

**PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS
REGULATORY COMMITTEE**

10.30 A.M.

19TH MARCH 2007

PRESENT:-

Councillors Roger Sherlock (Chairman), Eileen Blamire (Vice-Chairman), James Airey (substitute for Helen Helme), Evelyn Ashworth (substitute for David Kerr) (for Minute Nos. 228 to 242 only), Ken Brown, Abbott Bryning, Keith Budden, Anne Chapman, Susie Charles, Sheila Denwood, John Gilbert, Mike Greenall, Janice Hanson (for Minute Nos. 232 to 251 only), Pat Quinton, Robert Redfern, Peter Robinson, Sylvia Rogerson, Catriona Stamp (substitute for Chris Coates), Joyce Taylor and Paul Woodruff

Apologies for Absence:

Councillors Chris Coates, Helen Helme and David Kerr

Officers in Attendance:

Andrew Dobson	Head of Planning Services
David Hall	Development Control Manager
Angela Parkinson	Senior Solicitor
Martin Brownjohn	Senior Environmental Health Officer
Susan Butterworth	Planning Advice Assistant
Jane Glenton	Democratic Support Officer

228 MINUTES

The Minutes of the meeting held on 19th February 2007 were signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

229 PLANNING APPLICATIONS

The Head of Planning Services submitted a Schedule of Planning Applications and his recommendations thereon.

Resolved:

- (1) That the applications be determined as indicated below (the numbers denote the Schedule numbers of the applications).
- (2) That, except where stated below, the applications be subject to the relevant conditions and advice notes, as outlined in the Schedule.
- (3) That, except where stated below, the reasons for refusal be those as outlined in the Schedule.

(a) NOTE

A	- Approved
R	- Refused
D	- Deferred
A(C)	- Approved with additional conditions
A(P)	- Approved in principle
A(106)	- Approved following completion of a Section 106 Agreement
W	- Withdrawn
NO	- No objections
O	- Objections

Category A Applications

APPLICATIONS SUBJECT TO PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

230 LAND BETWEEN CARLOW WOOD AND WOODMAN LANE, BURROW WITH BURROW

(Under the scheme of public participation, Sarah Cleaver, Simon Cleaver, Michael Lecky-Thompson, Ann Brooks, Graham Parkinson, David Harris and Mr. Matthews addressed the Committee as objectors to the application.

David Blades and Richard Woodford, on behalf of the applicants, reiterated their support for the application.)

<u>Item</u>	<u>Application</u>	<u>Proposal and Applicant</u>	<u>Ward</u>	<u>Decision</u>
A14	07/00174/FUL	Retrospective application for the erection of two poultry breeder houses and egg store and ancillary hardstanding and landscaping for Mayfield Chicks Ltd	UPPER LUNE VALLEY	R

Sarah Cleaver addressed the Committee and advised Members that she resided less than 400 metres from Carlow Wood. This was the third time she had addressed the Committee. The scale of the business, with in excess of 40,000 birds, meant that it was an industrial-style operation. Moy Park had been granted an IPPC permit by the Environment Agency since the last planning application refusal, which had done little to protect residents, as there had been no improvement. The foul odours, and fumes and noise from vehicular movement, continued to be as bad. The cleaning process at the plant, using noisy power jets, was purgatory for residents, who were unable to enjoy their gardens. The noise and odour problems had been reported numerous times to the Environment Agency, but no action had been taken to address them. The factory was too large an operation to be sited near residential properties. She urged the Committee to refuse the application.

Simon Cleaver addressed the Committee and informed Members that he was sure they remembered the matter previously. The large number of people present at the meeting indicated the strength of objection and lack of trust regarding the operation. There could

be a change of use from a breeder farm to broiler production, which would result in additional odour nuisance. This was a retrospective application in regard to three new units, which had been built without planning permission. The conditions imposed under the Section 106 Agreement had not been adhered to. The new sheds had been built in the wrong footprint and were larger by some considerable amount and included an extended office at the front of the site. It was unlikely that the units could have been built in the wrong place by mistake. This was the company's third attempt to keep quiet about operations. He urged the Committee to be brave and refuse the application.

Michael Lecky-Thompson addressed the Committee and advised Members that Woodman Lane was designated unsuitable for heavy vehicles and was situated in an area of special landscape. Weight restrictions were not being applied. When HGVs were re-routed, residents were not notified. Heavy vehicles using the roads were not local traffic. A move to broiler production at the business would result in an increase in traffic, which would be intolerable to residents. The transport statement applied standard carriageway formulas, which were not applicable to a road deemed unsuitable for HGVs. The route management was ludicrous, considering the approaches to the premises. HGVs using Woodman Lane were damaging the hedgerows and private property. The application was flawed and he urged the Committee to reject it.

Ann Brooks addressed the Committee and informed Members that she was a resident of Overtown and had addressed the Committee twice before. Prior to the expansion at the premises, she was not aware of any complaints being made. At this time the business and residents had co-existed together. However, problems had emanated from the last development, when the premises had expanded to factory proportions. The local infrastructure could not support a factory of such a size and nature. Some of the conditions imposed in 1991 were still to be implemented, and residents could consequently have no confidence in the company's ability to honour conditions imposed. If the application was granted, the democratic planning process would be undermined.

Graham Parkinson addressed the Committee and advised Members that he was Chairman of the Parish Council. This was the third time he had been before the Committee. This was a retrospective application in connection with unauthorised buildings, which had doubled the size of the premises. At times lorries serving the premises blocked the village. An officer from the City Council, who had attended the scene to witness the bulldozers on-site, had been escorted off and told not to come back. As a result of the lorries serving the premises, hedges and walls were being scraped and crushed. On one occasion, a lorry had become stuck in the narrow lane, preventing all movements. Cars behind had to reverse in order for the lorry to be freed, and this operation had taken an hour. People walking dogs were being inconvenienced and frightened. Prior to Christmas, a local farmer had applied to build an agricultural building to house heffers and had been refused on the grounds that the area was in an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and could not be disfigured by agricultural buildings.

David Harris addressed the Committee and informed Members that he was a resident of Burrow and had spoken at Committee in December 2005. Reading from his letter, addressed to the City Council's Planning Services, he referred to the unpleasant odours endured in the area, which was a favourite with walkers, and to the increase in traffic to the premises. He referred to the traffic survey, which had been undertaken, and advised that no-one had consulted him in connection with this. The road signs erected stated that the road was unsuitable for HGVs, and these had been damaged by traffic

emanating from the premises. The buildings, the subject of the application, had been erected without planning permission. Increased production at the premises would lead to further health risks and fears. The recent avian flu outbreak at the Bernard Matthews premises in Norfolk, a plant which was supposedly well-run, did little to alleviate local fears. The chicken factory adversely affected local amenity. Whilst walking in the vicinity, pushing his small child in a pram, it was necessary to pick the pram up and move it onto the verge in order to avoid the wagons, which were going past. In light of the loss of amenity and perceived health risks, he urged refusal of the application, and hoped that he would not be before the Committee again in six months' time.

Kate Bigland addressed the Committee and advised Members that she was a resident of Overtown and endorsed the facts previously reported. She strongly objected to the happenings at Mayfield Chicks and to the illegally built buildings, one of which was 1,525 square metres in floor area and the other 1,440 square metres. It appeared the Planning Authority were overlooking this fact when dealing with Mayfield Chicks, otherwise why would the Authority allow such a state of affairs to occur? Residents had seen that the laws, which were present to protect the countryside and the people living in it, were being flouted. Only the owner, who lived away from the area, benefited from the expansion. She appealed to the Committee as the last bastion of what was decent and right to refuse the application and authorise that the chicken sheds be reduced to the size they should be, in order to give ratepayers confidence in the system.

Mr. Matthews addressed the Committee and informed Members that he lived in the house nearest to the development. He was sorry to have to speak again on the topic of odours emanating from the premises. The reports received were divergent to each other. The processes undertaken were that bags of air were collected and sent for analysis by experts. He could have no faith in the technology. The collection was undertaken in the fields nearby and not in properties, on the grounds that it was a linear measurement and greater near the factory, which was untrue. Whilst he thought Moy Park were good operators, if Moy Park departed, he was concerned what standards new owners would follow. The larger the chicken sheds, the greater the smells and associated problems. There was room on-site for more development. He had no confidence that the potential hazards of avian flu were agreed and quantified, as yet.

David Blades addressed the Committee and advised Members that he was from WSP Development and Transportation, Transport Consultants engaged by the applicant to look at traffic flows and highway impacts. He advised that WSP had been asked to keep a log for a year of every vehicle in the vicinity. He quoted, in detail, statistics and results from the survey, which showed that flows generated from the premises were a small proportion of the traffic using the highway, a maximum of 14-15 vehicles per day. Only one personal injury had been recorded in the year involving a bicycle and a car. He asked the Committee to consider whether, in the light of such a small flow of traffic generated by the premises, this was material to their consideration of the application.

Richard Woodford addressed the Committee, on behalf of the applicant, and informed Members that the Highway Impact details contained in the report to the Agenda were accurate. The company was looking at what lay behind the objections to the operation and meeting with residents in order to understand their concerns. From this, they had been given clear messages. Firstly, some residents wanted to see development, some of them having changed their position, based on facts, and had withdrawn their objections. He referred to Mr. Matthews, one of the objectors, who lived near to the premises and who had said that the operation was well-managed. There had been a

long period of complaints due to a lack of trust regarding the future operation. However, the Environment Agency and the Local Authority were powerful organisations and had powers. Egg production was the purpose of the business, rather than broilers. He felt that there was meaningful development. The company was in negotiations with a farmer to receive a 5-metre strip for planting and landscaping as a buffer zone. He urged the Committee to treat the objections with caution, rather than as being correct.

It was proposed by Councillor Chapman and seconded by Councillor Quinton:

“That the application be approved.”

Upon being put to the vote, 7 Members voted in favour of the proposition, 11 against, with 1 abstention, whereupon the Chairman declared the proposal to be lost.

It was then proposed by Councillor Airey and seconded by Councillor Charles:

“That the application be refused.”

Upon being put to the vote, 11 Members voted in favour of the proposition and 8 against, whereupon the Chairman declared the proposal to be carried.

Resolved:

That the application be refused for the following reasons:

- (1) The Local Planning Authority are not satisfied, on the basis of the revised information, that the problems with odour control and PM10s have been overcome.
- (2) The adverse impact of the size and number of HGVs on narrow country lanes and the associated traffic problems arising from the increased size of the plant, including the effect on amenity of the surrounding area.

The meeting was adjourned at 12.35 p.m. for lunch.

The meeting was reconvened at 1.15 p.m.

Councillor Quinton declared a personal interest in the following item, being a member of the Civic Society, and remained in the room during consideration thereof.

231 KINGSWAY RETAIL PARK, CATON ROAD, LANCASTER

(Under the scheme of public participation, John Braithwaite (on behalf of Mr. and Mrs. G. A. Pedder), John Braithwaite, Anne Stelfox and David Howard addressed the Committee as objectors to the application. George Mills, on behalf of the applicant, reiterated his support for the application.)

A18 07/00005/REM Reserved Matters application BULK WARD D
for 8 storey residential development (100 units) with associated car parking and landscaping for Worksharp (Lancaster) Ltd

John Braithwaite addressed the Committee on behalf of Mr. and Mrs. G. A. Pedder who, he advised Members, lived in closest proximity to the proposed development. They had not, at any stage, been assessed regarding any impact this would have on them and it was unclear how conclusions had been reached in this regard. The construction would be a short distance from their property and of considerable height, wholly above the eaves level of their property. The height and proximity of the building would dominate their home generally, with their living-room and bedrooms facing towards it. The construction would block their views and affect their privacy. The proposed development conflicted with Policy H19, which said that the conversion or adaptation of buildings to residential use would not be permitted unless criteria were met, one of these being in relation to there being no adverse effect on the amenity, which there would be for Mr. and Mrs. Pedder.

John Braithwaite addressed the Committee on behalf of the Civic Society and informed Members that the proposed development was inappropriate and in contravention of policy. It did not improve the quality of the area and was not of a high standard of design. Its form was massively out of context with Lancaster as a whole. The building would have a continuous flat parapet, and would use materials which were alien to their surroundings, with garish colour-finishes. For these, and other reasons, the construction would detrimentally affect the quality of the area. The proposals offered poor landscaping. The application conflicted with Policy H12 of the Local Plan and Policy E33, which reflected PPG15 (Planning and the Historic Environment) and added to the quality of life. The whole parapet to the facade of buildings would be lost. The original part of the building would be overshadowed, as would the view along Caton Road. The construction would damage the local scene. It would be in conflict with national policy. It did not constitute good planning and would result in a building of character which was poorer for visitors and residents.

Anne Stelfox addressed the Committee on behalf of the Civic Society and advised Members of concerns. The Civic Society had produced an alternative scheme which would retain the local building in its entirety and reflect the style and size of local buildings, using traditional materials, in a varied roofscape. The vista along Caton Road would be retained, rather than overshadowed. Replacement shrubs would retain the feature visible on approach. Detailed design drawings had been sent to the Case Officer and the applicant's agents. The Civic Society's view was that the present scheme was not the only possibility and urged the Committee to refuse the application on the basis of its poor design and it being contrary to national and local planning policy.

David Howard addressed the Committee and informed Members that he was a Lancastrian and an architect. Kingsway was a listed building. Part of the site was adversely spoilt through poor design and decisions made at Committee. There had been no indication as to how the outline application would be developed. Upon removal of the roof, there was no indication as to how the building would be protected. The proposed flats provided poor space, and the development had tenement-like walkways, with windows close to each other. The ventilation shaft feature was ugly. The development was bulging, brutal, monotonous, irrelevant, trendy in style, incongruous to the existing environment and a mockery. He advised of design faults and urged that they be addressed, that the advice of reputable architects be sought and that the Committee refuse the application.

George Mills addressed the Committee on behalf of the applicant, Worksharp (Lancaster) Ltd, and advised that the Civic Society design was such that no reputable builder would sign up to such a scheme. The proposed development would be bathed in sunlight throughout the day and would enjoy views across the city and Morecambe Bay. Some apartments would enjoy views of the River Lune. The development was sympathetic to the existing facade and celebrated an existence near to the river. The design was enduring, with overall qualities that intended to give some scale, but not mimic the existing. The apartments would be modern in form. There would be a strong marriage between old and new. The design was appropriate to the one-way system, with good sound insulation. The proposals had been approved by both the City Council and English Heritage.

It was proposed by Councillor Chapman and seconded by Councillor Quinton:

“That the application be refused.”

Upon being put to the vote, 7 Members voted in favour of the proposition, 7 against, with 4 abstentions, whereupon the Chairman declared the proposal to be lost.

It was then proposed by Councillor Sherlock and seconded by Councillor Charles:

“That the application be granted.”

Upon being put to the vote, 7 Members voted in favour of the proposition, 7 against, with 4 abstentions, whereupon the Chairman declared the proposal to be lost.

It was then proposed by Councillor Budden and seconded by Councillor Greenall:

“That the application be deferred to allow Officers to discuss possible improvements to the scheme with the Developer.”

Upon being put to the vote, 12 Members voted for the proposition and 6 against, whereupon the Chairman declared the proposal to be carried.

Resolved:

That the application be deferred to allow Officers to discuss possible improvements to the scheme with the Developer.

Councillor Hanson arrived at the meeting at this point.

Councillor Quinton declared a personal interest in the following item, being a member of the Civic Society, and remained in the room during consideration thereof.

232 KINGSWAY RETAIL PARK, CATON ROAD, LANCASTER

A19 07/00006/LB	Listed Building application for external alterations to retained facade and other alterations in connection with application for the erection of 100 residential units and associated works for Worksharp (Lancaster) Ltd	BULK WARD	D
-----------------	---	-----------	---

Councillor Chapman declared a personal interest in the following item, being acquainted with the owner of one of the businesses on-site (Out of the Woods), and remained in the room during consideration thereof.

Councillor Denwood declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the following item, being acquainted with the public speakers, left the room during consideration thereof and did not vote on the item.

Councillor Quinton declared a personal interest in the following item, having been present at the working group meeting, and remained in the room during consideration thereof.

Councillor Rogerson declared a personal interest in the following item, her spouse having dealt with the applicant in a business capacity, left the room during consideration thereof and did not vote on the item.

Councillor Woodruff declared a personal interest in the following item, as a member of Halton-with-Aughton Parish Council, and remained in the room during consideration thereof.

233 HALTON MILL, MILL LANE, HALTON

(Under the scheme of public participation, Parish Councillor, Brian Jefferson, Bernadette Needham, Deidre Winstanley and John Blowes addressed the Committee as objectors to the application. John Aspin, on behalf of the applicant, reiterated his support for the application.)

A20	07/00202/REM	Resubmission of HALTON- R
		06/01197/REM for WITH-
		Matters Application for the AUGHTON
		erection of an apartment block
		comprising of 36 two bedroom
		units with associated car
		parking and servicing for Time
		and Tide Properties Ltd

Parish Councillor, Brian Jefferson, addressed the Committee and advised Members that this was an opportunity for local residents to comment on the application. The two-month period of consultation had comprised only one meeting. The architects had indicated that there would be no compromise on the appearance of Blocks 4 and 5. The Parish Council believed that the problem was that, as the area in question lay outside the City Council remit, it had not received appropriate consideration. There were two crucial errors at this stage, these being that it was inappropriate that the development should be treated as a standalone site, and the styling should be a modern interpretation of the vernacular. The Lune Valley was timeless and it was not too late to prevent Halton being subjected to this aberration, although it was too late to prevent the damage to the riverbank. He hoped that the Committee had the commonsense to give an emphatic refusal to the application and vote against it.

Bernadette Needham addressed the Committee and informed Members that she was speaking on behalf of the Halton Mill Group. The group had been set up in January

2007 following a meeting with the Parish Council, when more than fifty people had spoken in concern at the development taking place. Those people had formed the group, which was voluntary and liaised with the Parish Council. The depth of feeling with regard to the development was shown by more than 300 objections, which had been received, many in the form of individually written letters. It was hard to untangle what was going on from Council documentation. The North West branch of Planning Aid, who provided free, independent and professional help, advice and support on planning issues to people and communities, were involved with the group. They had assigned a professional planning advisor to them. The riverside walk at Halton was the core of village life and the equivalent of Williamson Park or Happy Mount Park. The group would pursue the matter for as long as it was necessary.

Deidre Winstanley addressed the Committee and advised Members that, whilst she accepted the principle of development on-site, she wished to address the high number of residential units. It was a question of design. Good design was indivisible from good planning and development, which allowed people to live and work in an area. The thirty-six city-style apartments would do little to address the needs of the community, nor would the second-home apartments. Neither did the development address affordable/local housing or local jobs, with an over-supply of housing, which would prejudice the regeneration of urban areas. The number of dwellings proposed on-site was hard to define, and there was inadequate detail regarding materials to be used. The development was urban and not rural. The Secretary of State had upheld his decision to refuse, which was relevant to the matter. She urged the Committee to refuse the application.

John Blowes addressed the Committee and informed Members that the number of people who had been stirred into action in connection with the matter, indicated the level of interest and depth of feeling aroused. It was felt that the site should be developed in such a way that it was attractive to live in and visit, something that the present blocks did not reflect. It was felt that the Committee had not received impartial information from the Planning Service and this was the subject of an Ombudsman complaint. The masterplan needed to be developed and more information provided, following which consultation should take place. The employment provision should be addressed. Residents were prepared to help in the processes in a controlled manner, adhering to policy.

John Aspin addressed the Committee on behalf of the applicant, Time and Tide Properties Ltd, and advised Members that he would like to reiterate several points. The deferment from the January meeting of the Committee had led to a round-the-table discussion with residents and the Parish Council. It was clear that there was no intransigence on Time and Tide's behalf. Officers had endorsed the previous scheme. The company were willing to talk and felt it necessary that talks take place regarding the reserved matters. The Parish Council had been consulted. The scheme had been established and agreed before Time and Tide came along to put the meat on the bones. The previous scheme submitted had been superior. The company would go through the appeals process, as it had already been agreed that the site was suitable. The company had not been approached by the Halton Mills Group. He was willing to discuss additional designs, as this was his job and an area of work he loved to be involved in.

It was proposed by Councillor Woodruff and seconded by Councillor Ashworth:

"That the application be refused."

Upon being put to the vote, 14 Members voted for the proposition, 2 against, with 2 abstentions, whereupon the Chairman declared the proposal to be carried.

Resolved:

That the application be refused for the following reasons:

- (1) The density, scale, layout and appearance are unacceptable and inappropriate in the village location close to a Conservation Area.
- (2) The proposal does not accord with Local Plan Policy EC7 to ensure that development is employment-led and, in particular, does not provide for satisfactory phasing details to ensure implementation of the employment generating parts of the scheme.

Councillor Chapman declared a personal interest in the following item, being acquainted with the owner of one of the businesses on-site (Out of the Woods), and remained in the room during consideration thereof.

Councillor Denwood declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the following item, being acquainted with the public speakers, left the room during consideration thereof and did not vote on the item.

Councillor Quinton declared a personal interest in the following item, having been present at the working group meeting, and remained in the room during consideration thereof.

Councillor Rogerson declared a personal interest in the following item, her spouse having dealt with the applicant in a business capacity, left the room during consideration thereof and did not vote on the item.

Councillor Woodruff declared a personal interest in the following item, as a member of Halton-with-Aughton Parish Council, and remained in the room during consideration thereof.

234 HALTON MILL, MILL LANE, HALTON

(Under the scheme of public participation, Parish Councillor, Brian Jefferson, Bernadette Needham, Deidre Winstanley and John Blowes addressed the Committee as objectors to the application. John Aspin, on behalf of the applicant, reiterated his support for the application.)

A21	07/00037/REM	Resubmission of application number 06/01196/REM for Reserved Matters for the erection of an apartment block comprising of 31 two and 2 one bedroom units (33 total) with associated parking and servicing for Time and Tide Properties Ltd	HALTON- WITH- AUGHTON	R
-----	--------------	--	-----------------------	---

Parish Councillor, Brian Jefferson, addressed the Committee and advised Members that he had heard the arguments. The present mess evolved from the start of matters – Time and Tide had said this previously. When the brief had gone out, no consideration of where Halton was had been made, nor reference to the Parish Plan. A meeting with the developer was planned for the 23rd March. It would be necessary to get matters right and go back to the fundamentals. The Committee's support was needed and he urged them to refuse the application.

Brian Needham addressed the Committee and referred them to a photograph of the site where the apartment block would be built, close to where the beautiful iron bridge across the River Lune was positioned, which represented the gateway to Halton. He urged the Committee to refuse the application along the lines of the officer recommendation for the previous application.

Deidre Winstanley addressed the Committee and advised Members that she was mindful that it was late in the day. The apartment block fell within a conservation area, therefore the arguments for refusal of this application were stronger. She hoped she could trust the Committee to make the right decision again.

John Blowes addressed the Committee and urged Members to refuse the application. Any appeal arising would be supported.

John Asplin addressed the Committee on behalf of the applicant, Time and Tide Properties Ltd, and advised Members that they had made an unlawful decision previously. Outline approval had been agreed. Phasing of the development had not been agreed, therefore it could not be introduced. People were attempting to make retrospective changes. Whilst he sympathised with some of the comments, arguments had to be based upon facts, rather than emotions. The previous decision had been foolhardy. If taken to appeal, it was likely that Time and Tide would win.

It was moved by Councillor Woodruff and seconded by Councillor Charles:

“That the application be refused.”

Upon being put to the vote, 14 Members voted for the proposition, 2 against with 2 abstentions, whereupon the Chairman declared the proposal carried.

Resolved:

That the application be refused.

APPLICATIONS NOT SUBJECT TO PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Councillor Greenall declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the following item, as an employee of British Energy, left the room during consideration thereof and did not vote on the item.

235 NEW UNIT, MIDDLETON BUSINESS PARK, MIDDLETON ROAD, MIDDLETON

A5 07/00135/FUL Erection of a biomass OVERTON A(C)
renewable energy plant for WARD
Maiden Enterprise Ltd

The application was approved, subject to the following additional conditions (suitably worded):

- “(1) Control of emissions.
- “(2) Control of noise.
- “(3) Arrangements for a suitable financial contribution to be agreed and mechanism for paying such a figure to be agreed before development commences.”

236 BLACKTHORNE COTTAGE, BORWICK ROAD, OVER KELLET

A6 07/00056/FUL Variation of occupancy KELLET A
condition number 3 of planning WARD
consent 02/01203/REM for Mr.
J. McCarthy

237 70 SANDYLANDS PROMENADE, HEYSHAM, MORECAMBE

A7 07/00064/CU Change of use from single HEYSHAM A
dwelling to four self-contained NORTH
flats for AP Scaife WARD
Developments

It was proposed by Councillor Robinson and seconded by Councillor Hanson:

“That the application be refused.”

Upon being put to the vote, 6 Members voted in favour of the proposition, 11 against, with 2 abstentions, whereupon the Chairman declared the proposal to be lost.

It was then proposed by Councillor Taylor and seconded by Councillor Charles:

“That the application be granted.”

Upon being put to the vote, 11 Members voted in favour of the proposition and 6 against, with 2 abstentions, whereupon the Chairman declared the proposal to be carried.

Resolved:

That the application be granted.

Councillor Gilbert declared a personal interest in the following item, as a member of the Management Company, and remained in the room during consideration thereof.

238 FLEET HOUSE, NEW ROAD, LANCASTER

A8 06/01495/FUL Amendment to previously DUKE'S A(C)
approved application WARD
05/00560/FUL (now to erect 9
flats and 2 houses) for YMCA
Lancaster

The application was approved, subject to the following additional condition (suitably worded):

“Re-use of the historic cobbles at the front of the building and cleaning/making good of the stonework as per conservation request.”

Councillor Gilbert declared a personal interest in the following item, as a member of the Management Company, and remained in the room during consideration thereof.

239 FLEET HOUSE, NEW ROAD, LANCASTER

A9	07/00108/LB	Listed Building application for the demolition of garages in connection with the erection of 9 flats and 2 houses for YMCA	DUKE'S WARD	A
----	-------------	--	-------------	---

240 PUMPING STATION, OXCLIFFE ROAD, MORECAMBE

A10	06/01583/FUL	Erection of a 20m streetworks monopole, 3 antennae and 2 equipment cabinets for T Mobile	WESTGATE WARD	R
-----	--------------	--	---------------	---

241 LAND ADJACENT STONE JETTY, MARINE ROAD CENTRAL, MORECAMBE

A11	07/00124/FUL	Construction of new hovercraft housing building for Royal National Lifeboat Institution	POULTON WARD	A(C)
-----	--------------	---	--------------	------

The application was approved, subject to the following additional condition (suitably worded):

“Precise siting of the building to be agreed on-site with officers before the work commences.”

242 23 MARKET STREET, LANCASTER

A12	06/01350/CU	Siting of table and chairs on public highway for Nero Holdings	DUKE'S WARD	A
-----	-------------	--	-------------	---

Councillor Ashworth left the meeting at this point.

243 SUITE 5, 1 MANNIN WAY, LANCASTER

A13 07/00055/CU Change of use of B1 office to LOWER R
mixed use of B1 (Business) LUNE
and D1 (Non-residential VALLEY
institutions) – provision of WARD
dental health and therapy
services and the manufacture
of dental appliances for
Grange Dental Practice

244 FLAT 2, 11 CABLE STREET, LANCASTER

A15 07/00009/LB Alteration of internal walls for BULK WARD A
Ms. R. Robinson

245 WITHDRAWN

Agenda item No. 16 was withdrawn.

Councillor Bryning declared a personal and prejudicial interest in the following item, being an appointee to the Lancaster University Council and an appointee to the Court of Lancaster University.

**246 LAND FOR PROPOSED BAILRIGG BUSINESS PARK, BAILRIGG LANE,
LANCASTER**

A17 05/01114/OUT Land for proposed Bailrigg ELLEL D
Business Park, Bailrigg Lane, WARD
Lancaster

The application was deferred to await the final views of the Highway Agency regarding a direction in force.

247 GALGATE CRICKET CLUB PAVILION, MAIN ROAD, GALGATE

A22 07/00044/FUL Erection of new village hall for ELLEL A(C)
Ellel Parish Council WARD

The application was approved, subject to the following additional condition (suitably worded):

“Details of the car parking provision to be agreed and implemented before the site is brought into use.”

248 TOWN HALL, MARINE ROAD EAST, MORECAMBE

A23 07/00097/LB Listed Building Application to POULTON A
demolish partition walls to WARD
create Customer Service
Centre for Lancaster City
Council

Category D Application

249 PAVEMENT AT HILMORE WAY, MORECAMBE

A24 07/00078/DPA Widening of footpath and HARBOUR NO
construction of shared cycle WARD
and footway and construction
of humped crossing with
private vehicular access for
Lancaster City Council

250 DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

The Head of Planning Services submitted a Schedule of Planning Applications dealt with under the Scheme of Delegation of Planning Functions to Officers.

Resolved:

That the report be noted.

251 PLANNING ENFORCEMENT SCHEDULE

The Head of Legal and Human Resources submitted a report with regard to enforcement action being taken by the City Council.

Resolved:

That the report be noted.

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 5.26 p.m.)

Any queries regarding these Minutes, please contact
Jane Glenton, Democratic Services - telephone (01524) 582068 or email
jglenton@lancaster.gov.uk