the misuse of the area to the north of the proposal. In addition no details of a bin store were submitted, however this would need to be provided away from the neighbouring residential bedroom flat window at 14 Tarnbrook Road.

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
93/00513/FUL	Erection of single storey rear extension to form store room and reposition main entrance door/window	Permitted

4.0 Consultation Responses

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

Consultee	Response
Parish Council	No comments received at the time of compiling this report.
Property Services	No comments received at the time of compiling this report.
County Highways	No Objection
Environmental Health	No comments received at the time of compiling this report.
Cadent Gas	No Objection

- 4.2 No comments have received from members of the public.

5.0 Analysis

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

- Principle of Development
- Design
- Security Measures
- Residential Amenity

- 5.2 Principle of Development (NPPF Section 6: Economy, Policies DM14: Proposals Involving

- 5.2.1 The Council will seek to protect a local service that serves a local community and recognises the role local services can play in ensuring that communities are sustainable in the long term in accordance with DM56 of the DM DPD. Similarly DM15 of the DM DPD states that the Council will support proposals that involve the creation or sustainable expansion of a small business within the district.
- 5.2.2 The ground floor property has been utilised as a shop in this location since before circa 1993. To allow the business to continue and remain in this location, the proposed extension is required to allow the business to expand by providing additional shop floor space for the local community to utilise. Thereby protecting a local service that serves a local community, allowing the building to be extended, securing the long-term use of the building and existing business. As a result, it is considered that an extension can be accommodated to the rear elevation of the ground floor of the property, however as discussed below concerns have not been overcome with regards to the design and security measures of the proposed extension as advised within the pre-application.
- 5.2.3 Retail proposals that are outside of defined centres that generate no more than 150sqm of gross floorspace in total will be supported by the Council as stated within Policy DM19 DM DPD. The proposed extension together with the existing floor area of the shop will have a proposed gross floorspace of 111sqm, therefore the proposal complies with the criteria set out within Policy DM19 DM DPD. The shop is therefore considered a local facility that is acceptable outside of designated town centre.
- 5.3 Design (NPPF Section 12, Policies DM29: Key Design Principles)
- 5.3.1 Policy DM29 of the DPD requires a good standard of design, requires proposals to demonstrate an understanding of the wider context so that they make a positive contribution to the local area. Similarly paragraph 126 of section 12 of the NPPF states that the creation of high quality, beautiful and sustainable buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.
- 5.3.2 The design of the proposal is thought to be of poor quality, due to the combination of the flat roof, overall size and dog-legged shape of the extension, as well as the roller shutter and bollard security measures, together with gutter and eave detailing. Although the proposed development is to the rear elevation of the property, all development still requires a good standard of design and should be of high quality. The overall design is not thought to provide an active elevation and diminishes the openness that exists to the rear of the building. The design of the dog-leg shaped extension, together with the projection from the existing rear elevation, could lead to a misuse of the area to the north west of the proposed extension, due to lack of security/ natural surveillance. The number of proposed bollards suggests that there are issues with crime in the area and therefore the design of the dog-leg extension could exacerbate an existing problem further. Collectively, the design and layout of the proposal is not considered to be
- 5.3.3 The agent has stated within the submitted design and access statement that planning permission was previously granted for a single storey extension to the rear elevation for the existing shop in 1993. The local Planning Authority has researched into the previously approved extension, it was smaller in scale and as previously discussed the submitted application is not acceptable due to a combination of the flat roof, overall size and dog-legged shape of the extension and the proposed security measures.
- 5.3.4 The Council is not opposed to an extension to the existing ground floor business, however, the proposal is not considered to be an acceptable design. Improvements to the scheme as suggested to the agent could include a reduced projection, parapet walls with hidden gutters, the removal of the false window and reduced security measures.
- 5.3.5 The proposed design of the proposal is not seen to contribute positively to the identity and character of the area and the original building, through appropriate scale massing and detailing. As such, the proposal is considered to be contrary to section 12 of the NPPF and policy DM29 of the DM DPD.

5.4 Security Measures (NPPF Section 12, Policies DM29: Key Design Principles)

5.4.1 Policy DM29 of the DM DPD requires the safety and security of new development to be fully considered through the design process. Similarly, Paragraph 130F states that development should ensure places are safe, inclusive and accessible and which promote health and well-being, with a high standard of amenity for existing and future users and where crime and disorder, and the fear of crime, do not undermine the quality of life or community cohesion and resilience.

5.4.2 The submitted application fails to provide justification for the excessive amount of security measures that are being proposed in the form of eleven anti-ram bollards to the south west and west of the proposed extension and the roller shutter proposed to the rear elevation of the proposed extension. In addition to the excessive amount, the design of the security measures is seen to contribute to the poor design of the proposed development overall and therefore is not seen to comply with section 12 of the NPPF and policy DM29 of the DM DPD.

5.5 Residential Amenity (NPPF Section 12, Policies DM29: Key Design Principles)

5.5.1 Policy DM29 of the DM DPD states that new development should ensure that there is no significant detrimental impact to amenity in relation to overshadowing, visual amenity, privacy, overlooking, massing and pollution.

5.5.2 The neighbouring property of 14 Tarnbrook Road is located to the ground floor, directly adjacent to the existing shop. The proposed extension features a dog-leg design to reduce the overbearing impact upon the bedroom window of the neighbouring property of 14 Tarnbrook Road. However as previously discussed within the design section, due to the projection and the dog-leg design of the proposed extension, this could lead to a misuse of the area to the north west of the proposed extension, due to lack of security/ blind corners, and therefore, have an impact upon the amenity of neighbouring residential property.

6.0 Conclusion and Planning Balance

6.1 The proposed development is thought to be of a poor quality design, by reason of its scale, dog-leg shaped extension and the proposed security measures. The design is considered to therefore be detrimental to the local spatial character and the visual amenities of the original building and wider area.

6.2 The submitted application fails to justify the need for the excessive amount of security measures proposed, and together with the poor design, the security measures are thought to add to the poor design of the overall proposal.

6.3 The Council is supportive of an extension to the rear elevation of the ground floor business; however the design and security measures needs to be explored further as set out within the pre-application advice that was provided to the applicant prior to the submission of this planning application.

6.4 With consideration being given to all other matters, and due to the reasons outlined above, it is recommended to the Planning Regulatory Committee refuse the application.

Recommendation

That Planning Permission BE REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. The local planning authority considers that the design of the proposed development, by reason of scale, poor design and appearance of the extension would have an incongruous addition to the ground floor of the existing property. The proposed development would detrimentally detract from the local spatial character and is not thought to be a good standard of design or high quality. The proposal therefore fails to comply with policy DM29 of the Development Management DPD and paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The submission fails to demonstrate a proven and justified need for the excessive use of security measures proposed in the form of eleven anti-ram bollards and a security shutter to the rear elevation

of the extension. The proposed security measures would contribute to the poor quality design of the overall proposed development and is contrary to the requirements of Policy DM29 of the Development Management DPD and paragraph 130F of the National Planning Policy Framework.

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. Whilst the applicant has taken advantage of this service prior to submission, the resulting proposal is unacceptable for the reasons prescribed in the Notice. The applicant is encouraged to liaise with the Case Officer in an attempt to resolve the reasons for refusal.

Background Papers

None