Committee: PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS REGULATORY COMMITTEE
Date: MONDAY, 20TH FEBRUARY 2006
Venue: MORECAMBE TOWN HALL
Time: 10.30 A.M.

A G E N D A

1 Apologies for Absence
2 Minutes of the Meeting held on 23rd January 2006 (previously circulated)
3 Items of Urgent Business authorised by the Chairman
4 Declarations of Interest

Planning Applications for Decision

Community Safety Implications

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A5 05/01596/CU</td>
<td>Littledale Hall, Littledale Road, Brookhouse, Lower Lune Valley Ward (Pages 1 - 4) Change of use from Religious Retreat to Short Term Residential Care Home for Mr F Leigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6 05/01413/LB</td>
<td>St Chads Church, Farleton Old Road, Claughton, Lower Lune Valley Ward (Pages 5 - 8) Listed Building Consent for the removal of Church Bells for The Diocesan Board Of Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7 05/00646/CU</td>
<td>Wennington Institute, Bentham Road, Wennington, Upper Lune Valley Ward (Pages 9 - 10) Change of use and conversion of former village hall to domestic dwelling for P and R Smith</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8  A8 05/01437/FUL  Village Institute, Main Street, Hornby  Upper Lune Valley Ward  (Pages 11 - 18)

Application to modify condition 7 on application 03/00181/FUL to extend hours of opening until 01.00 am Friday and Saturday nights for Hornby Parish Council

9  A9 05/01600/FUL  Brookside, Whams Lane, Bay Horse  Ellel Ward  (Pages 19 - 20)

Erection of a 2 storey detached dwelling and separate garage on land to the side for Mr and Mrs K H Parker

10  A10 05/01535/FUL  Railton Hotel, 2-4 Station Road, Lancaster  Castle Ward  (Pages 21 - 24)

Demolition of existing 15 bedroom hotel and erection of 38 bedroom hotel with associated facilities and car parking for Mr E Stirling

11  A11 06/00021/FUL  31 Austwick Road, Lancaster  Skerton West Ward  (Pages 25 - 26)

Erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr and Mrs Crompton

12  A12 05/01616/FUL  Fairfield Hall, Westbourne Road, Lancaster  Castle Ward  (Pages 27 - 30)

Erection of an extension to nursing home for Hillcroft Nursing Homes

13  A13 06/00024/CU  14 Damside Street, Lancaster  Bulk Ward  (Pages 31 - 34)

Change of use of shop into amusement centre with new shop front as extension to existing adjoining unit for Classic Leisure (Northern) Limited

14  A14 05/01406/FUL  Bridge House Farm, Harterbeck, Wray  Lower Lune Valley Ward  (Pages 35 - 36)

Erection of a timber building glasshouse and open plant display area within a fenced secure area for Joyce Jones
15 A15 06/00051/CU 2 Well Lane, Yealand Redmayne, Carnforth Silverdale Ward (Pages 37 - 40)

Change of use of former Post Office to form part of dwelling and erection of a conservatory extension and detached car port with workshop store for Mr J Beck

16 A16 06/00004/CCC Beaumont View, Stratford Close, Lancaster Skerton West Ward (Pages 41 - 42)

Change of use from residential home for the elderly to day care facility and addition of a conservatory within courtyard for Lancashire County Care Services

17 A17 05/01584/CPA Land to the North of Lancaster starting at the Eastern End of the A683 Heysham to the M6 Link Phase 1 running In an Easterly Direction to connect with the M6 at Junction 34 (Pages 43 - 62)

Construction of a new highway - completion of Heysham to M6 Link and improvements to existing highways. (Comments on this proposal should be sent directly to Lancashire County Council, County Hall Preston PR1 8XJ or via the following link http://www.lancashire.gov.uk/environment/policyanddevelopment/m6link.asp for Lancashire County Council.)

18 A18 05/01570/DPA 50-72 Queen Street, Morecambe Duke's Ward (Pages 63 - 64)

Installation of new shop fronts, new windows to upper floors, replacement roofs and restoration of facade for Lancaster City Council

19 Background (Pages 65 - 66)

20 Delegated List (Pages 67 - 74)

21 Quarterly Statistics (Pages 75 - 76)
22 **Exclusion of the Press and Public**

The Committee is recommended to pass the following recommendation:

That, in accordance with S100A (4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it could involve the possible disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 13 of Schedule 12A of that Act.

Members are reminded that, whilst the following item has been marked as exempt, it is for the Committee itself to decide whether or not to consider this in private or in public. In making the decision, Members should consider the relevant paragraph of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, and should balance the interests of individuals or the Council itself in having access to information. In considering their discretion, Members should also be mindful of the advice of Council Officers.

23 **Untidy Land, 17 Thirlmere Drive, Morecambe (Pages 77 - 86)**

Report of the Head of Planning and Building Control Services

**ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS**

(i) **Membership**

Councillors Roger Sherlock (Chairman), Eileen Blamire (Vice-Chairman), Evelyn Ashworth, Ken Brown, Abbott Bryning, Keith Budden, Anne Chapman, Susie Charles, Chris Coates, Sheila Denwood, John Gilbert, Mike Greenall, Helen Helme, Jean Jones, Judith Jones, David Kerr, Pat Quinton, Sylvia Rogerson and Paul Woodruff

(ii) **Substitute Membership**

Councillors James Airey, Jon Barry, Jim Blakely, Janice Hanson, Emily Heath, Tony Johnson, Geoff Knight, Joyce Pritchard, Robert Redfern and Alex Stone

(iii) **Queries regarding this Agenda**

Please contact Jane Glenton, Administration Services - telephone (01524) 582068 or email jglenton@lancaster.gov.uk.

(iv) **Changes to Membership, Substitutions or Apologies**

Please contact Members’ Secretary, telephone 582170, or alternatively email memberservices@lancaster.gov.uk.

MARK CULLINAN
CHIEF EXECUTIVE
TOWN HALL,
LANCASTER LA1 1 PJ

Published on Thursday, 9th February 2006
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED
CHANGE OF USE FROM RELIGIOUS RETREAT TO SHORT TERM RESIDENTIAL CARE HOME

SITE ADDRESS
LITTLEDALE HALL
LITTLEDALE ROAD
BROOKHOUSE
LANCASTER
LANCASHIRE
LA2 9EY

APPLICANT:
Mr. F. Leigh
3 Littledale Hall Mews
Littledale
Lancaster
LA2 9EY

AGENT:

REASON FOR DELAY
Committee cycle

PARISH NOTIFICATION
No objections in principle, but queries the description of the development and the potential treatment to patients

LAND USE ALLOCATION/DEPARTURE
The land is designated as a Countryside Area in the Lancaster District Local Plan 1996-2006

STATUTORY CONSULTATIONS

County Highways - The change of use will not have a material impact upon the highway network and therefore there are no objections in principle. The applicant should however provide a reflectorised give-way sign on the gate adjacent to Littledale Road.

Commission for Social Care Inspection - No observations to make.

OTHER OBSERVATIONS RECEIVED
None

REPORT
Littledale Hall is a nineteenth century Grade II listed building set in an isolated position, approximately two miles due south-east of the settlement of Brookhouse, within the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
The Hall is accessed via a long and winding, single-width access track which follows the line of Foxdale Beck. A sizeable external car parking area is located directly outside the Hall.

The property is currently used as a Christian Retreat. This application proposes to change the use of the site to a short-term residential care home, registered with the Commission for Social Care Inspectorate. Information submitted with the application suggests that some of the short term residents will include people undergoing drug and alcoholic rehabilitation programmes. Normally this would be a permitted change of use but a condition of the original approval in 1991 specifically limited its use to a religious based retreat only. A supporting statement providing further information from the applicant is attached for members information. There will be no alterations to the fabric of the building.

The type of care provided is described as suitable for those with ‘psycho-social difficulties’. The age range will be 18-65 and residents will be temporarily accommodated at the Hall throughout their treatment.

The applicant has provided an example of the education options that will be available. These activities include basic training in literacy and numeracy, computer training, career planning, healthcare, relationship development and other training aimed at developing ‘life skills’. Care may be provided on an individual or group basis. Each person’s ‘care plan’ is developed individually, and prior to leaving the Hall a community support plan is provided to help integrate the person back into society.

Up to 20 people can be accommodated at any time with 8-10 members of staff who will provide 24-hour cover, and some staff will use separate accommodation at the Hall.

The applicant considers that there will be approximately five vehicle movements per day. Given the size of the car park, and the fact that the access road does have passing places, there are no traffic objections.

The use would appear an appropriate and positive use for this listed structure. The remote position of the building ensures that no neighbouring properties or uses are affected by the proposal. Members are therefore advised that the change of use can be supported.

HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

This application has to be considered in relation to the provisions of the Human Rights Act, in particular Article 8 (privacy/family life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property). Having regard to the principles of proportionality, it has been concluded that there are no issues arising from the proposal that appear 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.

RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED subject to the following conditions: -

1. Standard three year consent
2. Use restricted to short-term residential care home only for persons with psycho-social difficulties, with no permanent residential accommodation provided for patients.
13-01-06

Change of use from religious to short-term residential care home –
Littledale Hall Caton with Littledale

- The service category is Category D (Care Homes Regulations 2003). The Care Home will be registered with the Commission for Social Care Inspectorate. The Care provided will be to adults aged 18-65 years with a range of psycho-social difficulties.

- Residents will be engaged in a structured programme tailored to their individual needs as identified in their assessment and care plan (National Health Service and Community Care Act 1990). To facilitate the tailored approach to service delivery there will be a menu of education options available as negotiated with local service providers. **Sample Weekly Schedule (education) below:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Mon</th>
<th>Tues</th>
<th>Wed</th>
<th>Thurs</th>
<th>Fri</th>
<th>Sat</th>
<th>Sun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic Skills (literacy, numeracy)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Communications Technology</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careers planning</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promoting health</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Literacy</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive relationships</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life Skills</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarly residents will be provided with therapeutic services that meet their identified needs, which may include individual and group counselling as appropriate.

- Residents are temporary not permanent. Residents will usually have an existing address and will be encouraged to maintain this throughout the duration of their residency at Littledale Hall. Residents will be encouraged to maintain links in their community prior to residence at Littledale Hall. Prior to leaving Littledale Hall all residents will have a Community Support plan drawn up which will take into consideration the above.

- Staff will provide 24 hour cover. A rota will be provided in line with current legislation (Health and Social Care Act 2003) to the Commission for Social Care Inspectorate detailing staffing arrangements. To facilitate this separate accommodation is available at Littledale Hall.

I note that the more information provided the greater the chance of permission being granted. Should you require further detail or need clarification of the above to progress the application please do not hesitate to re-contact me.

Yours sincerely

Fred Leigh
This page is intentionally left blank
DECISION DATE: 23 January 2006
APPLICATION NO.: 05/01413/LB A6
PLANNING COMMITTEE: 20 February 2006

DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED: LISTED BUILDING CONSENT FOR THE REMOVAL OF CHURCH BELLS
SITE ADDRESS: ST CHADS CHURCH
FARLETON OLD ROAD
CLAUGHTON
LANCASTER
LANCASHIRE
LA2 9LA

APPLICANT: The Diocesan Board Of Finance
Church House
Cathedral Close
Blackburn
BB1 5AA

AGENT: Lea Hough And Co

REASON FOR DELAY
Delayed consultation responses.

PARISH NOTIFICATION
Claughton Parish Council argues that the bells should remain in situ and not removed to another location. If the bells have to be removed then the City Museum would be a more preferable location than St Chad’s.

LAND USE ALLOCATION/DEPARTURE
The site lies within a Countryside Area as defined by the Lancaster District Local Plan 1996-2006. Claughton is within the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

STATUTORY CONSULTATIONS
Conservation Officer - To safeguard the historic bells they should be relocated as detailed in the application.

OTHER OBSERVATIONS RECEIVED
None.
REPORT

This listed building application seeks to obtain consent for the removal of two historic bells from St Chad’s Church, which has recently been granted planning approval for a change of use to a domestic residence. The church is located on the eastern side of the A683, occupying an elevated position adjacent to The Old Rectory.

The bells are the most noteworthy feature of this building. The Medieval bell was cast in 1296 and is the oldest dated bell in England. A second (Georgian) bell is dated 1727 and is, in comparison, less significant. It is not known whether the bells were cast specifically for Claughton or were transferred during the Reformation.

The church was substantially rebuilt around 1904 although there are elements of the ancient fabric still visible, the east window tracery dating back to 1300. The church was declared redundant some time ago and a new residential use has been found for the building, which should hopefully prevent any further deterioration of the structure. The majority of internal fixtures have been removed without listed building consent and it is known that the Diocese was reprimanded by English Heritage as a consequence.

The applicant intends to relocate the Medieval bell to St Margaret’s Church in Hornby, where it would be supported off a new solid timber beam to match the existing timber of the entrance hall ceiling. A location for the Georgian bell has yet to be found, although there is a suggestion that Quernmore St Peter’s could be suitable once their belfry is restored. In the meantime the bell will be put into storage.

Ideally, it would be infinitely preferable that the bells remain in situ. Not only would this contribute to retaining part of the building’s remaining ecclesiastical character, but would also continue to be a source of pride for the settlement.

However the condition of the older bell is paramount, and it is known that the headstocks of both bells require either repair or renewal, which would have to be undertaken by a specialist. If the bells remain in their present location, this responsibility would fall upon the residential owner of the property. Given that listed building consent has already been granted for the conversion of the building, there is no planning mechanism for ensuring that this repair work be either paid for or carried out to the required standard.

If consent is granted then it is suggested that replica bells are installed to the bellcote at St Chad’s in an attempt to maintain the appearance of the building.

This is a balanced case. On one hand there appears to be considerable local feeling against the resiting. However the Local Planning Authority has reached the conclusion that the oldest bell requires repair and those remedial works cannot be guaranteed given the new use of the premises. Resiting the bell to another church in this part of the district will safeguard its future and, as a result, its national importance. This has to be the determining factor in this instance.

It is argued that the City Museum would be a more appropriate location. There are merits to this proposal too. The Museum would be able to guarantee preservation and would ensure that the historical significance of the Medieval bell is displayed for future generations. However there is recognition that where practical, bells from redundant churches should be transferred for reuse in other places of worship. The Local Planning Authority also believes that relocation in an accessible parish close to the original church is more desirable.
With regard to the Georgian bell, the Local Planning Authority recognises that this bell also requires remedial work in the future, but given that a final location has yet to be established we have concluded that this bell should remain in position until a final destination has been secured.

Therefore Members are advised that listed building consent can be granted for the resiting of the Medieval bell only to St Margaret’s Church in Hornby, but that a further listed building application will be required for the resiting of the Georgian bell once a suitable destination has been found. Storing the latter bell in lieu of a replacement location is not considered appropriate, particularly as the search for an alternative site could be a long procedure.

HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

This application has to be considered in relation to the provisions of the Human Rights Act, in particular Article 8 (privacy/family life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property). Having regard to the principles of proportionality, it has been concluded that there are no issues arising from the proposal that appear 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.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That **LISTED BUILDING CONSENT BE GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard listed building consent.
2. Development as per approved plans.
3. Consent applies to the resiting of Medieval bell only to the agreed location in St Margaret’s Church, Hornby with Farleton.
4. Within 3 months of the removal of the Medieval bell, a replacement replica bell manufactured from GRP to the satisfaction of the LPA shall be hung from the same position at St Chad’s Church, Claughton.
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED

CHANGE OF USE AND CONVERSION OF FORMER VILLAGE HALL TO DOMESTIC DWELLING

SITE ADDRESS

WENNINGTON INSTITUTE BENTHAM ROAD WENNINGTON LANCASTER LANCASHIRE LA2 8NR

APPLICANT:

P And R Smith Braddan House Braddan Bridge Dougal Isle Of Man IM2 4AG

AGENT:

The Hamilton Gee Partnership

REASON FOR DELAY

Awaiting amended proposals from applicant to address detailed concerns.

PARISH NOTIFICATION

Objects on the grounds of highway safety.

LAND USE ALLOCATION/DEPARTURE

Local Plan - The site is within the Countryside Area and within the Wennington Conservation Area.

STATUTORY CONSULTATIONS

County Highways - No objection to revised proposals subject to sight-line condition.

OTHER OBSERVATIONS RECEIVED

Four letters received from two parties objecting to the proposal on the grounds of dangerous access with restricted visibility, lack of footpaths and loss of agricultural land and access. Correspondence also received from neighbouring land owners contesting title of part of the site, however this seems to have been resolved in favour of the applicant.

REPORT

This site lies within the Wennington Conservation Area at the eastern entrance to the village. It is a very prominent and important building for the setting and appearance of the Conservation Area, acting as a "book end" to the village. The building walls are sound but the roof is collapsing and putting the structure in serious danger. The existing access arrangements are very poor but the application site includes a section of the adjacent field to allow this to be remedied.
This site was the subject of an application (no 88/265) to demolish the hall and erect a detached house, which was refused and a subsequent appeal dismissed on the grounds of inappropriate design, highway safety and conflict with rural development policies.

An application (No. 03/00830) to convert the hall to a dwelling utilising its existing access was refused in 2004 on housing policy and access visibility grounds. A subsequent appeal is held in abeyance pending the outcome of this application.

This proposal is a full application for the conversion of the former Village Hall to a dwelling. The details of the conversion are similar to those of the previous scheme and indicate that very little alteration to the external fabric of the building will be required beyond its re-roofing in slate. The fundamental difference between this and the previous application is that the site curtilage has now been extended into the adjacent field to provide a more appropriate curtilage and to allow the access to be moved eastwards to provide adequate visibility in both directions.

In policy terms, SPG16 puts important buildings within Conservation Areas that are in poor structural condition within Category A, allowing their conversion to residential use in appropriate cases. In this case, the building is already of domestic scale, character and appearance. Its location adjacent to existing residential properties would render it inappropriate for commercial use and its highway position would be inappropriate for commercial uses and its highway position would be appropriate for commercial vehicles or a significant traffic generator. Residential conversion as proposed would therefore appear to represent the most appropriate future use and the one most likely to safeguard the character and appearance of the building and benefit the setting of the Conservation Area.

The particular scheme has been designed to minimise its impact upon neighbouring amenities, locating only secondary uses on this side of the building.

It is considered therefore, that in its amended form this proposal can now be accepted.

HUMAN RIGHTS

This application has to be considered in relation to the provisions of the Human Rights Act, in particular Article 8 (privacy/family life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property). Having regard to the principles of proportionality, it has been concluded that there are no issues arising from the proposal which appear 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.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That PERMISSION BE GRANTED subject to conditions covering the following issues:-

1. Standard full permission.
2. Amended plans (6 December 2005).
3. Development in accordance with approved plans.
4. No demolition without consent.
5. Details of boundary treatments, landscaping and surface treatments to be agreed and provided.
6. Revised access, hardstanding and visibility splays to be provided.
7. Samples or roofing slate to be agreed.
8. Finish of car port structure to be agreed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DECISION DATE</th>
<th>APPLICATION NO.</th>
<th>PLANNING COMMITTEE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 January 2006</td>
<td>05/01437/FUL A8</td>
<td>20 February 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED</th>
<th>SITE ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APPLICATION TO MODIFY CONDITION 7 ON APPLICATION 03/00181/FUL TO EXTEND HOURS OF OPENING UNTIL 01.00 AM FRIDAY AND SATURDAY NIGHTS</td>
<td>VILLAGE INSTITUTE MAIN STREET HORNBY LANCASHIRE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICANT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hornby Parish Council Village Institute Main Street Hornby Lancashire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REASON FOR DELAY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Awaiting further information from applicant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARISH NOTIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Letter of management intent and support.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE ALLOCATION/DEPARTURE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Plan - The site is within the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Beauty and the Hornby Conservation Area and is a Grade II Listed Building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATUTORY CONSULTATIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Health Officer - No objection County Highways - No response received</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER OBSERVATIONS RECEIVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Six letters received objecting on the grounds of late night noise and disturbance from inside and outside the building, inadequate parking and loss of value to surrounding properties. Two letters of support but for occasional use only because of the above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPORT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This site is the Village Institute on the east side of Main Street, Hornby to the south of the river which is currently being extended and refurbished under permission No. 03/00181 (a copy of the report in respect of that application is attached for Members reference). The site lies in the middle of the village with a farmhouse and buildings to the north and east but is otherwise surrounded by dwellings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This proposal is a full application to vary Condition 7 of permission No. 03/00181 (restricting use to 11.30 p.m.) to allow opening until 1.00 a.m. on Friday and Saturday nights to allow for functions on these nights. This facility was previously available every night of the week, but rarely used other than on Fridays and Saturdays. The Parish Council do not anticipate a significant increase in the frequency of late night events as a result of the works being carried out and a copy of their letter of support is also attached for Members' reference. The facility will in future have a full time manager and within the refurbishment has been provided with much improved sound insulation and escape doors to address previous noise issues.

It is considered that the Parish Council constitute an appropriate responsible and democratically accountable body to manage this facility in the community interest and that it would be unreasonable for the planning process to restrict the use of the premises beyond that which has been long established in practice.

In the light of these circumstances therefore, it is considered that this proposal can be supported.

HUMAN RIGHTS

This application has to be considered in relation to the provisions of the Human Rights Act, in particular Article 8 (privacy/family life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property). Having regard to the principles of proportionality, it has been concluded that there are no issues arising from the proposal which appear 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.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That PERMISSION BE GRANTED subject to conditions covering the following issues:-

1. Permission granted as an amendment to permission No. 03/00181.
2. Hours of use to be no later than 11.30 p.m. Sunday to Thursday and 1.00 a.m. on Friday and Saturday nights.
Mr M Culbert,
Senior Planner,
Lancaster City Council,
Palatine Hall,
Dalton Square,
Lancaster.
LA1 1PW.

14th December 2005

Re:- Application No. 05/01437/FUL

Dear Mr Culbert,

I refer to our recent telephone conversation relating to the above.

The Institute has always been used for community events and gatherings of various users from the toddler group to the OAPs sometimes during the day but others into the evening. The Institute was used daily prior to the refurbishment and bookings are already been taken for user groups to return to the venue. The Village Trust also have various parties booked together with their own fund raising nights which have never been a problem to the community before.

The Institute has now been insulated and double glazed throughout and extraction fans in the hall will mean the windows will never need to be opened therefore the noise should be less. The front doors have also been adjusted so that these can be kept closed during evening events and in the event of a fire will be pushed open. In the past we have always had to lock back the front doors thus letting noise escape.

A great deal of effort, both physical and financial has been put into this project to bring the Institute up to first class modern day specifications to
be used to full advantage for daily and evening events for people of all ages throughout the Lune Valley.

Large amounts of money have been invested at both local and national level (ie Leader+, English Heritage the Big Lottery and Lancaster City Council) to make this a most suitable venue for all the community. We therefore feel it is our responsibility to be able to use this venue to its full capability whenever possible to be of benefit to the community and all concerned.

The Village Trust do not envisage a great increase in late night usage but would like to see more usage during the day with say organisations being brought to the village to help the community in general and especially the elderly who find it difficult to get in to town by bus, etc. We also do not wish to turn people away from this exciting Village Institute. If people wish to put on events (a great deal of these being for charitable and fund raising uses) or private use such as Silver Weddings, 21st birthday parties, family parties, we would like to be able to offer the facility of a late night on a Friday or Saturday until 1.00am. All events would be supervised to keep local disturbance to a minimum. The Village Institute is taking into its employment a full time Manager of this venue.

The Public Entertainment Licence on the institute prior to the refurbishment allowed for a later closing every night of the week, but this is not required as it is only on Friday and Saturday nights where there are occasional late night events. Arrangements are currently being made for a new Public Entertainment Licence to be applied for.

I hope this clarifies our telephone conversation, but if there are any concerns please contact me at the above address.

Yours sincerely

Andrew Wilkes
Clerk
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DECISION DATE</th>
<th>APPLICATION NO.</th>
<th>SCHEDULE NO.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 April 2003</td>
<td>03/00181/FUL</td>
<td>A22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED</th>
<th>SITE ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEMOLITION OF PART OF EXISTING HALL AND ERECTION OF A TWO STOREY EXTENSION TO INCORPORATE NEW LIFT, MEETING ROMS, KITCHEN, BAR AND W.C'S</td>
<td>VILLAGE INSTITUTE MAIN STREET HORNBY WITH FARLETON LANCASHIRE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICANT:</th>
<th>AGENT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Hornby Parish Council  
C/o Andrew Wilkes  
Clerk To The Council  
Greenacres  
25 Main Street  
Hornby  
LA2 8JR | Harrison Pitt Architects |

**REASON FOR DELAY**

Awaiting additional information.

**PARISH NOTIFICATION**

Application has been submitted by the parish.

**LAND USE ALLOCATION/DEPARTURE**

Lancaster District Local Plan - Within Forest of Bowland AONB and Hornby Conservation Area

**STATUTORY CONSULTATIONS**

*County Archaeologist* - Possible site with archaeological deposits, particularly medieval and post-medieval. Suggest condition to ensure programme of archaeological work be undertaken before works are commenced.

*County Highways* - Raising concerns over the potential impact from the reduced car parking area, but raises issues over the lack of service area and possible impact upon the adjacent classified road. Final views awaited.

*Access Officer* - Provides advice over internal fittings and ramp gradients.

**OTHER OBSERVATIONS RECEIVED**

Five individual letters of objection have been received from neighbouring residential properties. The letters raise the following areas of concern:-

- The hall is presently serviced from the side of the building, the proposed design will result in the loss of this service area and could lead to obstruction of the lane leading to Bridge End Farm which is in constant use.
- The use of the hall already generates major car parking problems, the loss of 6/8 parking spaces, plus the inevitable more intensive use of the building, will further exacerbate the problem and its impact upon neighbours and the village as a whole.
- The development will restrict access to a private garage to the rear of Main Street.
If allowed, the construction period will cause disturbance to neighbouring residents and business and could obstruct the farm access. The proposed development will lead to loss of privacy/noise and overlooking for the neighbouring residential property.

REPORT

This application site lies within the centre of the village of Hornby and is bounded by residential properties, a working farm and the classified Main Street.

The proposal, submitted by Hornby Parish Council, seeks consent to demolish a single storey part of the Village Institute to the rear of the main building and erect a two storey extension. The extension, whilst providing two floors internally, is designed to rise no higher than the ridge line of the existing pitched roof to the auditorium.

Internally, the extension will enable the provision of three meeting rooms, improved toilet/bar facilities and the introduction of facilities and access for disabled visitors. Externally, the new extension will be built over an area presently used for car parking and servicing of the rear rooms. This area of land lies alongside the main access road to Bridge End Farm.

Comments

The proposal has raised concerns from both local residents and the County Highway Engineer over the impact of the lost parking spaces and the servicing of the Institute. The applicant's supporting statement highlights the availability of a car park on the other side of the road, which is within the control of the Institute, and indicates that servicing will only take place from the front of the building as the Institute only enjoys a right of access over the farm access road. The County Surveyor's views over the proposed servicing/parking arrangements are anticipated in time for the Committee meeting.

Concerns have also been raised by neighbouring residents over the impact of the extension, the intensification of use and the unneighbourly relationship. Additional concerns have been raised over the potential disturbance during the construction period, should the development be approved. Appropriate planning conditions to control the hours of use, glazing of the upper floor dormer windows and a scheme of construction management would need to be attached to address these legitimate planning considerations.

Overall, the proposal is considered to represent an opportunity to further develop the Village Institute and the role it plays within the village and the wider rural area. However, the final views of the County Surveyor are required over the servicing arrangement. Subject to the arrangements being acceptable to the County Surveyor, the development should be supported with appropriate conditions.

Human Rights Act Implications

The applicant's right to respect for his home and peaceful enjoyment of his property has been balanced against the views and rights of objectors. However, for the reasons set out in this report and having regard to the principles of proportionality, the objections do not outweigh the applicant's right to use and develop his land subject to the recommended conditions.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Subject to no significant objections being raised by the County Surveyor, PERMISSION BE GRANTED with the following conditions:-

1. Standard five year time limit
2. Development to be completed in accordance with the approved plans.
3. Glazing to the upper floor dormer window to be obscure glass.
4. Hours of construction.
5. Scheme of Construction Management to be agreed.
6. Samples of external materials to be agreed.
7. Hours of use to be no later than 11.30 pm unless otherwise agreed.
8. As required by the County Surveyor.

ADVICE

1. Copy of Access Officer's comments
2. Development adjacent to a public footpath.
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED
ERECTION OF A 2 STOREY DETACHED DWELLING AND SEPERATE GARAGE ON LAND TO THE SIDE

SITE ADDRESS
BROOKSIDE
WHAMS LANE
BAY HORSE
LANCASHIRE
LA2 9BZ

APPLICANT:
Mr And Mrs K H Parker
Brookside
Whams Lane
Lancaster
LA2 9BZ

AGENT:
Nigel Phillips Design

REASON FOR DELAY
None

PARISH NOTIFICATION
Ellel Parish Council have no objections.

LAND USE ALLOCATION/DEPARTURE
The proposed site is located on land designated as Countryside Area in the Lancaster District Local Plan.

STATUTORY CONSULTATIONS
County Surveyor - No response received.

OTHER OBSERVATIONS RECEIVED
One letter received from the occupier of Oak Villa who has no objections to the scheme on the proviso that the existing agricultural looking unit is completely removed from within the site and that the materials and design replicate the traditional architecture of the local area.

REPORT
The site which forms the subject of this application is located on the north west side of Whams Lane, south west of Five Lane Ends and the Bees Dairy complex. The application site is located between two properties namely Brookside House and Oak Villa which form part of a small ribbon of residential development in this location, known as Bay Horse.
Bay Horse lies approximately 3 miles south of the village of Galgate on the classified road C449 which forms the main rural traffic route from Bay Horse to Quernmore.

With the exception of the ribbon of development and the long established Dairy complex the surrounding area is characterised by open rolling pastureland.

The submitted proposal is a full application which proposes the removal of an existing, unsightly storage/garage unit and the erection of a substantial two-storey property and detached garage within the existing domestic curtilage to the side of Brookside House.

The new dwelling would be a large two-storey four bedroomed house, of traditional design in brick under slate, replicating local architectural detail.

In policy terms this is not a Category A site and would represent an unsustainable development in an essentially isolated site in the rural area. The provision of a dwelling in this location would contravene with the Authority’s Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG 16) relating to new residential development. In addition the erection of a residential unit on this site, unconnected with the agricultural requirements of the surrounding area or any other personal circumstances, would clearly conflict with the Settlement policies in the Local Plan and the Structure Plan. Finally new residential development in this rural location would add to the gradual accretion of residential development, prejudicing the purposes of promoting sustainable development and protecting the character of the rural area.

In the absence of appropriate justification the development of the site in the manner proposed would clearly make the pursuance of these policies and practices elsewhere more difficult.

It is on this basis that Members are advised that planning permission be resisted in this case.

**HUMAN RIGHTS ACT**

This application has to be considered in relation to the provisions of the Human Rights Act, in particular Article 8 (privacy/family life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property). Having regard to the principles of proportionality, it has been concluded that there are no issues arising from the proposal which appear 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.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

That **PLANNING PERMISSION BE REFUSED** for the following reasons: -

1. Would add to the over-supply of housing within the district and conflicts with SPG16.
2. Dwelling is not required for the purposes of agriculture, forestry or other purposes appropriate to a rural area as such would conflict with the policies in the Local Plan and Structure Plan.
3. It would set a precedent for other similar sporadic developments in the countryside, making such applications progressively more difficult to resist.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DECISION DATE</th>
<th>APPLICATION NO.</th>
<th>PLANNING COMMITTEE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31 January 2006</td>
<td>05/01535/FUL A10</td>
<td>20 February 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DEMOLITION OF EXISTING 15 BEDROOM HOTEL AND ERECTION OF 38 BEDROOM HOTEL WITH ASSOCIATED FACILITIES AND CAR PARKING.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITE ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAILTON HOTEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 STATION ROAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANCASTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LANCASHIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA1 5SJ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICANT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr E Stirling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railton Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Station Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA1 5SJ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Rushton Incorporating Rhodes Day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REASON FOR DELAY**

Awaiting consultation responses

**PARISH NOTIFICATION**

N/A

**LAND USE ALLOCATION/DEPARTURE**

Local Plan - The site is unallocated.

**STATUTORY CONSULTATIONS**

- **County Highways** - Observations awaited.
- **Chief Engineer** - No objections.
- **Environmental Health Officer** - No objections. Conditions re. hours of construction and dust requested.
- **Conservation Officer** - Observations awaited.
- **United Utilities** - No objections.
- **Civic Society** – observation awaited

**OTHER OBSERVATIONS RECEIVED**

Thirty six letters of which 15 are signed copies of the same letter, have been received objecting to this proposal on the following grounds:-

Over-intensive development of the site.
Too tall in relation to existing development.
Too close to Station Road and Westbourne Road.
Design out of keeping with existing development.
Loss of green space at the junction.
Inadequate paring leading to increased on street parking and increased highway danger.

Two letters have been received supporting the proposal.

REPORT

BACKGROUND

This site is the end terrace property (nos 2 and 4) located at the junction of Station Road with Westbourne Road and its surrounding curtilage. To the rear of the site lies the modern Bay View Court block of flats. To the east lies the station, while to the south lie the similar Victorian terraced houses. The area is not within a Conservation Area and the only Listed Building in the vicinity is the station.

Members will recall that in October 2005, Committee refused an application against officer recommendation to demolish the existing Railton Hotel property and erect a new 39 bedroomed hotel on the following grounds:-

1. The development of the site in the manner proposed would represent an over-intensive development of the site which would result in the loss of the open aspect of this prominent corner and be detrimental to the character and appearance of this historic part of the city, and contrary to the provisions of Policy H19 of the Lancaster District Local Plan which sets out the general criteria for development of small sites within the urban areas of the district.

2. The development of the site in the manner proposed would represent an inappropriate form of development in relation to the adjoining terrace and the locality in terms of its scale, design and massing, which would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the locality and the setting of the adjacent Castle Conservation Area and nearby Listed Buildings and contrary to Policy 35 and para 5.7.14 of the Lancaster District Local Plan.

3. The development of the site in the manner proposed would be detrimental to the amenities and privacy of nearby residents due to significant overlooking from elevated public rooms at the rear and would therefore also be contrary to Policy H19 of the Lancaster District Local Plan in this respect.

THE PROPOSAL

This proposal is a revised application for the demolition of the existing hotel and the erection of a new 38 bedroomed hotel again occupying both frontages but a smaller footprint, leaving a wider distance to Station Road and occupying a shorter length of the Station Road frontage and having elevational design features more in keeping with those of the existing development on Westbourne Road.

The applicant claims that if this site is to continue in use as a hotel, its redevelopment has become necessary because the existing property cannot meet modern accessibility standards and has previously been extensively altered internally making further significant structural work unviable. He further claims that the scale of the replacement structure currently proposed is the minimum necessary to make such redevelopment economically viable.

The new plans will be displayed at the Committee meeting but the applicants consider the revised proposals have been specifically designed to try and accommodate the Committee's criticisms of the earlier scheme. Again, the design does not attempt to replicate the adjacent victorian facades but the elements on either side of the corner tower feature are some 2.5 storey (above ground level) high with dormer windows and ground floor bays to Westbourne Road which reflect and continue the scale and character of the existing development very well.
To create a focal point and landmark structure on this important corner, a single four storey (above ground level) conically roofed tower, with slightly projecting half hipped gables on both frontages is proposed, with a small projecting entrance porch of similar style, fronting Station Road.

The whole development again has basement level accommodation and is layed out in an L shape but with a shorter frontage to Station Road allowing the provision of secure cycle and bin stores and a vehicle turning space. All car parking would now be external and 8 spaces would now be provided.

This reduced scheme no longer crosses the 45 degree visibility line from the rear windows of the neighbouring dwelling at any point and has only one dining room window and one function room window at the rear, both of which could be obscure glazed. The impact of the development on neighbouring residential amenities has therefore been significantly reduced from that of the previous scheme.

However, the corner tower and entrance porch have a similar relationship to Station Road as the previous scheme.

Materials would be natural stone reused from the existing building, with slate roofs, some vertical slate hanging and timber windows. The rear elevations would be rendered to match those of neighbouring properties.

CONSIDERATIONS

There are no specific Local Plan policies relating to this site or the provision of Hotels/Tourist Accommodation in Lancaster. However the proposal conforms to the requirements of Policy EC6 relating to new employment development, and Policy H19 relating to development on small sites within existing urban housing areas. The proposal would also address the recognised shortfall in lower cost short-stay accommodation in the City Centre, adjacent to a major national transport network. Bearing in this in mind, the scheme provides two less off street parking spaces than currently exist on the site. Any overspill would use the station car park on the diagonal opposite corner. In policy terms, a proposal of this nature in this location would be acceptable without any dedicated off street parking facility.

This amended scheme again addresses the highway safety issues previously raised by the County Highway Authority and the applicant has previously indicated his willingness to negotiate a contribution to the erection of a mini-roundabout at the junction of Station Road with Westbourne Road, not exceeding £10,000.

CONCLUSION

It is considered therefore, that this revised proposal addresses the issues raised by Committee in respect of the previous scheme and represents a well thought out landmark scheme, which would maximise the development potential of this site and provide much needed modern tourist accommodation close to the railway station without detracting unduly from neighbouring amenities or the existing character and appearance of the area, and would enable much needed highway junction improvements and can now be supported.

Final detail amendments to the external elevations have been requested and are anticipated in time for Committee. Subject to the receipt of these, it is recommended that the Head of Planning & Building Control be empowered to approve the application subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement in respect of the contribution to the mini-roundabout (if required).
HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

This application has to be considered in relation to the provisions of the Human Rights Act, in particular Article 8 (privacy/family life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property). Having regard to the principles of proportionality, it has been concluded that there are no issues arising from the proposal which appear 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.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That subject the completion of a Section 106 agreement as set out above, the Head of Planning and Building Control be empowered to agree the application subject to conditions covering the following issues:

1. Full permission.
2. Amended plans.
3. No demolition until a contract for reconstruction has been let.
4. All stonework to be securely stored on site and used for the external elevations of the approved scheme.
5. Details of the stonework, coursing, heads, sills, quoins, pillars, jambs, chimneys, mullions and copings to be agreed.
6. Details of roof eaves, verges, ridges, hips, finials, dormers, and rainwater goods to be agreed.
7. Details of the windows, doors rooflights and screens, including set backs and finishes to be agreed.
8. Details of external landscaping, retaining and boundary walls, surfacing and gates including heights and siting to be agreed.
9. Samples of slate, render and any additional stone to be agreed.
10. Details of all external signage and illumination to be agreed.
11. Junction radius improvement.
12. Visibility splay at Westbourne Road and site entrance.
13. Car parking and control of entrance gates.
14. Turning space.
15. Hours of working and deliveries.
17. No pile driving without consent.
18. Archaeological evaluation and excavation.
19. Trap gullies to parking areas.
DECISION DATE
7 March 2006

APPLICATION NO.
06/00021/FUL A11

PLANNING COMMITTEE:
20 February 2006

DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED
ERECTION OF A SINGLE STOREY REAR EXTENSION

SITE ADDRESS
31 AUSTWICK ROAD
LANCASTER
LANCASHIRE
LA1 2QY

APPLICANT:
Mr And Mrs Crompton
31 Austwick Road
Lancaster
Lancashire
LA1 2QY

AGENT:
D.H.Design North West Limited

REASON FOR DELAY
None.

PARISH NOTIFICATION
N/A.

LAND USE ALLOCATION/DEPARTURE
Local Plan - The site is unallocated. Individual proposals to be considered on their merits.

STATUTORY CONSULTATIONS
Property Services - Council’s consent as former land owner also required. A note to this effect is needed on any decision.

OTHER OBSERVATIONS RECEIVED
No representation received.

REPORT
This site is a small semi-detached house with a small rear garden surrounded by 1.8m high screen fences. Both this and the attached neighbour's garden contain large sheds adjacent to the rear and party boundaries. This rear garden is also very closely overlooked from the other side by a terrace of two storey houses.
A previous application (No. 05/01112) for a single storey ridge roofed extension 6.8m long by 3.9m wide and set 0.7m from the party boundary was refused in October 2005. This crossed the 45 degree line by 4.2m and left only 1.3m to the rear boundary and was considered to be an over development of the site, leaving the property with inadequate private amenity space detrimental to the outlook and amenities of neighbouring occupiers, and contrary to the policies H19 and SPG12 of the Local Plan. These serious planning objections were considered to override the personal circumstances of the applicant.

In subsequent correspondence with the applicant's agent, the Case Officer suggested an alternative scheme for a reduced and relocated extension at the other side of the garden which was felt to address the most serious concerns and therefore be more likely to be acceptable. However, this was rejected by the applicant and their advisors as unworkable but no detail of this decision has been provided.

This proposal therefore, is a further full application for a reduced version of the original scheme, reducing its length to 5.5m, leaving 2.5m to the rear boundary. This extension is still only 0.7m from the party boundary and crosses the 45 degree line by 3.0m. The ridged roof has however been replaced by a flat roof which in this case will reduce its impact somewhat.

However, it is considered that this proposal filling the centre of this small garden, is still excessively large, representing an over development of the site in relation to neighbouring development, which would be seriously detrimental to the outlook and residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers and be contrary to the provision of policy H19 and SPG12 of the Lancaster District Local Plan.

It is the overall length of the extension and its proximity to the party boundary that remain the most concerning aspects of this proposal. As sympathetic as Officers and Members are to the needs of these applicants and their family, it is a cornerstone of planning practice that the personal circumstances of an applicant can only tip the balance in marginal cases. In this case it is not considered that these acknowledged circumstances should override such serious and fundamental planning objections.

In the light of these circumstances therefore, it is considered that this proposal should be resisted.

**HUMAN RIGHTS**

This application has to be considered in relation to the provisions of the Human Rights Act, in particular Article 8 (privacy/family life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property). Having regard to the principles of proportionality, it has been concluded that there are no issues arising from the proposal which appear 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.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

That **PERMISSION BE REFUSED** for the following reasons:-

1. Over development of site, detrimental to the amenities and outlook of neighbouring occupiers and contrary to policies H19 and SPG12 of the Lancaster District Local Plan.

2. Precedent.
DECLARATION DATE
3 March 2006

APPLICATION NO.
05/01616/FUL A12

PLANNING COMMITTEE:
20 February 2006

DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED
ERECTION OF AN EXTENSION TO NURSING HOME

SITE ADDRESS
FAIRFIELD HALL
WESTBOURNE ROAD
LANCASTER
LANCASHIRE
LA1 5DX

APPLICANT:
Hillcroft Nursing Homes
Caton Green Road
Brookhouse
Lancaster
LA2 9JH

AGENT:
JMP Architects Ltd

REASON FOR DELAY
Committee Cycle

PARISH NOTIFICATION
N/A

LAND USE ALLOCATION/DEPARTURE
The site is located within a residential area west of the City Centre. There are no specific land allocations relating to this site as identified on the Lancaster District Local Plan.

STATUTORY CONSULTATIONS
City Council Engineering Services - No objections on highway safety grounds or drainage related matters.
City Council Environmental Health Services - Specific controls are required to prevent adverse impact(s) to nearby residential properties. The development warrants a planning condition to control hours of construction, vehicular access, deliveries and other movements of heavy goods vehicles.

OTHER OBSERVATIONS RECEIVED
A petition has been submitted containing the names of 34 residents from 22 neighbouring properties. In addition nine individual letters have been received opposing the development on the following grounds; -

1) Traffic, parking, access problems and pedestrian safety;
2) Residential amenity in terms of overlooking/loss of light, noise nuisance from delivery and visitor vehicles and disruptive security lights;
3) Appearance of the proposed development and its resultant impact on the character of the area;
4) Construction disturbance;
5) The need for 4 additional bedrooms is questioned.
REPORT

BACKGROUND

In normal circumstances this application would have been determined under delegated powers, however in light of recent objections to the scheme this application has been referred to Committee.

This site is located on a large corner plot between Wingate Saul Road and Suunyside Lane, which backs the properties of Ashfield Avenue. Fairfield Hall is set back approximately 26 metres from the adjacent highway namely Westbourne Road. This classified road runs west out of the City Centre towards Abraham Heights and Willow Lane, which runs parallel to the estuary of the River Lune.

Fairfield Hall was granted consent for the change of use from a private hotel into a nursing home in 1985 (REF: 85/00945/CU). Later in 1995, planning permission was given for a two-storey extension to the rear of the property to provide a substantial expansion to this long established nursing home (REF: 95/00626/FUL). This application was controversial at the time and prompted a considerable amount of local opposition.

PROPOSED SCHEME

The proposed scheme is for a two-storey extension to the west side of the front elevation of the building to provide four additional bedrooms, a reception room and associated bathroom/shower facilities. It follows preliminary discussions prior to this formal planning submission. A smaller element of the scheme concerns the replacement of an existing front porch with a marginally larger, fully glazed reception area.

No part of the development would extend beyond the furthest most front elevation of the building or the side elevation facing Sunnyside Lane (west).

There are also a number of internal changes to the existing room arrangements, one of which initially led to objections from neighbours due to an obscure glazed window being enlarged and made clear to serve a bedroom which led to overlooking. However, following negotiations, the applicants have agreed to retain the existing smaller obscure glazed window and reorganise the arrangements so that this only serves a bathroom.

ISSUES ARISING

In terms of loss of light and over-shadowing the scheme has retained the suggested standard of 12 metres between the proposed development and the habitable rooms of the terraced properties of Ashfield Avenue. This is similar to the standards expected for domestic extensions as set out in the Residential Design Guide (SPG no 12) and should ensure that the nearby properties are not unduly harmed by the development. The agent has obtained and submitted data on sunlight and daylight data for Lancaster at various dates, which concludes that the proposed extension will have very little difference to the light at the back of the Ashfield Avenue. Given the angle of the proposed extension, it is not anticipated that the proposal will lead to direct overlooking.

In design terms it is considered that the scheme has been carefully designed and complements the traditional architecture of the exiting building and that of the surrounding area. It is also felt that the scale of the structure is sufficiently subservient in relation to the dimensions of the original building and that it provides appropriate stonework, window and door detailing.
A further issue relates to traffic generation, access provision and pedestrian safety. Given the relatively small scale it is considered that the proposed extension will not adversely affect vehicular movement, parking provisions or pedestrian safety at the site or within the immediate locality. The applicant advises that there will be approximately 15 vehicle movements a day, which can be accommodated within the existing parking area. The Council’s Engineering Services have raised no highway objections.

Some residents have referred to noise and security lighting as reasons for opposition. It is not expected that there will be any excessive noise from inside the building and that the only noise would arise from vehicle manoeuvres. This already occurs and given that the estimated vehicle numbers are comparatively low, there does not appear to be any noise grounds for resisting this proposal. There will obviously be noise and disturbance during the construction period but this will be relatively short lived and can be controlled by the usual construction hours condition. The issue of security lighting could be conditioned should this application be approved.

The question of need has also been raised amongst objectors. It has to be assumed that there must be a demand for this proposal given the investment that is required for this building work. Any concerns that the extension would lead to a change of use of the building are unfounded because any approval would be conditional upon the building retaining its use as a residential nursing home.

CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, the submitted scheme accords with planning requirements regarding the erection of commercial extensions. The design and scale of the proposal is in keeping with the existing building and the surrounding properties in this location. The character and appearance of the building is maintained.

On this basis Members are advised that this application can be supported.

HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

This application has to be considered in relation to the provisions of the Human Rights Act, in particular Article 8 (privacy/family life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property). Having regard to the principles of proportionality, it has been concluded that there are no issues arising from the proposal which appear 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.

RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT PERMISSION BE GRANTED subject to the following conditions: -

1. Standard Time Limit
2. Development to be carried out in accordance with approved plans
3. In accordance with the amended plans
4. Materials to match the existing front elevation of the property
5. Details of the window/door joinery to be submitted
6. Details of stonework and slate to be submitted
7. Details of all security lighting and screening to be submitted
8. Use of building to be solely as a residential nursing home
9. Standard hours of construction condition
10. New windows and altered window in side (west) elevation to be obscure glazed and retained as such thereafter
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED

CHANGE OF USE OF SHOP INTO AMUSEMENT CENTRE WITH NEW SHOP FRONT AS EXTENSION TO EXISTING ADJOINING UNIT

SITE ADDRESS

14 DAMSIDE STREET
LANCASTER
LANCASHIRE
LA1 1PB

APPLICANT:

Classic Leisure (Northern) Limited
6 Victoria Place
Concorde
Washington
NE37 2SU

AGENT:

Barden Planning Consultants

REASON FOR DELAY

None

PARISH NOTIFICATION

N/A

LAND USE ALLOCATION/DEPARTURE

Lancaster District Local Plan - The proposed property is allocated as an `Other Key Frontage’ within the City Conservation Area.

STATUTORY CONSULTATIONS

Environmental Health Officer - Offers no adverse comment.
Conservation Officer - No objections from a conservation point of view.
Police - No objections to this change of use.
Forward Planning Team - Policy S6 of the Local Plan applies. It would be difficult to argue that the proposal is in breach of the policy if all other considerations are satisfied.

OTHER OBSERVATIONS RECEIVED

No objections received from neighbouring residents.

REPORT

THE PROPOSAL

This application site is a single-storey corner property linking Damside Street with Wood Street within the City Centre Conservation Area. The site is located outside the main shopping area adjacent to the City’s Bus Station, on the northern periphery of the City Centre. The building is of modern construction linking
the traditional three-storey terraced properties of Damside Street with a single two-storey modern building on Wood Street.

The property is a retail unit within a frontage of mixed uses, including a video shop, hairdressers, a hot food takeaway and the immediately adjacent amusement arcade on Wood Street.

The proposal seeks consent for the change of use of this retail unit, known as Busy Bees to an amusement arcade. The application essentially forms an extension to the existing amusement arcade and therefore does not constitute a new amusement use within the City. The alterations to the shop front would be the subject of a separate full planning application and advertisement consent.

POLICY POSITION

Policy S6 of the Lancaster District Local Plan specifically addresses the use of buildings as amusements centres. It seeks to direct this form of development away from the Castle Conservation Area and Primary Retail Frontages.

Amusement centres are directed to ground floor properties within the City Conservation Area where they do not:

- Harm the character and appearance of the street scene or historic buildings;
- Compromise pedestrian safety on a major traffic route;
- Adjoin a similar use or break-up a continuous retail frontage; and;
- Have a significant adverse affect on the amenities of neighbouring residents or businesses.

Other policies that are relevant to this application are Policies S4 and S7 of the Local Plan, which defines Key and Other Key Retail Frontages and sets out criterion for these frontages within the City Centre. Essentially this policy is in place to protect the viability and vitality of the City Centre by controlling and restricting certain areas to vibrant uses, such as retail.

The proposed property is allocated within an ‘Other Key Frontage’ (which covers 2-14 Damside Street), and this specifies that A1 (Retail) and A3 (Food and Drink) uses that satisfy the criteria set out in policy S7 will remain the dominant uses.

In policy terms the proposal would be difficult to resist. In relation to Policy S6, criterion 3, the requirement not to adjoin a similar use is intended to prevent proliferation or clustering.

It generally conforms with the policies detailed above. It represents an extension to an existing amusement outlet and is acceptable in terms of the usage and the general impact on the street scene. It is considered that the proposed change of use would not unduly impact the vitality and viability of this street and the wider City Centre Conservation Area.

CONSIDERATIONS

The impact of the development on the amenities of residential property will be minimal as it is the same distance from the nearest residential units above ground floor premises on Damside Street. The proposed scheme is an extension to the established arcade and therefore it is highly unlikely that this small expansion will cause any undue harm. Comments from the Police and the Environmental Health Service clearly support this observation.
CONCLUSION

Overall it is considered that with appropriate conditions the proposed development would be acceptable from a planning point of view and would not compromise Policy S6 of the Lancaster District Local Plan.

On this basis Members are advised that this application can be supported.

HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

This application has to be considered in relation to the provisions of the Human Rights Act, in particular Article 8 (privacy/family life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property). Having regard to the principles of proportionality, it has been concluded that there are no issues arising from the proposal which appear 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.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That **PLANNING PERMISSION BE GRANTED** subject to the following conditions: -

1. Standard Time Limit
2. Use to be carried out in accordance with approved plans
3. Use of building to be solely used as an amusement arcade.
4. Ancillary to the existing adjacent amusement arcade and shall not be used as a separate unit.
5. Hours of Use shall be between 7.30 a.m. and 11.00 p.m. as imposed by Condition 5 of the original permission.

Advice Note:

The applicant is advised that the alterations to the shop front would have to be the subject of a separate full planning application and new advertisements may require Advertisement Consent.
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DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED
ERECTION OF A TIMBER BUILDING
GLASSHOUSE AND OPEN PLANT
DISPLAY AREA WITHIN A FENCED
SECURE AREA

SITE ADDRESS
BRIDGE HOUSE FARM
HARTERBECK
WRAY
LANCASTER
LANCASHIRE
LA2 8QP

APPLICANT:
Joyce Jones
C/o Agent

AGENT:
Michael Harrison

REASON FOR DELAY
Awaiting revised proposals from applicant.

PARISH NOTIFICATION
No objection.

LAND USE ALLOCATION/DEPARTURE
Local Plan - The site is within the Forest of Bowland Area of Natural Beauty and the Wray Conservation Area.

STATUTORY CONSULTATIONS
County Highways - No objection.
Conservation Officer - No comment.

OTHER OBSERVATIONS RECEIVED
Four letters received from neighbours opposite and three from other addresses in the village objecting to this proposal on the grounds that it would be out of keeping with its surroundings being wood and glass, loss of view and increased activity and noise, increased traffic and congestion, nuisance from security lights and precedent for further creeping development.

REPORT
This site is located at the eastern end of the village of Wray adjacent to Wray Bridge, the River Roeburn and the recently created Bridge House Tea Rooms which occupy the original stone barn and outbuildings on the site. This recently approved farm diversification scheme includes a craft workshop and sale room in addition to a café.
This proposal is a full application to create a small fenced area on the concrete apron of the previously existing modern farm buildings on the north side of the yard, to be used as a garden centre with a small timber chalet type sales building, a small greenhouse and an open plant display area.

The applicant is a local resident who currently grows plants locally under organic conditions, which are displayed and sold at shows throughout the North West and supplied to clients as contract planting for both exterior and interior schemes. This proposal seeks to consolidate this small scale operation on one site within the village of Wray where the applicants live within walking distance.

In land use terms, this is considered to be an appropriate location for the proposed use, provided that its small scale, low key nature is maintained. The particular location occupies an existing concrete apron and closes off the open side of the yard between the existing tea room and craft workshop. The site is reasonably well screened from its surroundings, there are no immediate neighbours, and there is good vehicular access and ample parking. Furthermore, it would compliment the existing use of the site and tourism in the village generally and would conform to the requirements of Policy TO3 of the Local Plan relating to its small scale tourism proposals in the rural area.

Members will note the neighbour concerns and it is accepted that the timber and glass materials of the development are not strictly in keeping with the adjacent stone structures, but they are small in scale, inconspicuously located, screened behind existing buildings and existing and proposed planting and stained green to further reduce their impact.

Furthermore, the applicant is only seeking a 5 year temporary consent, which will allow the proper development of the business, but will also allow the authority to keep the development under review and avoid establishing a use which could otherwise subsequently become inappropriate in its scale and form for this location.

On this basis therefore, it is considered that the amended proposals can be supported on a temporary basis as suggested.

HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

This application has to be considered in relation to the provisions of the Human Rights Act, in particular Article 8 (privacy/family life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property). Having regard to the principles of proportionality, it has been concluded that there are no issues arising from the proposal which appear 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.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That PERMISSION BE GRANTED subject to conditions covering the following issues:-

1. Temporary consent 5 years.
2. Amended plans.
3. Development and use in accordance with approved details.
4. Use to be contained within the approved perimeter fence, timber building and the courtyard between them and the existing buildings.
5. The display and sale of goods to be limited to those identified in the application or such others as may be agreed.
6. Details of timber finishes to be agreed, implemented and maintained.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DECISION DATE</th>
<th>APPLICATION NO.</th>
<th>PLANNING COMMITTEE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 March 2006</td>
<td>06/00051/CU A15</td>
<td>20 February 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED</th>
<th>SITE ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHANGE OF USE OF FORMER POST OFFICE TO FORM PART OF DWELLING AND ERECTION OF A CONSERVATORY EXTENSION AND DETACHED CAR PORT WITH WORKSHOP STORE</td>
<td>2 WELL LANE YEALAND REDMAYNE CARNFORTH LANCASHIRE LA5 9SX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICANT:</th>
<th>AGENT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr J Beck</td>
<td>Mr. T. Gill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Well Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yealand Redmayne</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REASON FOR DELAY**

N/A

**PARISH NOTIFICATION**

Views awaited

**LAND USE ALLOCATION/DEPARTURE**

Lancaster District Local Plan - Lies within the Arnside and Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Yealand Redmayne Conservation Area

**STATUTORY CONSULTATIONS**

None

**OTHER OBSERVATIONS RECEIVED**

None to date, any comments will be reported to committee

**REPORT**

This application seeks consent for the change of use of a former post office to form part of the residential property known as 2 Well Lane, Yealand Redmayne. In addition to the absorption of the shop into the main living area as a kitchen/dining area the application seeks the modification of the existing flat roof kitchen to a conservatory at the western end of the property and erect a detached workshop/carport to the rear of the dwelling.
The site comprises a two storey detached property with the post office element located within a small part of the ground floor. The remaining property is wholly residential with a good sized garden to the rear of the building. The property fronts onto Well Lane and has residential properties to the east and west of the site. The western boundary abuts a number of rear gardens to terraced dwellings fronting The Meadows. The rear gardens to the terraced properties are approximately 18m in length.

Planning History

The site has a limited planning history relating to a number of modifications to the building including the reduction of the size of the shop area in 1978.

Planning Policy

The application needs to be considered in respect of two distinct policy issues a) the impact and form of the residential extensions and b) the loss of the rural shop.

Impact of the Extensions

Policy H7 - seeks to ensure that housing development is appropriate in terms of density, design and does not have a detrimental impact upon nearby residents, the character of the village and wider landscape.

Policies E3 and E4 - relate to landscape protection within the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and Countryside area, seeking to ensure that any development does not have an adverse impact upon the landscape quality of the area.

Policies E35, E38 and E39 relate to development within conservation areas, again seeking to ensure that any development within a conservation area does not affect its setting, character or important views across the conservation area.

It is considered that the small-scale extension/modification of the dwelling will have little impact upon the character and setting of the village conservation or wider Silverdale and Arnside AONB. The relationship of the extensions to the neighbouring dwellings and the length of the rear gardens to the dwellings on The Meadows together with the presence of a number of semi mature trees will result in development that satisfies the spatial guidance set out in SPG 12 Residential Design Guide. Overall, subject to appropriate conditions it is considered that the creation of the conservatory and detached garage/store would not raise any significant planning issues and could be supported.

Loss of the rural shop

Policy S18 of the Lancaster District Local Plan seeks to protect the loss of village shops unless it can be demonstrated that committed attempts have been made to market the shop. Evidence will need to be provided that the property has been marketed in the appropriate local or trade press on more than two occasions at a realistic price over a period of at least one year and that no reasonable offers have been refused.

POLICY S18 reads: -

IN THE RURAL AREA, PROPOSALS FOR THE CONVERSION OF VILLAGE SHOPS TO NON-A1 RETAIL USE WILL NOT BE PERMITTED UNLESS IT CAN BE DEMONSTRATED THAT THE SHOP IS NO LONGER VIALBE
Marketing Evidence Submitted

Initially, the applicant submitted no evidence of marketing but has indicated that the post office ceased trading in January 2002 following a period of diminishing trade. However following discussion with the applicant it has been established that the property was marketed with two local agents for a long period prior to closure of the shop. It is understood from the most recently appointed agent, Fisher Wrathall, that the business was marketed at a reasonable price but received little interest and no firm offers. This information has only been verbal and a formal statement from the agent is awaited.

In addition to the marketing of the property the applicant has provided accounts for the years running up to the closure of the shop. These accounts show falling trade and vastly reduced profits:

Other Village Facilities

The Post Office was the only shop in the village until its closure in 2002. The shop was located at the southern end of the village in a less than prominent position at the western end of Well Lane, a short residential cul-de-sac. Following closure of the shop which comprised a Post Office, news agency and general store the Post Office element of the business was transferred to a `community Office’ in the village hall and has been operating from this location on a part time basis for approximately three and half years. The Village Hall is located approx 400m outside Yealand Redmayne, but is centrally located between Yealand Redmayne and Yealand Conyers alongside the village school.

Assessment

In assessing the quality and quantity of any supporting evidence, District Plan Policy S18 is relevant the details and constraints of the policy are outlined above.

To date the applicant has provided accounts that indicate falling and minimal profits for the shop, clearly raising issue over the commercial viability of the shop. In addition, the local agent has outlined the marketing of the business over a considerable period prior to its closure and the lack of interest/offers for the business. It is anticipated that a formal statement should be available from the marketing agent in time for the committee meeting.

Taking these matters into account, and based upon the marketing and viability information submitted and the extended period of closure, It is concluded that the non viability of the business has been adequately demonstrated and that the proposal accords with District Plan Policies. Members are advised that the application should be supported.

HUMAN RIGHTS ACT IMPLICATIONS

It is recognised that a recommendation of refusal may result in an interference with the applicant's right to develop their land in accordance with the Human Rights Act. However, on the facts of this case it is considered both necessary and proportionate to control development in the public interest in light of the concerns set out in this report and for the stated reasons.
RECOMMENDATIONS

That PERMISSION BE GRANTED subject to the following conditions

1. Standard time limit.
2. Development to be built in accordance with the approved plans.
3. Samples of the external finishes (slate and Render) to the garage store to be agreed.
4. The store/workshop building shall only be used for domestic purposes, ancillary to the main use of the dwelling.
5. Precise details of the modifications to the vehicle access from Well Lane to be agreed.
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED
CHANGE OF USE FROM RESIDENTIAL HOME FOR THE ELDERLY TO DAY CARE FACILITY AND ADDITION OF A CONSERVATORY WITHIN COURTYARD

SITE ADDRESS
BEAUMONT VIEW
STRATFORD CLOSE
LANCASTER
LANCASHIRE
LA1 2JP

APPLICANT:
Lancashire County Care Services
48 West Cliff
Preston
Lancashire
PR1 8HU

AGENT:
GVA Grimley

REASON FOR DELAY
None

PARISH NOTIFICATION
None

LAND USE ALLOCATION/DEPARTURE
The site is allocated as a Residential Area in the Lancaster District Local Plan 1996-2006

STATUTORY CONSULTATIONS
This is a County Council application and all external consultations are undertaken by the County.

Engineering Services - No objections subject to the imposition of conditions relating to the retention of car parking spaces and the provision of a turning space within the site boundary.

OTHER OBSERVATIONS RECEIVED
None.

REPORT
This site is an existing residential car home for the elderly, located on Stratford Close, which is accessed via Barley Cop Lane.

The building is constructed from brick and has a tiled roof. The surrounding properties comprise residential bungalows. A public allotment is located at the rear of the premises.
There are two elements to this proposal; firstly the erection of a conservatory within the existing courtyard; and secondly the change of use of the building to provide a day care facility.

The conservatory will have a shallow, semi-hexagonal pitch and will be located on the rear eastern wing of the building and will be obscured from public view. Therefore there are no objections to this part of the scheme.

The change of use is more controversial in that it would almost certainly involve an increase in vehicular traffic at the site. The premises currently rely upon on-street parking, and despite a lack of residential driveways it would appear that the surrounding roads were not excessively busy with vehicles during the daytime.

The scheme proposes 17 car parking spaces (of which 13 are new spaces) on the eastern boundary, and these will be hidden by a new 1.8m high boundary fence to minimise impact upon the nearest residential properties. A minibus turning area is provided within the site and a drop-off zone will also ensure that bus vehicles do not park on the public highway opposite the junction with Shakespeare Road.

The applicant has indicated that there will be a minibus operating on “two or three” occasions each day and that this will reduce the need for visitor vehicles, which are estimated at no greater than two per day. There will be eight staff vehicles and one delivery vehicle on a daily basis.

Whilst the number of visitors appears unusually low, there would appear to be sufficient car parking spaces within the site to accommodate demand even if it is greater than the applicant envisages. It is recommended that the nature of these car parking spaces (visitor spaces, staff spaces) are indicated on the site and retained for those purposes at all times.

The use is similar to the one that currently exists, seemingly without detriment to neighbouring residents.

On this basis of the details submitted, the Local Planning Authority is of the view that there are no justifiable objections to the scheme on planning grounds.

**HUMAN RIGHTS ACT**

This application has to be considered in relation to the provisions of the Human Rights Act, in particular Article 8 (privacy/family life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property). Having regard to the principles of proportionality, it has been concluded that there are no issues arising from the proposal that appear 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.

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

That the City Council has **NO OBJECTIONS** subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard car parking retention condition
2. Car parking spaces to be permanently marked out
3. Standard vehicle turning space condition
4. Details of the boundary gates and fencing to be agreed
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED

CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW HIGHWAY - COMPLETION OF HEYSHAM TO M6 LINK AND IMPROVEMENTS TO EXISTING HIGHWAYS.

SITE ADDRESS

LAND TO THE NORTH OF LANCASTER STARTING AT THE EASTERN END OF THE A683 HEYSHAM TO THE M6 LINK PHASE 1 RUNNING IN AN EASTERLY DIRECTION TO CONNECT WITH THE M6 AT JUNCTION 34

APPLICANT:

Lancashire County Council
County Hall
Preston
PR1 8XJ

AGENT:

Executive Director Of Environment

REASON FOR DELAY

None.

PARISH NOTIFICATION

None.

LAND USE ALLOCATION/DEPARTURE

The route of the bypass is predominantly located within the North Lancashire Green Belt. It will also affect four County Biological Heritage Sites (CBHS), two of which are the River Lune and the Lancaster Canal, where the towpaths comprise designated Informal Recreation Areas. Long Bank Wood and Dale Wood are the other CBHS. Tree Preservation Order 44 at Cross Hill Field is located close to the proposed route.

Land to the east of Junction 34 is designated as a Countryside Area, whilst land on the western fringes of Torrisholme and Scale Hall are allocated as Urban Greenspaces and Areas of Outdoor Playing Space.

The A6 (Lancaster Road), the A683 (Caton Road) and the A589 (Morecambe Road) are Access Corridors, as is the West Coast Mainline. Primary Bus Corridors affected are identified as the B5321 (Lancaster Road/Torrisholme Road) and the A589 at Morecambe Road.
STATUTORY CONSULTATIONS

As the determining authority, all statutory consultations are undertaken by the County Council.

Engineering Services - Awaited

Environmental Health Services - Awaited

OTHER OBSERVATIONS RECEIVED

The Local Planning Authority has received three letters expressing opposition and support for the scheme. It is the role of the County Council to consider these observations and these letters has been forwarded to them for consideration.

REPORT

Summary of Development

This application proposes the construction of a new vehicular highway comprising of a dual carriageway linking Junction 34 of the M6 Motorway with Phase I of the Heysham Link Road.

The road will measure 4.8km in length and will incorporate a combined footway/cycleway on the western carriageway.

Procedural Issues

The City Council is a statutory consultee in its role as the local planning authority. The Council has agreed an extension of time so that the proposals could be debated at this Planning Committee. The County Council anticipate that the application will be considered at its Development Control Committee on 5 April 2006 at the earliest.

As part of this application the County Council have produced an Environmental Statement that, following evaluation, discharges their obligations under the Environmental Impact Assessment Regulations 1999. This Statement includes analysis of the impacts upon ecology, landscape, air quality, water quality, geology and soils, the cultural heritage and disruption caused by general noise, vibration and visual impacts.

Chronology of Proposed Development and Justification of Route

A northern link road has been mooted ever since the late 1950’s when a route was shown on the County Development Plan. During the 1980’s a number of bids were made to include such a route on the national road building programme, and in 1988 the Lancaster Local Plan formally protected the line of a possible route through the grounds of Lancaster & Morecambe College.

However the publication of the Morecambe & Heysham Local Plan envisaged a different bypass, known as the Western Route, joining the local road network at Mellishaw Lane. In 1995 the Western Route became subject to consideration at the Lancashire Structure Plan Examination in Public (EIP), where it was concluded that the Northern Route could perform much of the function as its Western counterpart, but with less environmental damage. In the meantime Phase I of the Heysham to M6 link had been constructed and was open to traffic.

In 2000 the Inspector at the Lancaster District Local Plan (LDLP) Inquiry concluded that the Western Route should be deleted from the Local Plan because the benefits that would accrue were not clear, and any benefits would be outweighed by environmental damage.
Public consultation took place a year later regarding both routes, and the County Council resolved to undertake comparative environmental impact studies. An M6 link road remained the County’s top priority.

Modifications to the LDLP were prepared and consulted on. Perhaps the most telling evidence of the suitability of the route occurred during consideration of the modifications in 2001. The Government Office for the North West (GONW) commented that “given that the balance of advantage appears to lie with the Northern Route on most counts, the preference for the Western Route appears perverse”. Furthermore the ability of the Western Route to meet the terms of the Conservation Regulations 1994 was considered “questionable” when compared with the Northern option.

An independent regeneration and economic assessment (undertaken by ERM Economics in 2004) also concluded that the Western Route’s argued advantage over the Northern Route was not significant. The Northern Route would offer an improvement in strategic accessibility to and from the Port of Heysham, and would produce local economic benefits for a lower capital cost when compared to the Western Route, particularly if it was complimented with a third Lune crossing which would open up direct access to the industrial area at Luneside. Later that year the County Council formally supported the Northern Route, but without the provision of a bridge linking the existing highway network with Luneside.

Public consultation occurred and a preliminary scheme was amended as a result. The scheme now before Members has been approved as the preferred option by the County Council Cabinet. Last year the County Council submitted the scheme to the Department for Transport as the first step towards obtaining Central Government funding.

On 13 January 2006 the North West Regional Assembly’s Executive Board ratified the decision to select the link as one of 25 major regional transport schemes it will recommend to Central Government.

Development Plan Background

It must be made clear that this report does not consider the ‘need’ for the road. This has already been considered during the Development Plan process, and the LDLP states that the City Council “supports the completion of the Heysham-M6 link road as a matter or priority”. The LDLP was adopted in 2004 without identifying a specific route for the M6 link, although both potential routes were protected pending a final decision by the County Council. In September 2004, following environmental assessment of both options and having taken Counsel’s opinion, the Northern Route was selected as the preferred option and also received the support of the City Council.

The strategic purpose of the road is twofold, namely:

- To provide a direct link for Morecambe & Heysham traffic (particularly Port and tourism traffic) and assist the regeneration of the Lancaster & Morecambe area (particularly Heysham); and,
- To contribute as one of a number of measures, to solving the traffic problems of Lancaster, improving safety and environmental conditions there and enabling existing road space to be used more effectively to give priority to buses, cyclists and pedestrians.

Both The Joint Lancashire Structure Plan (2001-2016) and The Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West (RSS) recognise that the link is significant to the operation of the region in improving access to the Port of Heysham and, more generally, the resort of Morecambe. The link would also remove a substantial volume of traffic from the River Lune bridges in Lancaster. The Regional Transport Strategy confirms the general policy that “long distance traffic will be concentrated on motorways and primary routes”.
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Regional guidance also acknowledges that port-related traffic at Heysham can have a significant impact on congestion and environmental quality on approach routes to the port. Rail and road links to this port are poor, and this is seen as a threat to potential future growth. The transfer of port traffic from road to rail is an integral part of the solution, but the guidance also considers that “improved access is essential to ensure economic competitiveness”. The role of the highway network is vital considering that the potential for rail growth is currently constrained by network capacity and financial implications associated with rail transfer.

All the relevant development plans recognise that constructing new roads to accommodate future traffic growth is not, generally, environmentally or economically sustainable. This position is emphasised by national planning guidance which seeks to reduce the need to travel and make the best use of existing highway infrastructure. However the Transport White Paper indicates that schemes designed to create additional highway capacity can be justified where the needs of motorists and other road users are adequately balanced against wider concerns such as landscape impact. Positives such as the reduction of community severance, decreases in freight congestion and improvements in air quality are all central facets of central government transport policy.

In accordance with these objectives, the first major investment priority of the Lancashire Local Transport Plan (2006/7-2010/11) is the Heysham to M6 link.

There is, therefore comprehensive support throughout the planning process for the Northern Route.

**Detailed Description of Proposal**

The road will link with the existing highway network via two `intermediate" junctions and seven footway/cycleway connections. It will be lit over its entire length.

The remodelling of the M6 junction is a critical feature of the proposal and will provide for new signalised junctions on Caton Road on either side of the existing motorway bridge. The replacement slip roads will be longer to improve vehicular safety and to incorporate the modified junctions. Three new ponds are proposed adjacent to the existing motorway, two of which are designed to aid highway drainage.

The northbound exit slip road continues beyond the western Caton Road junction and forms a new bridge across the River Lune. It then continues under a new bridge which will carry Halton Road, before connecting with the first intermediate junction. This roundabout provides a new vehicular link direct to Halton Road. The northbound entry slip road continues towards Foundry Lane before joining the M6. A minor modification to the existing cyclepath and footpath occurs close to the southern end of the new Lune Bridge.

The route of the Heysham to M6 link runs westwards under Kellet Lane and the diverted Green Lane. In between these two bridges the first lay-by is provided on both sides of the road. A proposed bridleway will connect Green Lane Bridge with Halton Road. On the northern side of the road, part of Howgill Brook is to be converted to an open watercourse. Two smaller ponds occupy positions on the southern side of the new highway.

The road progresses south-westwards under a reorientated Lancaster Road (A6) at Beaumont and connecting with the second intermediate junction due north west of the Beaumont College site. This junction contains a link to the A6 at a signalised T-junction.

The road then crosses the Lancaster Canal before spanning diversions of both Powder House Lane and Folly Lane. In between these sections the highway crosses the West Coast Mainline and provides a second pair of lay-bys. A large area of mounding, attempting to screen the road from nearby residential property close to Hammerton Hall Lane, is created due south of the route. A cycleway connection is provided at the Folly Canal Bridge.
A series of four larger drainage and attenuation ponds are formed on the southern side of the carriageway, and a single smaller pond to the north. The road begins to turn southwards and further mounding and planting is necessary adjacent to Endsleigh Grove and around the Russell Drive area. The western end of Barley Cop Lane is realigned to form a new junction with Torrisholme Road.

A new bridge carries the route over the remodelled Torrisholme/Lancaster Road and the road runs through the land adjacent to Lancaster & Morecambe College and connects to the existing roundabout, which will be upgraded to a signalised crossroads. Morecambe Road is widened at this point. A revamped T-junction to Hadrian Road and improvements to the existing dual carriageway between Northgate and Morecambe Road completes the link.

There are numerous areas of screen planting for the length of the road, particularly at junction points and along embankments.

**The Absence of the Luneside Link**

When Full Council expressed support for the Northern Route, one of the requirements was that a bridge connecting Morecambe Road and the Luneside West area (hereafter referred to as the Luneside Link) would form part of the scheme.

It is commonly accepted that the provision of the Luneside Link would alleviate pinch points of congestion on the existing city centre gyratory system. It would also, as part of this application, provide a direct route to the motorway network and provide more convenient access to job opportunities in the Luneside area.

It is therefore regrettable that the Link is not being proposed as part of this submission and that the consequential regeneration benefits for Luneside cannot be delivered at this time. The Luneside Link is not ruled out in the future, and the need for an additional river crossing will be stated in the forthcoming Local Development Framework documents, but it forms no part of this application.

However there is a material difference between the aspirations expressed by Council, and the formal requirements of the Development Plan. Neither the Joint Lancashire Structure Plan nor the LDLP includes any requirement that the Northern Route should include the Luneside Link. The Link is not explicitly referred to in the RSS, whilst the Lancashire Local Transport Plan makes reference only to cycleway linkage along the bypass.

Therefore, whilst the scheme now proposed does not meet with all the criteria as requested by the City Council, the proposal does not depart from the Development Plan, and therefore the support for the Northern Route expressed in the LDLP remains unaffected.

**Alternative Travel Benefits Accruing from Proposal**

Whilst the Luneside Link is not included, a commitment towards the provision of sustainable transport measures is proposed to take advantage of the estimated 20% reduction in traffic on the city centre gyratory.

The removal of this level of traffic provides opportunities for complementary measures aimed at promoting more sustainable transport choices. Without these measures the travel benefits associated with the bypass would be short-term and the planning system would have failed in delivering improvements to the transport network in this district.
The County Council maintain that completion of the link would create further opportunities to increase and further the development of bus priority measures. Two particular proposals identified involve the reallocation of road space to provide additional bus lanes and a review of the signal timings to facilitate bus priority.

The absence of a suitable site for a Park and Ride facility on the fringes of the City continues to consistently affect the transport choices of both residents and visitors. The A683 Caton Road corridor is being considered for Park and Ride as part of this application. The County Council advise that a study would evaluate the operation of the site before and after the completion of the M6 Link. It is argued that the predicted reduction in traffic volumes on Caton Road may potentially allow for the provision of an inbound bus lane. However a park and ride facility may also be considered at the point where the road intersects with the A6, as this would provide a natural interceptor location in both directions for the M6 and for Morecambe.

The provision of the continual cycle/footway along the bypass would create another link in the district's impressive cycle and pedestrian routes. The Lancashire Local Transport Plan acknowledges that cycling has "built up a momentum in Lancaster" and this scheme would permit a sizeable expansion of the current network. There would be connections from this new route to the B5321 Lancaster Road, A6 Lancaster Road, Green Lane, Halton Road and the Lune Valley Ramble Cycle/Footway. Cycleways would also be provided along the A6 Lancaster north and south diversions.

The rail system is not directly affected by the proposals, although improved pedestrian and cycle links may encourage the use of alternative modes of transport. The transfer of Port of Heysham freight from road to rail remains a valid objective, although it is recognised that the movement of freight is a commercial decision based predominantly on market forces.

The RSS confirms that whilst modal shift is an important component of freight strategies, the "essential role" of the highway network must not be overlooked.

**Vehicular Statistics**

The existing Lune Bridges accommodate an Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) of 45,800 vehicles. 84% of these vehicles involve traffic to and from the Morecambe-Heysham peninsula, with 57% being traffic between the peninsula and Lancaster (south of the River Lune).

The County Council predicts that the Northern Route would become the appropriate route for 72% of the Heysham Port traffic, much of it involving heavy goods vehicles.

The forecast scheme flow west of the A6 is 33,700 AADT in the first year, with 31,800 AADT predicted to use the section east of the A6. The overall transfer of traffic off the existing peninsula highways is 30,000 AADT, which equates to a reduction of 42%. Of this a reduction of 19-25% is estimated for the route between the A589 Morecambe Road roundabout and Junction 34 of the M6.

Skerton Bridge would be removed of 19% of existing traffic in the first year, and Greyhound Bridge relieved of 31%.

In total the reductions on the A683 across both peak periods and in each direction are calculated at 49%, whilst the A6 achieves a more modest reduction predicted at 33%.

Perhaps the most measurable statistic relates to journey time savings. Taking the route from the Morecambe Road roundabout through to Junction 34, the new road is estimated to reduce journey times by up to 74% eastbound during the morning peak, and 76% westbound during the evening peak.
The scheme has been appraised for a 60-year period. It is predicted that the implementation of the road would result in 691 fewer accidents.

**Material Considerations - Assessment of the Physical and Visual Impacts**

There will clearly be substantial amenity impacts arising from the most major structural and landform alterations. The alignment of the route is such that the majority of the cut areas would be at the higher, eastern end of the site and the fill areas at the predominantly lower, western end.

Commencing with the easternmost section of the proposal, the bridge to Junction 34 will require widening on the eastern side by approximately 9 metres. As a result the supporting embankment will need to be increased, taking it further towards Hudson's Farm. In an attempt to mitigate the impacts of this enlarged embankment, a 60m long retaining wall will be constructed to match the materials used on the existing motorway bridge.

The creation of the second River Lune Bridge is the largest single engineering operation associated with this development. This will necessitate a minor realignment of the existing cycle route as the road crosses the cycleway and a new connection is formed just prior to Croskells Junction. The bridge will be located approximately 90m west of the existing M6 bridge, but will be 7m lower than the current structure. The width of the structure will measure almost 30.5m.

This concrete crossing will be supported via two circular-ended piers, both of which are to be positioned on the edges of the river to provide a degree of symmetry. The end supports will comprise reinforced concrete backseats. There is some concern that the lower level of the bridge will, when viewed from the city against the backdrop of the existing bridge, be visually injurious. However the close proximity of the bridges should help to alleviate that concern.

The remodelling of Junction 34 requires an increased area of land take to the east and west of the bridge, but substantial screen mounding is proposed to negate the visual impact. However, negative effects of the development include the requirement to demolish a detached residential property, known as Woodend, on Caton Road and the removal of the main access to Cottam's Farm on the same stretch of highway. Two interceptor-protected attenuation ponds are created to the south.

After leaving the river the road goes into a deep cutting east of Halton Training Camp. A retaining concrete wall of 120m length which rises to a height of 10m is required to avoid excessive land take. A new asymmetric span bridge at this point will carry Halton Road over the link. The asymmetric solution is not the most visually pleasing span arrangement, and a bridge with either a single span or three spans with intermediate piers would have been preferable. However the proximity of the first intermediate roundabout and driver view were critical highway concerns that affected the design of the bridge.

Linkage to this roundabout from Halton Road is another physical alteration that will affect the residents of Halton. The access has been discreetly located on the western side of the existing bridge, and enhanced planting and the presence of a pond (unconnected with drainage) should ensure that this area is sensitively treated.

Foundry Lane Bridge (to the north) requires replacement to accommodate the northbound entry slip at junction 34. A new four-span bridge of equal 24m lengths is proposed with a slight gradient, although the precise position of this bridge has yet to be agreed. It could be on the line of the existing structure or slightly off-line. The line of the bridge will be determined solely on the basis of ‘minimum disruption’. A retaining wall of 190m length and 6m height is proposed where the proposed slip road converges with the M6.
The proposed retaining wall to the south at Shefferlands is a more considerable engineering operation. At this point the slip road enters a deep cutting and the wall is required to mitigate land take from the properties to the west. This wall would be 200m in length and would rise to a height of 15m. To counteract the visual impact of this change in landform, a reclining crib wall with a landscaped terrace is proposed. Such structures usually permit planting within the wall cells to soften the impact further. However it is by no means sure that this will be the most appropriate solution at this section; other alternatives may be explored if there is a need to minimise land take any further.

The cutting provided on either side of the new road to the east of Kellet Lane comprises the most significant vertical changes to the landscape as the road continues westwards towards Kellet Lane Bridge. The existing line and level of Kellet Lane is unaltered but a new four-span bridge with spans of 17m, 30m, 30m and 17m will cross the link road. The cutting at this point will emphasise the span of the bridge.

A similar (albeit smaller) crossing is required at Green Lane, which is to be diverted. This four span structure will measure 12m, 20m, 20m and 12m and will be prominent from the east. The new bridleway will be located tight to the western carriageway and will connect to Halton Road. The route then begins to fall steadily for a length of 850 metres towards the Beaumont area of Lancaster.

To the northwest of the Green Lane diversion approximately 200m of the Howgill Brook (currently underground) will be converted to an open watercourse. This is in mitigation for the loss of an unnamed watercourse to the east which will become dry due to the depth of the cutting; the cutting here will be 18metres deep and will pass through underlying rock stratum, resulting in the severing of the waterflow, which will be connected by highway drainage.

A culvert at Beaumont Gate will maintain the stream that crosses the link road. The deep cutting continues and a new retaining wall of a length yet to be determined, but rising to a possible height of 12m, is required to avoid relocation of an electricity pylon. A new ‘accommodation bridge’ is also needed to provide continued access to the surrounding fields for the occupant of Beaumont Gate Farm. A three span structure is considered appropriate, but the design of the structure will mirror those used at Kellet Lane and Green Lane. Another retaining wall of indeterminate length and up to 6m in height is needed at Beaumont Farm to avoid further land take.

By far the most substantial physical alteration to the north of the City is the construction of the Lancaster Road Bridge, which will take the A6 over the link road. The bridge itself will be a standard two span design with equal 22m spans. The provision of this structure, and the works required to divert a section of Lancaster Road and provide a link to the second intermediate roundabout, will undoubtedly have an impact upon nearby residential property. At present the A6 at this point is a busy route, but is surrounded by undeveloped land protected by the Green Belt designation. There can be no doubt that the works provided here will have an urbanising effect in terms of appearance, character, noise and traffic volume. However the roundabout will be between 6 and 12m below the existing ground level and the link to Lancaster Road is predominantly located in a new cutting, with planting helping to protect neighbouring and visual amenity in the long-term.

The Beaumont Junction necessitates a further retaining wall of 4m height to protect the foundations of another pylon.

The road continues from the roundabout towards the main urban area. The next obstacle is the Lancaster Canal, which has a maximum width of approximately 15m. A new bridge with a 20m span crossing the canal and western towpath and a 6m span crossing the eastern towpath is proposed. This structure is altogether different from those used on other sections of the route; the spans are to be curved to mimic archways used on this stretch of the canal network. This bridge will also be faced with masonry or stone.
Both Folly Lane and Powder House Lane are to be diverted adjacent to the Folly Lane Railway Bridge, where the link road will cross the West Coast Mainline. The road needs to be at its highest point here (approximately +12.5m vertical change) to cross the railway embankment. A single span (40m) stone-faced bridge is considered to be the most effective and, in the circumstances, least imposing structure. The earthworks continue to the west of this bridge where the four largest surface water outfall ponds are to be provided. Isolated properties at Folly Lane are protected by new and extensive landscaping areas.

The road continues turning southwards and provides a pair of lay-bys serving both sides of the highway. It then runs through the vacant land in between the residential areas of Russell Drive and Endsleigh Grove. These areas constitute the most dense districts of housing that are visually influenced by the proposal.

A large area of new planting is proposed at the rear of Russell Drive close to the northern drainage pond, and this should lessen the visual impact of the highway as it begins to turn south-eastwards. Further mitigation in the form of landscape mounding and planting is required adjacent to the properties on Endsleigh Grove, in an area known locally as Cross Hill.

Perhaps the most controversial element of the scheme involves the bridge crossing over Torrisholme Road. Again a single span (17.5m) structure is envisaged crossing the B5321, with the abutments and wing walls made from reinforced earth, faced with masonry textured pre-cast concrete blocks or panels. The retaining wall to the south-east corner will be 80m long to accommodate the diversion of Barley Cop Lane, and a large area of screen mounding is provided adjacent to this diversion.

Like the Lancaster Road Bridge, this is a significant change to the appearance of this part of the district. It is arguable that the Torrisholme Bridge will have a greater impact because of the close proximity to a greater number of residential properties and the fact that the bridge will cross the B5321 at the point where the peripheries of Lancaster and Morecambe are separated by an open field to the east. This physical separation of Scale Hall and Torrisholme will be dominating when scaled against the size of residential property, although the scale of the nearby College and pylons is more in keeping with the dimensions of the bridge. The alternative option would be to provide a further intermediate junction (probably a roundabout) at this location. This would have a much lesser visual impact but would create a further intersection, requiring traffic from all four directions to slow and potentially stop. Given its proximity to the Scale Hall roundabout and the landform changes that would ensue, it is clear that the bridge was created to avoid that scenario.

A 2m-high perspex screen fitted to the parapet will be moderately useful in alleviating noise, yet the visual impacts of a bridge of this size cannot be totally mitigated at this prominent and sweeping corner. However a belt of planting in the grounds of Thorpe View Day centre and screen planting on the northwest side of the route will assist in shielding part of the route. The presence of pylons in the immediate locality limits the potential for further mitigation, although the bridge itself has been designed to have the lowest possible vertical alignment.

The property most affected here is 179 Torrisholme Road, where it is envisaged that a bank of planting will help ameliorate the impacts of the road. The County Council advise that the domestic drainage arrangements that run westwards from this bungalow will be altered.

The road continues along an embankment towards Thorpe View and through grassland and a section of a sporting field at the Lancaster & Morecambe College. Once again the proximity of a pylon requires a retaining wall of 2.5m in height. Screen planting will separate both the College and the retained part of the sport pitches from the bypass. This area also contains an open drainage ditch that requires diversion and culverting on the northern side of the road. Two further culverts at Scale Hall Junction require further investigation before plans to extend or alter them are finalised.
The proposed remodelling of the Scale Hall Roundabout is essential to ensure that linkage with Phase I is effective and can be achieved with no major disturbance to traffic flows using Morecambe Road. Therefore a high-capacity, multi-lane signal-controlled crossroads will replace this roundabout, providing two lanes each for straight ahead and right-turning traffic and one lane for left-turning traffic on the southwest and northeast approaches of the link road. The physical works here will affect both the entrance and egress from the McDonald’s Restaurant and also will also require a new junction replacing the access to Hadrian Road. Culverts in this location will require extension.

Part of the domestic land belonging to 16 Hyndburn Close is required to provide the remodelling of the Scale Hall junction.

The College is exceptionally close to the new route at this point but the safeguarding of land around this location ensures that residential dwellings are at an appropriate distance. The nearest properties are situated adjacent to the existing Phase I and although the link will involve increased usage of the road, the visual impacts associated with the alterations to the existing infrastructure are considered to be appropriate.

A small retaining wall is required on the opposite side of the road at this point to avoid land take from residential property. Existing planting and perimeter garden fencing will screen a sizeable portion of the wall.

The bypass then continues to link with Northgate via a remodelling of the A683/Northgate crossroads.

In total an estimated 262 properties are estimated to experience effects from the link. 54 are calculated as having ‘substantial adverse impacts’, 55 ‘moderate adverse impacts’ and 153 ‘slight adverse impacts’. The majority of the most substantially affected properties are located at Russell Drive, the settlements at Lancaster Road including Beaumont Grange, and the land around Shefferlands. Non-residential buildings that are also sensitively affected are the Crematorium, the Lancaster & Morecambe College and Thorpe View Day Centre. Views from public footpaths and linear recreation features such as the canal would be moderately affected. Sporting grounds such as Torrisholme Cricket Club, the Vale of Lune Rugby Union Club and Lansil Golf Course would suffer disruption during construction.

As part of the physical impact assessment, the applicants have undertaken an appraisal of the impact upon cultural heritage. 34 sites of archaeological interest, predominantly earthwork or structural remains, have been identified within the road corridor. The majority of these relate to agricultural activity, and will be severely affected. However most are of an unknown date and significance, and therefore investigation via disturbance of the land mass may actually reveal their archaeological importance.

The scheduled monuments and listed buildings within the road locality will “only face a minimal adverse impact” caused by possible vibration during construction and the increased level of exhaust fumes. Mitigation measures would be provided as part of any archaeological investigation.

In summary, the Local Planning Authority is of the view that the most conspicuous alterations to the highway network involve four areas; the new River Lune Bridge and the works around Halton Road; the provision of a Lancaster Road Bridge and linkage to the intermediate roundabout; the bridge over the West Coast Mainline, and the construction of the Torrisholme Road Bridge. In all four cases landscaping and screen mounding is an effective tool but the physical appearance of these structures constitutes a perceptible change in the character and appearance of these locations.

On a general note, the introduction of lighting for the length of the highway will generate a different, urbanising outlook for all neighbouring residents, and is a key visual, and environmental, consideration.
Material Considerations - Assessment of the Environmental Impacts

The Northern Route affects two distinct areas of landscape character. Most of the length of the road cuts through an area defined as Low Coastal Drumlin Landscape Character Type, whilst the Urban Landscape Character Type lies further to the east where the route turns south-westwards. A small area of Low Coastal Drumlin Type is affected.

The LDLP indicates the land use designations across these areas of landscape. The overriding designation is that of the North Lancashire Green Belt, which runs along the northern fringes of the city and Halton Training Camp, continuing westwards towards the Vale of Lune Rugby Club and Russell Drive.

The River Lune and the Lancaster Canal are County Biological Heritage Sites that also accommodate Informal Recreation Areas.

General Countryside Area designations exist to the east of Junction 34, whilst Areas of Urban Greenspace and Areas of Outdoor Playing Space are located adjacent to Lancaster & Morecambe College.

All areas have been subject to stringent environmental assessment and the outcomes of these investigations can now be summarised.

In terms of national government policy, the siting of the road within the Green Belt is the most notable element of the proposal. The purpose of Green Belt designation is to check the unrestricted sprawl of built-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns from merging; to safeguard the countryside from encroachment; to preserve the setting of historic towns and to assist in regeneration by encouraging the re-use of brownfield land. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to keep land permanently open.

Very special circumstances must exist before ‘inappropriate’ development in the Green Belt can be justified.

Where road building is proposed, any road should “contribute to the achievement of objectives for the use of land in Green Belts”. These opportunities include improving access to the open countryside, providing opportunities for outdoor sport/recreation, retaining land in agricultural and forestry uses, securing nature conservation interests and retaining attractive landscapes.

The first objective can be achieved; the new route will allow direct access to Lancaster Road and Halton Road on the northern rural fringes. New opportunities for recreation are also proposed as part of the scheme, through a new bridleway link and improvements to the cycleway network, which includes the provision of a length of cyclepath along the western carriageway with seven footway and cycleway connecting points.

The existing agricultural uses are retained as required, although a negative aspect of the development is the loss of an area of Grade 3a agricultural land.

Therefore it would appear that the most pertinent and controversial issues are the effects upon nature conservation interests and landscape impact. In assessing these matters, the County Council entered into pre-submission discussions with English Nature, the Environment Agency, the Lancashire Wildlife Trust and the RSPB.
It was concluded that the route area was generally “of limited ecological interest” although a number of protected species do occur in the area. These included various species of bat (soprano and common pipistrelle, whiskered, daubenton and noctule), otter, three species of bird breed (song thrush, linnet and bullfinch) and four species of fish (bullhead, brook lamprey, river lamprey and salmon). Small sites of particular interest for fungi were found in Valley Meadow and Powder House Lane, but there was a low diversity of plant species in the general area. Long Bank Wood, a Biological Heritage Site, was home to a nationally rare species of spider (Leptphyphantus insignis).

Of the protected bat species identified, three known bat roosts are sited close to the road, and the effects of noise and vibration during construction, and traffic light glare following completion, may adversely affect bats. Hedgerow disturbance will also affect the species. As part of a series of compensatory measures, new bat roosting opportunities will be built into bridges as part of their design. The balancing ponds and replacement hedgerows should also ensure that some of the mitigating measures will ultimately provide a positive effect for bats.

With regard to otter, no otters were detected during the surveys and populations are considered to be at such a low level that any impacts due to road kill or habitat loss are considered as “negligible”.

In terms of bird habitat, the song thrush was considered to be at risk of a negative impact due to the loss of hedgerows. Other (non-protected) species at risk of some negative impact include lapwing, curlew and dunnock. Both lapwing and curlew will simply move to neighbouring fields, whilst the dunnock nests in hedges and will encounter a temporary disadvantage whilst compensatory hedgerows are provided and established. Other species of bird such as the kestrel, which enjoys long grassland habitats, will be positively affected by the creation of the new landforms.

Modifications to fish habitats such as changes in flow or water quality could affect fish in reaching their breeding grounds. However similar highway schemes in this country have incorporated mitigation measures to protect the numbers of migratory fish both during and after construction.

Both important fungi sites are affected by land take, and whilst attempts to recreate conditions to encourage fungi to establish on adjacent sites can be made, there is uncertainty about how successful mitigation measures may be. As the fungi are of county importance, this is considered a significant impact.

The habitat of the rare spider species is not directly affected by the proposed route.

A coffer dam is proposed at the River Lune crossing to enable construction of the bridge piers, and such work would be conditional on the agreement of a scheme whereby disruption of the Biological Heritage Site is minimised.

Around 25m of the Lancaster Canal is affected by the need for the new road crossing. This section is relatively diverse in species, and care must be taken to ensure that the impacts here are temporary (as envisaged). It is anticipated that re-colonisation from other sections of the canal would occur once conditions were remedied.

No ponds are affected by the scheme. The nearest pond is over 150m away from the Northern Route and the most sensitive pond is almost 400m away. The creation of the new ponds (most of which are associated with draining the road) will be a positive development despite the debatable water quality of these new features.

Most other species were of local/district importance (such as moths, butterflies and amphibians) although the areas around the River Lune and Cote Beck contained some habitats and species that were regionally important, particularly with regard to aquatic invertebrates.
Low numbers of mammals, such as deer, brown hare, and the presence of generally common lichens, wetland plants and vascular plants added weight to the conclusion that most species and habitats found in the scheme corridor were of no greater than local importance.

It is generally considered that whilst some negative impacts will occur, compensatory measures will, in the main, achieve some success in protecting the majority of nature conservation interests. Where displacement of locally important species occurs, alternative sites are available in adjacent fields. The proposals will therefore be compliant with Policies E17 and E18 of the LDLP, which prohibit development within County Biological Heritage Site of development affecting protected species unless the development demonstrably outweighs the need to protect the site. Even though an exceptional case can be justified, the compensatory measures aimed at restoring (where necessary) habitat quality and expanding and enhancing local habitats will fulfil the policy criteria and complement the biodiversity targets set in the RSS.

With regard to landscape quality, there would be loss of an area of parkland due south of Beaumont Grange and characteristic of a Drumlin Field Type, thereby being of county level importance. The proposed earthworks will be undertaken with the aim of recreating the drumlin landform.

The hedgerow network is a significant feature of this landscape and there will be changes to the shape, scale and size of the field patterns. The ecological survey results indicated that the network varied in quality, although as a whole hedges contained between 2-4 woody species and were worthy of national importance. The loss of connectivity in the hedgerow network is a major negative impact that can only be mitigated by the creation of new hedgerows along the scheme boundaries and the enhancement of other rows outside the site curtailage. The translocation of individual woodland ground flora from nearby sites along routes where new hedgerows are laid could be effective but would require landowner consent.

The ecological value of the hedgerows is in stark contrast to the number of `veteran' trees in the area, which was markedly low at 21; none of which were of outstanding ecological value. 5 of these trees will be lost and will be replaced with 4 similar trees per specimen.

No designated geological features, important mineral resources or major aquifers are affected by the proposal. Although the new bridge crosses the River Lune, it will not adversely affect the natural erosion and deposition of soils along the course of the river. New outfalls in the immediate locality of the river and the introduction of interceptors on both outfalls adjacent to the M6 would ensure that the quality of highway water discharging into the river would improve.

There has been some discussion regarding the hydrological effects on the River Lune caused by the erection of the new bridge. This matter has been discussed in outline with the Environment Agency, and it has been concluded that a study will need to be undertaken to establish that the locations of the piers will not increase the upstream water levels and increase the risk of flooding.

By their very nature the bridge crossings will alter the character of the landscape, especially those bridges at Torrisholme Road, the West Coast Mainline, Lancaster Road, the Lancaster Canal and the River Lune. The narrow country lane network east of Torrisholme Road towards the M6 would be severed by the proposal, and this constitutes significant change in the appearance of the landscape.

The cuttings are a major change to the landform and are to be designed with a 1 in 2.5 side slope to limit land take and would, at the eastern end of the site, reach depths up to 21m. Material excavated would be used elsewhere on the site, preventing the need for off-site disposal. The cuttings would have an influence on natural drainage paths, and some of the high embankments would cause some restriction of groundwater flows. The two main areas of cutting east of the A6 and west of the M6 will impact upon the hydrogeological regime of the locality due to the lowering of the water table.
Whilst the considerable engineering operations are obvious landscape impacts, the Local Planning Authority is satisfied that the works can be mitigated via the provision of intensive landscaping and sympathetic mounding solutions, especially around areas of woodland and the most sensitive hedgerow networks. In this regard it concludes that the most attractive elements of the landscape are generally retained, or that compensatory measures can be adequately provided.

However it considers that the introduction of lighting for the entire length of the road has the potential to be the greatest permanent alteration to landscape character, creating a new corridor of illumination through the countryside between Torrisholme Road and Halton Road. This will have an impact upon the appearance of the Green Belt, but it will not necessarily impact upon the ‘openness’ of the area, depending on how the illumination is screened by landform changes. In the most sensitive areas north of Lancaster, particularly between Shefferlands and Lancaster Road, the provision of cuttings will help conceal large areas of the lighting and the peripheral glow that will ensue.

Other environmental factors include vibration, airborne dust and dirt, all of which can lead to a loss of amenity. These impacts are considered to be greatest during the construction phases and would not be permanent, although it is estimated that 50% of those residing within 50m of the road would be likely to be “seriously bothered” by construction nuisance. This figure falls to 20% when the distance to the site is doubled. Of the 168 properties lying within 40m of the road, none are considered to be at risk from damage from air or ground-borne vibration.

It is anticipated that strict conditions, such as construction noise level agreements, would be implemented should consent be forthcoming.

Environmental impact is also created by the additional noise associated with vehicular traffic, particularly following completion. In an effort to reduce the noise impact, the surface of the highway would be a thin material aimed at reducing both traffic noise and vehicle spray. Other measures include man-made solutions, like the aforementioned noise attenuation screen at Torrisholme Bridge, or the use of embankments and mounding to negate sound.

As with all highway improvement schemes the bypass would have advantages as well as disadvantages in relation to noise. Increases in noise in the main affected population centre of Torrisholme are an inevitable consequence due to the road’s location, and the County Council advise that properties may qualify for remedial measures under the Noise Insulation Regulations. Elsewhere other urban areas would benefit from the redistribution of traffic.

The same balance must be applied to the issue of air quality. In total, emissions over the entire network will ‘marginally increase’. Pollutant levels within 200m of the scheme will still be below the relevant Air Quality Standards, with the exception of Croskells Farm, where there will be an above-average level of nitrogen dioxide in the base year.

Within the Lancaster Air Quality Management Area however, there would be considerable reductions in emissions, amounting to a decrease of greater than 20% in carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, carbon dioxide and nitrogen dioxide levels in 2010, falling to 20% or marginally under in 2025. These improvements are not confined to the gyratory city centre system; pollutant concentrations on the A6 (both Lancaster Road and Main Road), A5105 (Coastal Road), A5105 & A589 (Marine Road East), A589 (Heysham Road/Westgate), A588 (Lancaster Road & Ashton Road) would all show improvements in air quality, whilst only the existing A683 (Phase I of the Bypass) and B5273 (Oxcliffe Road) showed deteriorations.
To summarise, the impact upon the openness of the North Lancashire Green Belt, caused predominantly by the provision of lighting, is considered the most sensitive issue in terms of landscape change, but can be mitigated as a result of the use of embankments and cuttings. Losses to the continuity of the hedgerow network, some areas of fungi, the removal of a small proportion of veteran trees and the loss of some versatile agricultural land are negative aspects. Air quality and noise impacts in the areas closest to the route can be mitigated to some extent, but cannot be totally remedied.

The impact upon sensitive habitats is however surprisingly low, as a result of the relatively limited ecological interests in the locality. Environmental gains in surrounding fields will, in the main, compensate for any ecological loss. Improvements in air quality and noise will affect a substantial number of properties on routes where traffic numbers and vehicle emissions will decrease.

Material Considerations - Assessment of Economic and Social Impacts

The RSS advises that “best use should be made of the existing infrastructure, with new road construction only being considered once a thorough examination of all possible solutions to the problem have taken place”. However the Strategy recognises that further investment in infrastructure is required to provide relief to communities adversely affected by heavy traffic. “In some locations, the provision of a suitable bypass may be the only way to resolve traffic-related problems”.

A common disadvantage of the industrial sites at Heysham is that they have limited access to public transport and poor access to the motorway network. Completion of the Heysham-M6 link is considered to be an essential component in assisting viability of these industrial sites and those at White Lund, Mellishaw North and Royd Mill. It is predicted that by 2020 these sites could be expected to generate over 6,000 additional jobs.

The economic value of Heysham Port cannot be understated. It is the largest port in Lancashire and is an important hub for the movement of freight between the UK, Isle of Man and Ireland.

Local Authorities can work with bodies such as Network Rail and the freight transport companies to assist in the transfer of freight from road to rail. The Lancashire Local Transport Plan encourages the use of Quality Freight Partnerships as a means of reconciling economic, environmental and social concerns. The LDLP favours greater use of the branch line to Morecambe and Heysham and the establishment of a freight rail terminal at the Port. Yet until those Partnerships can achieve these goals, the improvement of the road network remains critical to the long-term viability of the local economy.

One of the strategic actions rising from the Morecambe Action Plan is the development of the link road, and it is recognised that the link would augment the regeneration of Morecambe by providing improved accessibility for both residents and visitors, and also enhance the interest of developers who may otherwise be reluctant to invest in the resort. However the opportunities arising as a result of the improved access must be balanced against the likelihood that existing residents would be more able to access employment opportunities and other retail areas outside the district.

The Regional Economic Strategy emphasises the need for economic inclusion, and this is especially relevant to Morecambe and Heysham. Sites chosen for development need to have “the right physical connections, in terms of proximity and transport links”. It is the Local Planning Authority’s view that the Northern Route would not only be a key driver in assisting economic regeneration of the coastline, but also would benefit and sustain the rural communities closest to the road by improving access from the urban area.
Worsening journey time reliability is a major problem, not just within the main routes around the centre of Lancaster but at both Junctions 33 and 34 of the M6. Traffic regularly tails back beyond Galgate at J33 and, rather dangerously, on the inadequate slip road and the inside lane of J34. Congestion represents one of the biggest, and most immediate threats to economic expansion at both district and regional level. The present road pattern of the historic core of Lancaster, coupled with the restriction caused by the lack of vehicular river crossings, is an obstacle to providing a first-class transport infrastructure, with damaging effects on the competitiveness of the district’s businesses.

Impacts on the agricultural sector of the economy are also significant. In total eleven farms are affected by the bypass, and over 42 hectares of Grade 3a (good quality) agricultural land is required to deliver the road. In some circumstances the road will bisect agricultural holdings, affect drainage or involve minor land take; in others the scheme would require the removal of major farm accesses and buildings. The loss of Grade 3a land is significant and is a negative impact of the proposal. Policy E6 of the LDLP states that the permanent loss of such land would only be permitted where the proposal brings “significant economic or community benefits which outweigh the loss of land”.

Should the scheme proceed then there will be inevitable disruption to the transport network, resulting in temporary impacts upon business interests in the district. The reconstruction of the motorway slip roads alone is guaranteed to adversely affect the travelling public and cause lengthy delays, whilst local diversions (such as the closure of Foundry Lane during bridge building operations) will cause disruption to the local populace. Local businesses, including Lancaster & Morecambe College, the Post House Hotel, and Beaumont College would suffer varying levels of disturbance during the building phases.

The premises known as Broadoak Leisure Buildings, sited on Lancaster Road, would be demolished to create access for the scheme, although it is anticipated that alternative premises within the district would be sought for this popular local business.

Socially, the areas containing the greatest concentrations of multiple-deprivation (indicated by measurements of income, health, employment, education and child poverty) are the Alexandra, Poulton and Harbour Wards in Morecambe/Heysham. Unemployment rates in the resort are significantly higher than the national average, and these three wards are particularly adversely affected. The geographical isolation of the peninsula, as the Morecambe Action Plan indicates, is a contributory factor to this social exclusion. Facilitating improved access to these areas via the link is considered to be a key factor in providing greater opportunities and choice for the residents in these wards and surrounding areas.

The Lancashire Local Transport Plan comments that the link would have a positive social effect by improving road safety and health in the district, which would lead to enhanced air quality within the urban areas and an expanded walking and cycling network. Another potential benefit associated with the removal of traffic from the city centre gyratory system is the likelihood of fewer road traffic accidents when compared with the proposed route.

The reduction of urban traffic would lead to improved accessibility for public transport, and the potential for a range of transport benefits which would help the most disadvantaged groups of society.

There is clearly a strong case to be made for supporting the link in terms of improving economic development. National planning advice requires Authorities to ensure that infrastructure is provided to support business performance. It also recognises that positive economic growth can deliver social benefits, where proposals are properly planned.

The social and economic progress envisaged as a consequence of this bypass, despite the absence of the Luneside Link, is considered to be of major importance to the wellbeing of the district as a whole.
Conclusions

The Northern Route is recognised throughout the development plan process as being of strategic importance to the North West region and the economic fortunes of the district.

The debate regarding the appropriateness of the Northern Route should not be affected by further discussion of the merits of the Western Route. Previous assessments of both schemes found that the considerable advantage lay with the northern option. The western route was most unlikely to conform with the Conservation Regulations 1994 and any preference for that route has been previously described as “perverse”. The Northern Route therefore is the only feasible option.

The absence of the Luneside Link is unfortunate. The provision of another vehicular river crossing would provide additional relief to the gyratory network and would help deliver further regeneration of the Luneside area. Whilst the bridge is a desirable addition, it is not referred to in the development plan and should not directly affect the consideration of this proposal.

The construction of new highways is often seen as contrary to the Government’s objective of reducing the need to travel by car. However there is regional and national recognition that roadbuilding still has a part to play in delivering essential infrastructure where it is justified. In this case, a key component of the justification is the commitment to providing alternative travel benefits.

The long-term aim of local transport policy is the promotion of sustainable travel choices. As part of this objective, more road space should be given over to pedestrians, cyclists and public transport within town centres. Contributory factors would include park and ride facilities, increased bus lane opportunities, and cycleway expansion. All of these elements are included within the application as alternative transport benefits arising from the reduction of urban centre traffic, which, subject to the planning process, would be delivered. Without these initiatives, the bypass would only deliver short-term benefits. However this package of measures cannot be fully implemented until the road is constructed.

It is anticipated that the road would be heavily used for the transportation of freight by heavy goods vehicles. This would remove an estimated 72% of port-related freight movements away from the congested central areas, which is a principle entrenched within the Government’s Sustainable Distribution Strategy 1999. A further principle is the protection of potential routes that could be critical for freight movement, such as this bypass. Whilst Freight Quality Partnerships have the potential to provide alternatives such as road to rail transfer, these can only be developed in co-operation with private business and the rail authorities. The Local Planning Authority considers that it would be appropriate to request further investigation into the long-term possibility of using rail at the Port of Heysham.

A scheme of this magnitude will unavoidably change the character and appearance of this area of the district. The provision of new landscaping areas, embankments and cuttings will help mitigate the visual impacts of the road and bridges to a point, but there can be no doubt that in some areas the rural fringes will take on a greater urbanised form.

The Local Planning Authority considers that the three most affected areas in visual terms are the new River Lune crossing & Halton Road works, the alterations required around the A6 (Lancaster Road) and the construction of a new bridge at Torrisholme Road.

The River Lune crossing will contribute to a much-needed improvement to Junction 34, which is necessary regardless of whether it supports a new link road. The bridge will appear symmetrical but will be lower than the existing river crossing. It is considered acceptable in terms of location, although the design of the structure may require further investigation and amendment in relation to potential hydrological impacts. It would be reasonable to request that the City Council be notified of these alterations in due course.
The works around Halton Road may appear as a lesser engineering operation but will still provide a deep cutting, a lengthy retaining wall and an asymmetric bridge with a new junction to Halton Road. The Local Planning Authority is satisfied that the visual impact of the new infrastructure is acceptable, being lessened by the presence of the existing bridge and softened by the provision of new landscaping areas.

The Lancaster Road alterations are significant because they involve the realignment of the existing highway and the construction of a bridge over the new road, which cuts through the land north of Beaumont College and links to the A6 via a new junction. This constitutes a major change to the appearance of the landscape but the road should be relatively well screened by the topographical alterations, resulting in the new road being situated by between 6-12m below the existing ground level.

The crossing over the West Coast Mainline is a significant structure because of its elevation which, when the parapet walls are included, reaches almost 14 metres. The diversion of both Powder House Lane and Folly Lane are required to facilitate the road. It will have little impact upon residential amenity but will comprise a new urban feature on the immediate periphery of the city.

The Torrisholme Road Bridge will be dominant as it provides the elevated route into the urban area. It will become a physical barrier between the Torrisholme and Scale Hall area and can only be partially obscured by landscaping. However there are other structures of a sizeable scale in this vicinity, notably the College buildings and the electricity pylons, and it is considered that the scale of the bridge is not excessive. Air quality and noise impacts in the areas closest to the route can be mitigated to some extent, but cannot be completely remedied. Other properties and businesses in urban centres located away from the road will benefit from the reduction of traffic volumes on the existing one-way network.

The most urbanising impact of the road is the provision of illumination along its entire length. In environmental terms the peripheral luminosity will be a substantial change to the character of the landscape, but will not necessarily impact upon Green Belt openness because of the introduction of cuttings and embankments into which the road will be sited.

However this is still considered to be the main effect upon the North Lancashire Green Belt. The road satisfies criteria such as improving access to the countryside, providing opportunities for recreation (via the bridleway and cycleway improvements), retaining surrounding land in agricultural use (and thereby ensuring that no other development occurs along the route of the road) and securing nature conservation interests.

Some species are adversely affected by the route but measures aimed at improving or creating alternative habitats close by can successfully mitigate the impacts of development. It is the disturbance to the hedgerow network, and the consequential impacts upon the habitats of bats and birds such as the song thrush that will be the main change to the natural environment. The loss of connectivity between hedges will be partially mitigated by the provision of new hedge boundaries.

Despite being of a limited ecological interest, the locality still accommodates areas of fungi and it is debateable whether attempts to recreate these areas elsewhere will be successful. That aside, the complimentary measures indicated in the supporting documents are appropriate and the impact upon sensitive natural habitats is comparatively low.

The economic efficiencies created by the construction of the road are palpable. Reductions in journey times and vehicle volume through the congested areas is critical to the success of this scheme. Accompanied by the proposed sustainable transport measures, the highway has the potential to deliver improved accessibility to Morecambe and to the surrounding rural areas, a direct freight link from the Port of Heysham to the M6 and linkage to existing industrial and employment areas clustered around White Lund and Heysham. This improved access will hopefully lead to greater opportunities being created for all individuals and groups within the area.
Recommended Response to the Consultation

The transport network through Lancaster is presently inefficient. In effect, it comprises a highway system that has its origins in the 18th century, trying wilfully to cope with the demands and volume of 21st century transportation.

This district is a model for many others in terms of its sustained commitment to alternative travel modes, not least the increasingly impressive cycling network. However, in order to take the next step in encouraging the use of public transport via a series of priority measures and incentives aimed at changing travel behaviour, capacity within the urban areas needs to be created. As the RSS advocates, there is still the need for further targeted investment in new or improved roads and public transport infrastructure if the Vision for the North West is to be achieved. The two are not separate aspirations, but should form part of an integrated and multi-modal transport framework for the benefit of the local community.

If Members are satisfied that the environmental, visual, economic and social consequences of the scheme are satisfactory - as this report concludes - then the City Council should support the scheme with vigour. The opinion of the Council would be a vital consideration should this application be called-in for determination by the Secretary of State. Even if this scheme is successful following any public inquiry, funding streams may be withheld if the City Council’s recommendation was not positive.

The findings of the Lancashire Local Transport Plan provide perhaps the most telling statistic. A MORI Survey (2003) undertaken as part of that document found that the levels of satisfaction with the local road system were worse in this district than in any other in Lancashire. Whilst all other districts scored a positive mark, the one notable exception was the Lancaster District. This dissatisfaction has negative impacts upon the economic and social activity of the area, and the provision of an alternative route designed to relieve congestion is the most essential priority for the competitiveness of the district.

It is the Local Planning Authority’s view that a justifiable case has been presented which satisfactorily addresses the material considerations related to this type of major infrastructure development. Therefore, it recommends that Members support a new vehicular highway to be constructed along the Northern Route, to complete the Heysham-M6 Link Road.

HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

This application has to be considered in relation to the provisions of the Human Rights Act, in particular Article 8 (privacy/family life) and Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property). Having regard to the principles of proportionality, it has been concluded that there are no issues arising from the proposal that appear 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.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the CITY COUNCIL HAS NO OBJECTIONS to the proposed development, subject to the following comments:

1. The scheme should be delivered in conjunction with the full range of sustainable traffic and transport initiatives to avoid the estimated 20% reduction in traffic on the gyratory network from being filled by more private vehicular traffic;

2. The scheme shall also include a full investigation of a Park and Ride facility for the north of the city, either at Caton Road or at the intersection of the road with the A6.
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED

INSTALLATION OF NEW SHOP FRONTS, NEW WINDOWS TO UPPER FLOORS, REPLACEMENT ROOFS AND RESTORATION OF FACADE

SITE ADDRESS

50 - 72 QUEEN STREET
MORECAMBE
LANCASHIRE
LA4 5EP

APPLICANT:

Lancaster City Council
Palatine Hall
Dalton Square
Lancaster

AGENT:

O' Neil And Petrie Ltd

REASON FOR DELAY

Awaiting consultation replies

PARISH NOTIFICATION

Morecambe Neighbourhood Council - No observations received at the time this report was drafted

LAND USE ALLOCATION/DEPARTURE

Within the Morecambe Conservation Area. The site is just outside the shopping centre as defined in the Lancaster District Local Plan.

STATUTORY CONSULTATIONS

Engineering Services - No objections

OTHER OBSERVATIONS RECEIVED

One letter has been received; it comes from the proprietor of a shop on the opposite side of Queen Street supporting the scheme, but expressing concern that the accommodation above the shops may be used to provide one bedroom flats.

Any other representations received will be reported orally at committee.

REPORT

This proposal is a block scheme, part of the Morecambe Townscape Heritage Initiative. It involves a row of shops with living accommodation above along the south eastern end of Queen Street, between Lines Street and the block of flats proposed by First Base Homes which was approved last year.
Although the terrace is outside the shopping centre defined in the Lancaster District Local Plan the ground floor has a continuous retail frontage. The existing shop fronts are generally in very poor condition and the elevation above them has suffered from unsympathetic window alterations. The new shop fronts are based on the surviving ones at nos. 66-72, which are to be restored to something resembling their original form. It is also intended to re-roof the terrace using Welsh slate, and to replace the windows at the same time with new double glazed timber framed sash ones.

Policy E35 of the Local Plan requires that development proposals which would affect important views in and across Conservation Areas should not erode their historic form and character. The new shop fronts and the detailed alterations to the elevations above them reflect the Victorian character of the original terrace.

This scheme is to be welcomed. It offers an opportunity to rejuvenate the appearance of the terrace, making a major contribution to the regeneration of Poulton. It is to be regretted that the premises at the corner of Queen Street and Lines Street (no. 48, Lees Games) have not been included but the existing shopfront is in better condition than most of those in the block and in less urgent need of replacement.

HUMAN RIGHTS ACT IMPLICATIONS

This application has to be considered in relation to two sections of the Human Rights Act: Article 8 (privacy/family life), and Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property). There are no issues arising from the proposal which appear 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.

RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT PERMISSION BE GRANTED subject to conditions as follows:-

1. Standard five year condition.
2. Development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
3. Details of sections and mouldings of timber to be agreed.
4. Pointing to be carried out using lime mortar in accordance with details to be agreed with the local planning authority.
List of Background Papers

Schedule of Planning Applications for Consideration by Planning Committee on 20 February 2006

For each of the planning applications being considered, the planning file, including any relevant correspondence, consultation and neighbour responses, is part of the relevant background papers.

More particularly, in addition to the above, the following documents are relevant:

A7 Planning Applications – 1/88/265, 03/00830
A8 Planning Applications – 03/00181
A9 Supplementary Planning Guidance 16 (Housing)
A10 Planning Application – 05/00725
A11 Planning Applications 05/01112
A12 Planning Applications – 85/00945, 95/00626
A13 Planning Applications – 83/737, 83/00962, 83/01207
A17 Lancaster District Local Plan
   Joint Lancashire Structure Plan
**LANCASTER CITY COUNCIL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>APPLICATION NO</th>
<th>DETAILS</th>
<th>DECISION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/01098/FUL</td>
<td>4/5, Ten Row, Glasson Dock Installation of replacement windows for Strawberry Roth</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/00787/LB</td>
<td>7 Lancaster Road, Caton, Lancaster Listed Building Application to replace single-glazed windows with double-glazed units and to replace missing mullions with painted stone for Stephen Thwaite</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01055/FUL</td>
<td>1 West View, Glasson Dock, Lancashire Remove bitumen coating and apply wet dash rendering on gable end wall for Mrs V A Bancroft</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01069/FUL</td>
<td>68 - 70 Church Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Construction of an external ramp for the disabled and fit 2 no external task lights for Royal Bank Of Scotland Group</td>
<td>Application Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01070/LB</td>
<td>68 - 70 Church Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Listed Building Application for construction of disabled access ramp internal stair lift, alterations to doors and fit 2 no external task lights for Royal Bank Of Scotland Group</td>
<td>Application Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01086/LB</td>
<td>Hill Top Farm, Silverdale Road, Yealand Redmayne Retrospective Listed Building Consent for installation of a satellite dish to rear for J. E. Walker</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01092/FUL</td>
<td>Hill Top Farm, Silverdale Road, Arnside Retrospective application for installation of a satellite dish to the rear for J E Walker</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01220/FUL</td>
<td>Strands Farm, Station Road, Hornby Proposed revisions to permission 04/00397 to change external materials and fenestration to two approved B1 business units for Dalesmoor Homes Ltd</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01239/FUL</td>
<td>28 - 30 Regent Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Retrospective application for installation of new security roller shutters for C/o Agent</td>
<td>Application Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01244/FUL</td>
<td>Lane House Farm, Brookhouse Road, Brookhouse Erection of a rear two storey extension for Mr And Mrs S Cornthwaite</td>
<td>Application Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01252/CU</td>
<td>49 Cleveleys Avenue, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed change of use of shop to form residential and alterations to front elevation for Mr And Mrs Burbury</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01253/FUL</td>
<td>87 Norton Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of a single storey rear extension and front porch for Mr And Mrs Reeves</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01288/CU</td>
<td>Fowlers Depositories Limited, Mellishaw Lane, Morecambe Change of use of land to car sales area for Gelmode Limited</td>
<td>Application Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01293/FUL</td>
<td>52 Main Street, Heysham, Morecambe Refurbishment and alterations to the front elevation of the building for Mrs Goulding</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01299/FUL</td>
<td>Kilross, Flat Lane, Yealand Conyers Construction of new farm access off highway with gate and fence for Mr P Winder</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01300/CU</td>
<td>Arrow Barn, Arrow Lane, Halton Change of use from agricultural land to garden and installation of new field entrance for Richard Williams</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01303/FUL</td>
<td>44 Chequers Avenue, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of single storey extension to the rear to replace existing porch and construction of front and rear dormers for Mr And Mrs Angus</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01312/FUL</td>
<td>8 Rossendale Avenue, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of garage extension to side and rear for Mr Gerard Walker</td>
<td>Application Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01323/FUL</td>
<td>5 Elmsdale Close, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of two storey side extension to form kitchen and sitting room with bedroom and shower-room over for Mr And Mrs Robinson</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01337/CU</td>
<td>43 Devonshire Road Morecambe Change of use of shop to form living accommodation for dwelling and installation of new front, and new window to enlarge 1st floor window for Stephen Everett</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01338/FUL</td>
<td>36 Lindeth Road, Silverdale, Carnforth Provision of a car park for Reginal Kaye Nurseries Ltd</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01343/FUL</td>
<td>8 Hestham Parade, Morecambe, Lancashire Construction of pitched roof over flat roof with velux roof lights to rear for Deena Burns And Julie Hunt</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01361/LB</td>
<td>2 Houghton Court, Halton, Lancaster Listed Building application for loft conversion for Mr March</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01379/FUL</td>
<td>Land Between 17 And 19, Whin Grove, Bolton Le Sands Erection of a single detached dwelling with integral double garage for Mr And Mrs Bainbridge</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01393/FUL</td>
<td>26 The Roods, Warton, Carnforth Erection of a single storey extension to form kitchen, playroom and sunroom for Mr And Mrs Smith</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01400/ADV</td>
<td>Various Sites At Whitelund Industrial Estate And Vickers Industrial Estate, Morecambe, Erection of 8 free standing advertising signs for Groundwork Blackburn</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01405/FUL</td>
<td>The Coach House Beaumont Grange, Kellet Lane, Slyne Erection of a single storey double garage for Mr P Edmondson</td>
<td>Application Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01408/FUL</td>
<td>2 Cottage Farm, Aldcliffe Hall Lane, Lancaster Proposed conversion of store/workshop into accommodation for a resident carer with attached new conservatory for Mr T Clokey</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01414/LB</td>
<td>5 Westfield Hamlet, Nether Kellet, Carnforth Listed building application for reduction of window to front</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS 20 FEBRUARY 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05/01418/FUL</td>
<td>School House, Lodge Lane, Wennington</td>
<td>Erection of a porch and garden room for Mr And Mrs Marsden</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01422/FUL</td>
<td>44 Whinfell Drive, Lancaster, Lancashire</td>
<td>Erection of a garage extension for Mr P Hanley</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01423/FUL</td>
<td>1 Laurel Bank, Lancaster, Lancashire</td>
<td>Erection of a detached double garage for C. Forsberg And L Hintz</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01424/LB</td>
<td>1 Laurel Bank, Lancaster, Lancashire</td>
<td>Listed Building Application for the erection of a detached double garage for C Forsberg And L Hintz</td>
<td>Application Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01427/FUL</td>
<td>9 Hindburn Close, Carnforth, Lancashire</td>
<td>Erection of a 1.8m high fence to the side for C Thorp</td>
<td>Application Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01429/FUL</td>
<td>Upper Brow Top, Rakehouse Brow, Quernmore</td>
<td>Modification of condition no 3 on planning permission 04/00396/FUL for Mr D Hardman</td>
<td>Application Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01436/FUL</td>
<td>35 Chapel View, Overton, Morecambe</td>
<td>Erection of a single storey extension to the rear for Mr &amp; Mrs Wilson</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01439/FUL</td>
<td>13 Pembroke Avenue, Morecambe, Lancashire</td>
<td>Erection of a two storey rear extension and extension to existing kitchen for Mr &amp; Mrs S Sunderland</td>
<td>Application Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01445/FUL</td>
<td>Land At Capernwray Hall, Borwick Road, Capernwray</td>
<td>Erection of storage building to store dry timber billets for wood chip boiler system for Mr P Burt</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01447/FUL</td>
<td>51 Slyne Road, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth</td>
<td>Erection of a conservatory to rear for Mrs C Preddy</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01449/FUL</td>
<td>5 - 9 Hornby Road, Caton, Lancaster</td>
<td>Installation of new shop front, relocation of ATM and erection of a flat roof extension to the rear for United Co-operatives Ltd</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01454/FUL</td>
<td>Land Adjacent To 80, Main Road, Galgate</td>
<td>Erection of a garage for Mr J Dennison</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01455/FUL</td>
<td>11 Hale Carr Grove, Heysham, Morecambe</td>
<td>Erection of a two storey extension to the side and rear and a rear conservatory to the rear for Mr And Mrs J Walsh</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01458/FUL</td>
<td>Manor House Farm, Lancaster Road, Slyne</td>
<td>Erection of a single storey side extension for Mr And Mrs Hoggarth</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01459/LB</td>
<td>Manor House Farm, Lancaster Road, Slyne</td>
<td>Listed Building application for the erection of a single storey side extension for Mr And Mrs Hoggarth</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01460/FUL</td>
<td>Old Waterslack Farmhouse, Waterslack Road, Silverdale</td>
<td>Erection of Field Shelter and Feed/Machinery Store for Mr. Heavy</td>
<td>Application Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01462/CU</td>
<td>306 Lancaster Road, Morecambe, Lancashire</td>
<td>Change of use from private dwelling to opticians practice for Moon And Coxhill Opticians</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application No.</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01463/FUL</td>
<td>63 Cork Road, Lancaster, Lancashire</td>
<td>Retrospective application for erection of a conservatory and kitchen extension for Mr I And Mrs E Row</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01464/ADV</td>
<td>Superdrug, 2 Royalty Mall, Morecambe</td>
<td>Erection of new illuminated fascia signs for Superdrug Stores Plc</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01474/FUL</td>
<td>54 Greaves Road, Lancaster, Lancashire</td>
<td>Demolition of existing extension to rear and erection of new single storey extension to rear for Mr And Mrs Wilshaw</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01475/FUL</td>
<td>23 Market Street, Lancaster, Lancashire</td>
<td>Installation of a new shop front. for Caffe Nero Plc</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01476/LB</td>
<td>23 Market Street, Lancaster, Lancashire</td>
<td>Listed Building Consent for a new shop front for Caffe Nero Plc</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01477/FUL</td>
<td>Heysham 1 Power Station, Heysham</td>
<td>Erection of a new training workshop in place of existing two storey portacabin for British Energy Plc</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01478/FUL</td>
<td>137 - 141 Lancaster Road, Morecambe, Lancashire</td>
<td>Alterations to rear area of shop to improve access and erection of a 1.3 metre high fence to rear. for Lawrence Hunt And Co Ltd</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01483/FUL</td>
<td>3 Rothesay Road, Heysham, Morecambe</td>
<td>Application to lower kerb and create driveway across grass verge onto block paved area to front of house for Mr D Brown</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01484/LB</td>
<td>Hipping Hall, Leck Road, Cantsfield</td>
<td>Listed Building application for partial demolition of garage/store and rebuild as laundry/dry store/staff facilities building for Casterton Leisure Ltd</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01485/FUL</td>
<td>Hipping Hall, Leck Road, Cantsfield</td>
<td>Partial demolition of garage/store and rebuild as laundry/dry store/staff facilities building for Casterton Leisure Ltd</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01487/FUL</td>
<td>363 Lancaster Road, Morecambe, Lancashire</td>
<td>Removal/replacement and erection of new extract ventilation ducts for Mr S Cheung</td>
<td>Application Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01490/FUL</td>
<td>36 Sunnybank Road, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth</td>
<td>Demolition of existing garage and erection of two storey side extension for Mr And Mrs Woodhouse</td>
<td>Recommendation Pending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01491/FUL</td>
<td>10 Shortlands Drive, Heysham, Morecambe</td>
<td>Erection of a conservatory to rear for Mr And Mrs Fletcher</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01492/FUL</td>
<td>Beau Site, Haverbreaks Road, Lancaster</td>
<td>Erection of a hipped roof over existing flat roof to side for Mr A White</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01493/FUL</td>
<td>Borwick Lodge, Borwick Lane, Borwick</td>
<td>Erection of a summer house in the grounds for J E Sharpe Esq</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01497/CU</td>
<td>Former Abc Motor Yard, Northgate, Morecambe</td>
<td>Change of use from car sales to storage and sales of leisure buildings and materials. for Broadoak Leisure Building Limited</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application Number</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01501/FUL</td>
<td>17 Birch Drive, Silverdale, Carnforth</td>
<td>Erection of a two storey extension to the side and a garage to the front. for Mr C Blakely</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01502/CU</td>
<td>70 - 72 Penny Street, Lancaster, Lancashire</td>
<td>Proposed change of use from A1 (retail) to A2 (financial and professional services) for Reed Employment Plc</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01503/FUL</td>
<td>Fair View, Slyne Road, Morecambe</td>
<td>Erection of an extension to bungalow to form two storey dwelling. for Mr N Needham</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01505/FUL</td>
<td>Little Grange, Main Road, Slyne</td>
<td>Replacement of conservatory, conversion of redundant barn to form kitchen, dining room with bedroom over and a single garage for Dr &amp; Mrs G Ingham</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01506/LB</td>
<td>Little Grange, Main Road, Slyne</td>
<td>Listed Building application for replacement of conservatory, conversion of redundant barn to form kitchen, dining room with bedroom over and a single garage for Dr &amp; Mrs G Ingham</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01508/FUL</td>
<td>4 Well Lane, Yealand Redmayne, Carnforth</td>
<td>Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of a new conservatory to the rear and a rear dormer for Mr &amp; Mrs B Stirzaker</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01510/FUL</td>
<td>6 Well Lane, Yealand Redmayne, Carnforth</td>
<td>Erection of a ground floor dining/sun lounge extension to rear and velux roof light for Mr And Mrs J S Parkinson</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01511/FUL</td>
<td>11 Haweswater Place, Morecambe, Lancashire</td>
<td>Erection of a two storey side extension to form garage with bedroom/bathroom over for Mr. &amp; Mrs. Wilson</td>
<td>Application Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01512/FUL</td>
<td>22 Edenvale Crescent, Lancaster, Lancashire</td>
<td>Erection of a low pitch metal clad roof over existing flat roof, installation of a new window to first floor, alteration of door to form window and creation of new door on front north elevation for The Trustees</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01513/FUL</td>
<td>Land Between Nos 1 And 3, Burlington Grove, Morecambe</td>
<td>Alterations to a previously approved application for the erection of a detached dwelling. for John Pearson</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01514/FUL</td>
<td>Bucks End, Eskrigge Lane, Gressingham</td>
<td>Demolition of part of agricultural building and erection of a two storey extension for Lt. Col &amp; Mrs Baldwin</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01517/FUL</td>
<td>Wyreside Lakes Fishery, Gleaves Hill Lane, Ellel</td>
<td>Erection of a single storey extension to the side to create new toilet and shower block. for Mr And Mrs E Birkin</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01518/FUL</td>
<td>Land Between 23 And 30, Schola Green Lane, Morecambe</td>
<td>Erection of 2 semi-detached houses for L G Joiners Ltd</td>
<td>Application Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01519/FUL</td>
<td>4 Whernside Road, Lancaster, Lancashire</td>
<td>Proposed two storey side extension and rear first floor extension for Mr C Davies &amp; Ms H. Wright</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01527/CU</td>
<td>86 Heysham Road, Heysham, Morecambe Change of use from taxi office to cold food takeaway for Geraldine Holland</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01528/FUL</td>
<td>46 Emesgate Lane, Silverdale, Carnforth Erection of a first floor extension over existing garage to form additional bedrooms for Mr Farrow &amp; Ms Peet</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01531/FUL</td>
<td>1 Salisbury Close, Heaton With Oxcliffe, Morecambe Erection of a conservatory to the rear for Miss Furnivall And Mr Hargreaves</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01532/LB</td>
<td>10A Greaves Drive, Lancaster, Lancashire Retrospective applications for listed building consent for various internal and external works for Mr &amp; Mrs S P Brady</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01538/ADV</td>
<td>Kingsway Retail Park, Parliament Street, Lancaster Erection of 4 externally illuminated fascia signs and 2 externally illuminated entrance signs for Pizza Hut</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01539/FUL</td>
<td>Kiberick, Main Street, Arkholme Erection of a conservatory to the rear for Mr And Mrs Spooner</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01544/CU</td>
<td>Thurnham Mill Hotel Ltd, Thurnham Mill, Thurnham Change of use from letting bedrooms to managers accommodation incorporating the installation of a new window to side elevation for Mitchells Brewery Ltd</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01545/CU</td>
<td>Butler Works, Wyresdale Road, Lancaster Change of use of some of the buildings from marquee hire to a building for stage and theatrical equipment hire, the storage and assembly of stage and sets and the mail order of products for Evans Marquee Hire</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01548/FUL</td>
<td>25 Bailey Lane, Heysham, Morecambe Demolition of existing bathroom and erection of a new single storey extension to form bedroom and bathroom to the rear. for Mr And Mrs M Wood</td>
<td>Application Withdrawn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01549/FUL</td>
<td>7 Thorpe Avenue, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of garage to side for Mr J Walker</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01550/CU</td>
<td>Kirklands Poultry Farm, Blea Tarn Road, Lancaster Change of use of part of egg packing building to a milk distribution and storage depot for Mr G Shepherd</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01555/AD</td>
<td>Bammers Farm, Moss Lane, Thurnham Erection of an agricultural building for livestock and storage for Mr And Mrs Ayrton</td>
<td>Further Details Not Required (AD/PA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01556/CU</td>
<td>Field 2661, Off Highfield Lane, Bolton Le Sands Retrospective application for use of land for equestrian purposes and erection of a stable block for Alan Neal Marwood</td>
<td>Recommendation Pending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01557/CU</td>
<td>Sherbourne, Lancaster Road, Slyne Change of use of adjoining land to form part of domestic curtilage and amendments to previously approved application 04/01590/FUL for Mr And Mrs J Clough</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01559/ADV</td>
<td>Kingsway Retail Park, Parliament Street, Lancaster</td>
<td>Retrospective application to retain three non-illuminated signs on front elevation at PC World for Dixons Stores Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01560/FUL</td>
<td>406 Heysham Road, Heysham, Morecambe</td>
<td>Application to vary condition 6 on 04/01627 to allow opening times from 8 am to midnight for Mr A Ahad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01561/ADV</td>
<td>99 Main Road, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth</td>
<td>Erection of new signage for Suzuki GB Plc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01562/FUL</td>
<td>Lancaster University, Bailrigg, Lancaster</td>
<td>Proposed installation of 25 no. cycle parking enclosures for Lancaster University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01563/FUL</td>
<td>Safeguard Storage, Warton Road, Carnforth</td>
<td>Renewal of temporary permission 02/01295/FUL for the siting of a portable building to be used as a canteen for TDG Ltd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01565/FUL</td>
<td>3 Newcroft, Warton, Carnforth</td>
<td>Erection of a rear conservatory for Mr &amp; Mrs Helsby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01566/FUL</td>
<td>St Peters Cathedral, Balmoral Road, Lancaster</td>
<td>Erection of new fences and gates to south side for Diocese Of Lancaster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01567/LB</td>
<td>St Peters Cathedral, Balmoral Road, Lancaster</td>
<td>Listed Building Application for the erection of new fences and gates to south for Diocese Of Lancaster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01568/FUL</td>
<td>Wenning Cottage, Wennington Road, Tatham</td>
<td>Amendment to application 03/01179/FUL to redsign / reposition agricultural shed for T And P Metcalfe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01569/FUL</td>
<td>11 Madison Avenue, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth</td>
<td>Erection of a ground floor bathroom and sun lounge extension and first floor roof conversion for Mr And Mrs Western</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01571/FUL</td>
<td>Low Dykes Cottage, Dykes Lane, Yealand Conyers</td>
<td>Installation of first floor gable window opening for Ms A Rigby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01575/FUL</td>
<td>79 Dale Street, Lancaster, Lancashire</td>
<td>Erection of a rear kitchen extension for Mr C Elderton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01576/FUL</td>
<td>3 Easdale Avenue, Morecambe, Lancashire</td>
<td>Erection of a rear conservatory extension for Mr And Mrs J Henry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01577/FUL</td>
<td>76 Highland Brow, Galgate, Lancashire</td>
<td>Proposed alterations to roof to form rear first floor bathroom extension for Mr And Mrs Hewitt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01580/FUL</td>
<td>17 Colchester Avenue, Lancaster, Lancashire</td>
<td>Erection of a rear conservatory for Miss Bewsher &amp; Mr Carrington</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01582/FUL</td>
<td>24 Cleveland Grove, Morecambe, Lancashire</td>
<td>Erection of a detached garage for Mr D Harris</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01589/CU</td>
<td>35 Clarendon Road East, Morecambe, Lancashire</td>
<td>Change of use from three self-contained flats to one residential dwelling for Adactus Housing Association</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application No</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01591/FUL</td>
<td>3 Greenwood Crescent, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth</td>
<td>Erection of a single storey extension to the side and rear for A Chilton &amp; J Carney</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01592/CU</td>
<td>St Georges Works, Schola Green Lane, Morecambe</td>
<td>Change of use and conversion to joiners workshop with minor external alterations for Ian And Sue Knowles</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01593/FUL</td>
<td>10 Hadrian Road, Morecambe, Lancashire</td>
<td>Erection of extension to existing conservatory to the rear for Mr And Mrs North</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01598/LB</td>
<td>Kingsway Retail Park, Parliament Street, Lancaster</td>
<td>Listed Building Application for fitting out of shop unit and signage and location of condenser units. for Laura Ashley</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01599/ADV</td>
<td>Kingsway Retail Park, Parliament Street, Lancaster</td>
<td>Erection of new signage for Laura Ashley</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01604/FUL</td>
<td>16 Ulleswater Road, Lancaster, Lancashire</td>
<td>Demolish existing two storey rear extension and erect two storey rear extension (including balcony) for Mrs C Hannah</td>
<td>Application Withdrawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01608/FUL</td>
<td>7 Oxcliffe Road, Heysham, Morecambe</td>
<td>Retention of boundary wall for Mr W Fu</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01611/FUL</td>
<td>Altham Meadow, Bartholomew Road, Morecambe</td>
<td>Alterations to day centre including new porch and new window and door for Flagship Care (Lancaster) Ltd</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01613/FUL</td>
<td>Slyne Tennis Club &amp; Bowling Green, Hanging Green Lane, Hest Bank</td>
<td>Erection of a scorers hut for Slyne-w-Hest Bowling Club</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01614/FUL</td>
<td>Unit 1, 1 Corn Market, Lancaster</td>
<td>Installation of a new shop front for Boultbee (Lancaster) Ltd</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01620/FUL</td>
<td>31 Dunkirk Avenue, Carnforth, Lancashire</td>
<td>Erection of first floor extension over porch for Mr And Mrs Robinson</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01622/FUL</td>
<td>7 Newmarket Avenue, Lancaster, Lancashire</td>
<td>Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of a new conservatory to rear for Mr And Mrs Carr</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/01625/FUL</td>
<td>70 Cleveleys Avenue, Lancaster, Lancashire</td>
<td>Construction of a pitched roof over existing flat roof with rear dormer, demolition of rear lean-to and erection of a new single storey rear extension for Mr &amp; Mrs Oakden</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/00011/FUL</td>
<td>55 Sea View Drive, Hest Bank, Lancaster</td>
<td>Erection of a single storey extension to front for Mr And Mrs Malvern</td>
<td>Application Permitted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LANCASTER CITY COUNCIL -- DEVELOPMENT CONTROL SERVICES

INFORMATION ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS QUARTER ENDING DECEMBER 2005

TOTAL DECISIONS TAKEN/TIME FROM APPLICATIONS TO DECISION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>0-8 wks</th>
<th>8-13 wks</th>
<th>13+ wks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings, Major</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings, Minor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices/research and development/light industry</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing Storage and Warehousing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Distribution and Servicing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other Developments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of use</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Householder Developments</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertisement</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listed Building and Conservation Area Consent</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL THIS QUARTER</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCENTAGE TOTAL THIS QUARTER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of DC decisions issued:
- Major applications in 13 weeks: 20%
- Minor applications in 8 weeks: 73%
- Other in 8 weeks: 81%

Performance in relation to major applications has reduced significantly as a number of long standing issues were resolved in the last quarter and permissions issued. It is expected this will improve over the following quarters. In the other areas the performance has improved slightly and it is anticipated this will be maintained.
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