



Committee: PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS REGULATORY COMMITTEE

Date: MONDAY, 24 AUGUST 2015

Venue: LANCASTER TOWN HALL

Time: 10.30 A.M.

A G E N D A

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

1 Apologies for Absence

2 Minutes

Minutes of meeting held on Monday 27 July 2015 (previously circulated).

3 Items of Urgent Business authorised by the Chairman

4 Declarations of Interest

To receive declarations by Members of interests in respect of items on this Agenda.

Members are reminded that, in accordance with the Localism Act 2011, they are required to declare any disclosable pecuniary interests which have not already been declared in the Council's Register of Interests. (It is a criminal offence not to declare a disclosable pecuniary interest either in the Register or at the meeting).

Whilst not a legal requirement, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 10 and in the interests of clarity and transparency, Members should declare any disclosable pecuniary interests which they have already declared in the Register, at this point in the meeting.

In accordance with Part B Section 2 of the Code Of Conduct, Members are required to declare the existence and nature of any other interests as defined in paragraphs 8(1) or 9(2) of the Code of Conduct.

Planning Applications for Decision

Community Safety Implications

In preparing the reports for this agenda, regard has been paid to the implications of the proposed developments on Community Safety issues. Where it is considered 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.

Category A Applications

Applications to be dealt with by the District Council without formal consultation with the County Council.

5	A5 14/01215/FUL	Land Associated With Intack Farm, Long Dales Lane, Nether Kellet, Carnforth	Kellet Ward	(Pages 1 - 8)
		Erection of a 34.5 metre high wind turbine from ground to blade tip with associated control box and hardstanding for E J Ward & Sons		
6	A6 15/00624/FUL	Land At Mossgate Park, Mossgate Park, Heysham, Lancashire	Heysham South Ward	(Pages 9 - 13)
		Erection of 15 dwellings (Class C3) and associated access for Mr James Carman		
7	A7 - 15/00714/OUT	Land At Bowerham Lane, Lancaster, Lancashire	Scotforth East Ward	(Pages 14 - 21)
		Outline application for the erection of 20 dwellings for Messrs Huddleston		
8	A8 15/00297/CU	Land Adjacent To Chipping House, Chipping Lane, Bay Horse	Ellel Ward	(Pages 22 - 26)
		Retrospective application for change of use of agricultural land for the siting of mobile home for domestic use with domestic curtilage and associated landscaping for Mr Ben Morris		
9	A9 15/00967/FUL	The Knoll, Westbourne Road, Lancaster, Lancashire	Castle Ward	(Pages 27 - 29)
		Demolition of existing porch and erection of a single storey side extension for Dr And Mrs Whittle		
10	A10 15/00729/LB	The Knoll, Westbourne Road, Lancaster, Lancashire	Castle Ward	(Pages 30 - 32)
		Listed building application for the demolition of existing porch and		

erection of a single storey side extension, removal of existing and installation of new internal partition walls, installation of windows, and erection of gates and fence for Dr And Mrs Whittle

11 Delegated Planning Decisions (Pages 33 - 40)

ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

(i) Membership

Councillors Roger Sherlock (Chairman), Helen Helme (Vice-Chairman), June Ashworth, Stuart Bateson, Eileen Blamire, Carla Brayshaw, Dave Brookes, Sheila Denwood, Andrew Kay, James Leyshon, Margaret Pattison, Robert Redfern, Sylvia Rogerson, Malcolm Thomas and Peter Yates

(ii) Substitute Membership

Councillors Susie Charles (Substitute), Mel Guilding (Substitute), Tim Hamilton-Cox (Substitute), Geoff Knight (Substitute), Richard Newman-Thompson (Substitute), Jane Parkinson (Substitute), David Smith (Substitute) and Nicholas Wilkinson (Substitute)

(iii) Queries regarding this Agenda

Please contact Sarah Moorghen, Democratic Services: telephone (01524) 582132 or email smoorghen@lancaster.gov.uk.

(iv) Changes to Membership, substitutions or apologies

Please contact Democratic Support, telephone 582170, or alternatively email democraticsupport@lancaster.gov.uk.

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

Published on Tuesday 11 August 2015.

Agenda Item A5	Committee Date 24 August 2015	Application Number 14/01215/FUL
Application Site Land Associated With Intack Farm Long Dales Lane Nether Kellet Carnforth		Proposal Erection of a 34.5 metre high wind turbine from ground to blade tip with associated control box and hardstanding
Name of Applicant E J Ward & Sons		Name of Agent Mr Richard Corbett
Decision Target Date 7 January 2015		Reason For Delay Awaiting appeal decision on nearby wind turbine, further information from the applicant, officer workloads and changes to national planning guidance
Case Officer		Mr Andrew Holden
Departure		No
Summary of Recommendation		Approval

(i) Procedural Matters

This application would normally have been determined under the Scheme of Delegation. However, Cllr Mace has requested that the application be referred to the Planning Committee for a decision on the grounds of ecology and mineral safeguarding.

The application was initially on 29 June Committee agenda but just prior to that meeting Government made changes to National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) relating to the determination of applications for wind turbines. A decision on the application was deferred to gain clarity from Government on the interpretation of the NPPG's wording.

1.0 The Site and its Surroundings

1.1 The application site is located about 0.8km east of the eastern edge of Nether Kellet and approximately 1.5km south of the southern edge of Over Kellet. It falls within an area of semi-improved agricultural land that is bordered by Long Dales Lane to the west, Dunald Mill Lane to the south, Green Hill Lane public right of way to the east, and Nether Kellet Road and Addington Road to the north. Access would be from the well maintained private road that serves Intack Farm and Meadow View Caravan Park off Long Dales Lane.

1.2 It falls within the District's Countryside Area but about 1.5km outside of the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and approximately 3.5km outside of the Arnside and Silverdale AONB.

2.0 The Proposal

2.1 The application seeks planning permission for a single wind turbine with a hub height of 24.8m and a total height of 34.5m from ground to blade tip. Each of the 3 blades would measure 9.6m in length. The proposal also includes a small control box and area of hardstanding.

3.0 Site History

3.1 Intack Farm has a long and varied site history but there are no planning applications that relate to this wind turbine proposal other than a previous application (14/00378/FUL) for the same proposal which was withdrawn due to the lack of supporting information.

4.0 Consultation Responses

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

Consultee	Response
County Highways	No objection subject to a condition relating to Construction Traffic Management Method Statement (including designated routes to and from the site)
Environmental Health	Initial objection on the grounds that the noise information submitted contained some inconsistencies. However, on balance it is considered that given the size of the turbine and the distances involved from existing dwellings and holiday caravans, the objection can be overcome by the imposition of relevant noise related condition.
Natural England	No objection
Wildlife Trust	No comments received
RSPB	No comments received
Forest of Bowland AONB	No comments received
Arnsdale and Silverdale AONB	Concerned that the impact of the proposed turbine and its cumulative impact on long distance views from the AONB has not been assessed
Ministry of Defence (MoD)	No objection
Civil Aviation Authority (CAA)	Standard response to consult with MoD, NATS, nearby aerodromes (Warton and Blackpool) and Air Support Units (police and ambulance).
National Air Traffic Service (NATS)	No objection
Air Ambulance	No comments received
BAE Warton	No objection
Blackpool Airport	No comments received
Police Air Support Unit	No comments received
Conservation Officer	No objection
Nether Kellet Parish Council	Objection as it is felt that it would have a detrimental effect on leisure providers in close proximity to the site, which would as a consequence have an adverse effect on businesses (shop and public houses) in Nether Kellet and Over Kellet. A further objection received post-NPPG changes citing a detrimental effect on the surrounding area which is largely free of obstruction on the sky-line. In view of its situation on high ground between the villages of Over Kellet and Nether Kellet, the turbine's presence would dominate what is essentially a rural environment with farmland and tracts of woodland amongst a rolling landscape.
Over Kellet Parish Council	An objection received post-NPPG change. Acknowledges that the proposal falls within the parish of Nether Kellet, but it will be clearly visible from Over Kellet parish. The Parish Council deems that the proposal contrary to national and local policies on landscape and design impacts given the landscape quality in which it falls as well as being visible from both of the District's Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which in turn is likely to adversely affect that part of the rural economy derived from tourism. It is contrary to NPPG as the proposal does not have the community's backing.

5.0 Neighbour Representations

5.1 Three objections have been received from local residents (though 2 of them originate from the same property) and one from the owners of Hawthorn Caravan Park, citing the following reasons:

- Adverse impact on character of the countryside, including cumulative impacts (including references to the dismissed appeal for a larger wind turbine at nearby Birkland Barrow)

- Detrimental to the area's tourism
- Traffic concerns
- Noise, shadow flicker and vibration
- Harmful impact on ecology
- Safety to horses and their riders
- Already a number of hazards in the area (power and gas lines)
- Negative impact on property values
- Negative impact on the health of local residents
- Planning decision should reflect local people's views

6.0 Principal National and Development Plan Policies

6.1 National Planning Policy Framework

The National Planning Policy Framework indicates that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development (**paragraph 14**). The following paragraphs of the NPPF are relevant to the determination of this proposal:

Paragraph **17** – 12 core land-use planning principles

Paragraph **28** – rural economy

Paragraph **32** – transport

Paragraphs **56** and **58** – good design

Paragraphs **93** and **98** – renewable energy

Paragraph **109** – natural environment

Paragraphs **118** – biodiversity

Paragraphs **129**, **131**, **132** and **134** – conservation

6.2 Core Strategy

SC1 – Sustainable development

SC5 – Achieving quality in design

ER7 – Renewable energy

6.3 Development Management DPD

DM18 – Wind turbine development

DM27 – Biodiversity

DM28 – Landscape impacts

DM32 – Setting of heritage assets

DM35 – Key design principles

6.4 Local Plan (saved policies)

E4 – Development within the Countryside

7.0 Comment and Analysis

7.1 The key issues arising from this proposal are:

- Principle of development
- Landscape and visual impact
- Aviation safety
- Impact on ecology
- Impact on residential amenity
- Impact on heritage assets
- Impact on the highway network

7.2 Principle of development

7.2.1 As set out within the NPPF, the government seeks to support the transition to a low carbon future by, amongst other things, encouraging the use of renewable resources through the development of

renewable energy. It indicates that to help increase the use and supply of renewable and low carbon energy, Local Planning Authorities should recognise the responsibility on all communities to contribute to energy generation from renewable or low carbon sources. It also states that even small-scale projects provide a valuable contribution to cutting greenhouse gas emissions. In determining this application regard should be made local policies contained in both the Lancaster District Core Strategy (policy ER7) and Development Management DPD (policy DM18). These policies look favourably on renewable energy schemes and seek to promote and encourage proposals provided that potential impacts are satisfactorily addressed.

7.2.2 A Written Ministerial Statement was made on 18 June 2015 requiring Local Planning Authorities to only grant planning permission for applications for wind energy development if:

- The development site is in an area identified as suitable for wind energy development in a Local or Neighbourhood Plan; and
- Following consultation, it can be demonstrated that the planning impacts identified by affected local communities have been fully addressed and therefore the proposal has their backing.

It then goes on to state that whether the proposal has the backing of the affected local community is a planning judgement for the Local Planning Authority. Officers have made enquiries of Government as to what they interpret as “backing of the community”. Government have to date failed to respond, and whilst Officers will continue to press for a response, it is envisaged that a reply may not be forthcoming.

The above wording is reiterated in National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). However, similar changes were made to affordable housing provision last year, and through legal challenges have recently been found to be unlawful. Furthermore, NPPG is only guidance. It is not planning policy and does not form part of the Development Plan. Whilst it is a material consideration it carries very little weight. Therefore the application must be assessed in accordance with the NPPF and the Development Plan, and if the proposal is deemed acceptable against the requirements of the national and local policies then the application should be approved. This does not mean that the comments received from local residents and organisations will not be considered, but rather that as with all planning applications their comments are weighed up alongside planning policy. In this case, the issues raised by the local community are addressed in the following paragraphs and put in the policy context.

7.3 Landscape and visual impact

7.3.1 The landscape and visual impact submitted as part of this application was woeful, and therefore not assisted the Local Planning Authority in its assessment of the application. A wind turbine of this height is likely to be significant in the immediate landscape, though it is acknowledged that the impact is reduced from more distant views due to the local topography. Its impact would be reduced if all associated infrastructure (such as cables) are kept underground, but this can (and should) be conditioned. Whilst it is noted that the Arnside and Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) office has concerns regarding the proposal, the impact of a single turbine with only an overall height of 34.5m at a distance of 3.5km away (though the higher ground of the AONB that could afford clearer views of the turbine are even further away at 5km) would be nominal. Their other concern about the cumulative impact with the Birkland Barrow proposal has subsequently fallen away with the Planning Inspectorate dismissing the appeal for that (80m high) wind turbine. This was the main reason for delaying the determination of this application as the Local Planning Authority would have required additional information from the applicant regarding cumulative impacts had the Planning Inspectorate allowed the appeal. Whilst there are other wind turbines either implemented or permitted in the wider area (Back Lane Quarry and Addington for example) there are sufficient separation distances and intervening landform for there not to be an adverse cumulative visual impact. Likewise the Forest of Bowland AONB is about 1.5km away to the south east at its nearest point and the topography and vegetation between it and the application site would screen most views of the turbine from the protected landscape of the proposal. Lastly, it is also recognised that there are existing man-made structures in the locality, namely the overhead power lines and their associated pylons, and therefore this is not unspoilt landscape. A wind turbine of this size in this location would not be considered to be unacceptable because whilst it would introduce a moving structure close to the top of a drumlin and therefore it would be clearly visible in its local context, the

nature of the drumlin area in which it would fall is such that it would be generally more screened to wider views, and even then would often be seen in the setting of the nearby electricity line. However, the cumulative impact of the 2 different pieces of electricity infrastructure would not be sufficient to sustain a reason for refusal.

7.4 Aviation safety

7.4.1 There are no aviation safety concerns arising from this proposal. As set out in Section 4 the MoD, NATS, CAA and BAE Warton do not object to the application.

7.5 Impact on ecology

7.5.1 Wind turbines can have an adverse impact on ecology, especially birds and bats. Field boundaries and watercourses need to be considered as part of this ecological assessment as these features can form important 'corridors' for wildlife. Whilst there are stone walls and hedgerows that form field boundaries in the immediate area, these are set more than 50m away from the proposed wind turbine and therefore are not deemed to cause any significant biodiversity concerns. That said, to future proof the situation, a condition should be imposed to prevent any trees or shrubs being planted within 50m of the wind turbine to ensure that wildlife that might utilise such vegetation for foraging or commuting would not be attracted into an area that could cause them to come into conflict with the structure.

7.5.2 It is acknowledged that there are 12 Biological Heritage Sites within 1 km of the site, namely Long Dales Lane Fields, Hawthorn Rocks, Helks Wood Farm Pasture, Helks Wood, Intack Wood, Swantley, Dunald Mill Craggs, Dunald Mill Hole, Long Riddings Wood, Cock's Wood, Limestone Pavement and Craggs south of Cock's Wood and Kit Bill Wood. These form a ring around the proposed site, the nearest being about 320m away albeit the other side of the main road between Over Kellet and Nether Kellet. The connectivity between these sites is likely to be limited by the road network and the lack of boundary features and watercourses as mentioned in 7.5.1. The immediate area around the application site and the site itself is semi-improved agricultural land used for livestock. Whilst it has the capacity to support some wildlife the manner in which it is farmed (grazing, silage, muck spreading) would limit its ability to support the form of wildlife that would conflict with the operation of a wind turbine.

7.6 Impact on residential amenity (visual, shadow flicker and noise)

7.6.1 Outlook – It is a well-known planning principle in this country that there is no 'right to a view'. The test in this instance is whether the turbine would affect the outlook of residents to such an extent that there would be an overly-dominant and disproportionate impact on day-to-day living. Bearing this in mind, it is noted that the nearest properties and caravans fall some distance from the proposed wind turbine:

- 1 & 2 Newlands Farm – 325m to the west
- Wayside – 287m to the north east
- 1 & 2 Intack Bungalows – 250m to the south east
- Meadow View Caravan Park – 275m to the south

Due to intervening vegetation, buildings and/or landform each of the above would be protected from direct views of the proposed wind turbine from windows serving their properties. 1 and 2 Newlands Farm are set down the hill from the proposed site and there are large outbuildings to the rear and side of these residential properties that would screen most, if not all, of the wind turbine. Wayside is situated over 15m lower than the top of the drumlin with the proposed site for the wind turbine being on the opposite side of the peak and set over 10m below the summit. Therefore views of the upper parts of the turbine will be visible from the property though it would not be in the direct line of sight due to the orientation of the property in relation to the turbine's siting. 1 Intack Bungalow has windows in its western gable which would afford views of the wind turbine which would be set up slightly on the hillside in comparison to the height of the property. However, given the height of the wind turbine and the separation distance involved it would not dominate the view from this property. 2 Intack Bungalows is more protected by its attached neighbour (no.1). Lastly, there are some caravans to the northern edge of the caravan site that would face directly towards the wind turbine. However, there is a healthy and well established hedgerow along the access track that would screen

most, if not all, of the views of the turbine from these static holiday caravans.

7.6.2 Shadow Flicker – This is the effect of the sun shining behind the rotating turbine blades and creating an intermittent shadow inside nearby buildings. It only occurs when certain meteorological, seasonal and geographical conditions prevail. The effects only occur 130 degrees either side of north relative to the wind turbine with shadows potentially cast 10 times the rotor diameter (approximately 192 metres from the turbine in this case). The receptors identified in 7.6.1 are all located outside the likely affected area. However, given the topography there could be the potential for a small amount of hours of theoretical shadow flicker per year. Smart systems can effectively ‘shut-down’ turbines during the periods where shadow flicker could be experienced, and again a condition can be included on any grant of planning permission. With the imposition of such a condition, residential amenity relating to shadow flicker can be safeguarded.

7.6.3 Noise – Noise arising from this proposal would be attributed to its construction and its ongoing operation, though it should be noted that the only noise associated with modern wind turbines primarily relates to aerodynamic noise only; any mechanical tones or noise are predominantly eliminated on modern machines. It is not envisaged that either of these activities would result in excessive noise (especially given the background noises generated by the nearby quarries) that would be deemed un-neighbourly. However, a noise assessment should have addressed these issues, with recommendations for mitigating any adverse impacts. Environmental Health initially objected to the application as the noise assessment submitted contained a number of inconsistencies. However, in taking into consideration the height of the turbine and the distances between the turbine and existing dwellings and holiday caravans (as set out in 7.6.1) Environmental Health is satisfied that any consent could be conditioned. The condition in question would require the applicant and/or any other successor in title at the request of the local planning authority, following a noise related complaint made to it, to employ at their expense a consultant approved by the local planning authority to assess the turbine noise levels at the complainant’s property. If the noise levels exceed the levels specified in ETSU-R-97 then the applicant and/or any other successor in title would have to carry out necessary mitigation (again at their own expense) in order to bring noise levels into compliance.

7.7 Impact on Heritage Assets

7.7.1 To the west at a distance of about 0.8km sits Nether Kellet Conservation Area. To the south the Listed building of Dunald Mill Cottage is located at a similar distance, and to the north east the Listed building of Birkland Barrow Farmhouse is situated about 0.9km away. It is considered that the settings of both the Listed properties are contained to the immediate surroundings by historical existing boundaries and the adjacent rising ground between the properties and the turbine site. Together with the intervening distances it is not considered the settings of the heritage assets will be unduly effected. In relation to the Nether Kellet Conservation Area it is considered that the principal setting to the village is the main village street and its immediate surroundings. The land to the east between the turbine site and the Conservation Area is interrupted with existing vegetation and rising landforms. There are about 30 other Listed buildings within 2km of the application site and a further Conservation Area (Over Kellet), but views are distant and their settings are generally interrupted by adjacent rising ground and existing vegetation. Therefore it is considered that the setting of the heritage assets will not be unduly affected.

7.8 Impact on the Highway Network

7.8.1 The Highway Authority has made comment on the application, concluding that there is no highway objection to the proposal though they do seek the imposition of a condition requiring the developer to submit a Construction Traffic Management Method Statement (CTMMS) prior to works commencing. Upon completion, it is considered likely that there will be a negligible traffic impact associated with the development proposal. However, during the site’s period of construction and decommissioning the delivery or removal of components and lifting equipment to and from site are likely to have an impact on vehicle movements over the surrounding public highway network. Being in an area primarily characterised by quarries, farmland and caravan parks the local road network is already utilised by large vehicles and towed trailers, and therefore there is evidence that the road network is capable of dealing with such traffic. However, the abnormal loads associated with the development make the request for the CTMMS an acceptable one. Once on site, the vehicles and equipment will need to be transported across one and half field lengths. The application advises that no formal access is required, but the fields are soft underfoot and some form of track from the field gate off the

main access to Intack Farm and Meadow View Caravan Park will be required. Details of this will need to be provided prior to its construction.

7.9 Other Matters

- 7.9.1 Objections raised by the local residents/businesses raised some other issues, including impacts on human health and horse welfare (there is no evidence that wind turbines adversely affect either), impacts on property values (not a planning consideration) and impacts on tourism (again there is no evidence that wind turbines have a socio-economic adverse effect). Power lines and gas pipelines are also referred to, but the site of the proposed wind turbine falls outside of such routes, including the “buffer zones” that run either side of their alignments that would trigger the need to consult with the relevant infrastructure provider.

8.0 Planning Obligations

- 8.1 There are no planning obligations to consider as part of this application.

9.0 Conclusions

- 9.1 The proposal will generate renewable energy, which is in accordance with national and local planning objectives. The NPPF states that applications for renewable energy schemes should be approved if its impacts are or can be made acceptable. As set out above, the proposal is not considered to have a significant impact on the character or appearance of the landscape, the nearest Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, residential amenity, ecology or nearby heritage assets. It meets the requirements of national and local planning policies, and whilst the content of the NPPG is noted, it holds little weight in the determination of this application. Furthermore, the issues raised by the local community have been fully assessed against the policy requirements and deemed to be acceptable. Therefore despite changes to the NPPG during the determination period, the application is still recommended for approval subject to controls required by conditions.

Recommendation

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

1. Standard 3 year timescale
2. Development in accordance with approved plans
3. Material, colour and finish of wind turbine and control box (including no lighting, logos or advertisements)
4. Construction Traffic Management Method Statement
5. Details of access track
6. Shadow flicker controls
7. Noise controls
8. Wind turbine and associated infrastructure to cease use and be removed from the site entirely within 25 years of the date of it first producing electricity, or within 3 months following a period of 12 months of it not producing electricity
9. Decommissioning and restoration of land
10. No micro-siting unless otherwise agreed in writing with the local planning authority
11. Hours of construction
12. Cabling underground
13. No tree or shrub planting within 50m of the wind turbine

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

In accordance with the above legislation, the City Council can confirm the following:

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

Human Rights Act

This recommendation has been reached after consideration of the provisions of The Human Rights Act. Unless otherwise stated in this report, the issues arising do not appear to be of such magnitude to override the responsibility of the City Council to regulate land use for the benefit of the community as a whole, in accordance with national law.

Background Papers

None.

Agenda Item A6	Committee Date 24 August 2015	Application Number 15/00624/FUL
Application Site Land At Mossgate Park Mossgate Park Heysham Lancashire		Proposal Erection of 15 dwellings (Class C3) and associated access
Name of Applicant Mr James Carman		Name of Agent
Decision Target Date 1 September 2015		Reason For Delay N/A
Case Officer	Mr Andrew Drummond	
Departure	No	
Summary of Recommendation	Refusal	

1.0 The Site and its Surroundings

- 1.1 Mossgate Park is located at the south east corner of Heysham, covering an area of approximately 45 hectares. This application relates to one phase of this larger (predominantly) residential development. The site is situated on land to the west of the spine road, to the east of Silverdale Avenue and north east of the all-weather pitch. The surrounding land to the south and south east of the application site has recently been developed with some areas being retained as semi-natural open space.
- 1.2 The 0.35 hectare application site is currently undeveloped. It is generally a level site, left uncultivated so had a semi-natural covering of vegetation before it was utilised as a site compound for the wider development site.
- 1.3 The site is undesignated in the Lancaster District Local Plan.

2.0 The Proposal

- 2.1 The application seeks planning permission for 15 dwellings, of which none would be affordable. The detached properties are 2 storey and 2.5 storeys in height and with the semi-detached town houses extending to 3 storey. In terms of size there would be 7 3-bed houses and 8 4-bed houses. Materials such as those used on other phases of Miller Homes' development within Heysham Mossgate are proposed, which include concrete tile roofs, brick walls, white uPVC framed windows and doors, and close boarded timber fencing for the rear gardens.
- 2.2 Access would be gained from the spine road to the east. Properties would be slightly set back from the spine road by 3 to 5 metres. It has been laid out in this manner to provide a built, active frontage to the spine road and to continue to the soft, grassed landscaping that is characterised within the development to the south and east.

3.0 Site History

- 3.1 The following applications, albeit now lapsed (with the exception of the 2006 Reserved Matters

consent), have previously related to the wider Heysham Mossgate development, including this site.

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
93/01139/OUT	Outline application for residential development of 45 hectares including sports complex, pub and shops	Approved
01/01295/OUT	Renewal of outline consent for a further three years until 31 January 2005	Approved by the Secretary of State in 2005
06/01000/REM	Reserved Matters Application for the erection of 395 dwellings including associated infrastructure and public open space	Approved

4.0 Consultation Responses

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

Consultee	Response
County Highways	Objection on parking grounds. Also concerns relating to surface water drainage.
Local Lead Flood Authority	Insufficient information submitted as part of the application to assess surface water drainage.
Environmental Health	No objection subject to conditions relating to dust control, hours of construction (Mon to Fri 0800-1800 and Sat 0800-1400 only) and contaminated land.
United Utilities	No objection subject to conditions relating to foul and surface water drainage, the latter based on sustainable drainage principles with evidence of an assessment of the site conditions.
Fire & Rescue	It should be ensured that the scheme fully meets all the requirements of part B5 of the Building Regulations.
Police	Strongly recommend that the whole development is built to Secured by Design standard.
County Education	Seek a contribution of £72,178 towards 6 primary school places.

5.0 Neighbour Representations

5.1 One objection has been received raising the following reasons:

- Risk of flooding (as experienced from earlier development in area)
- Inappropriate design
- Loss of daylight
- Overbearing of dominant development

6.0 Principal National and Development Plan Policies

6.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

The National Planning Policy Framework indicates that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development (**paragraph 14**). The following paragraphs of the NPPF are relevant to the determination of this proposal:

Paragraph **17** - 12 core land-use planning principles including a good standard of amenity for all
 Paragraph **49 and 50** - housing
 Paragraphs **56, 58 and 60** - design

6.2 Development Management DPD

Policy **DM35** Key design principles
 Policy **DM39** Surface Water Run-Off and Sustainable Drainage
 Policy **DM41** New residential dwellings
 Policy **DM48** Community Infrastructure

6.3 Lancaster District Core Strategy

Policy **SC1** Sustainable Development
Policy **SC2** Urban Concentration
Policy **SC4** Meeting the District's Housing Requirements
Policy **SC5** Achieving Quality in Design

6.4 Other Policy Documents

Meeting Housing Needs Supplementary Planning Document

7.0 Comment and Analysis

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

- The principle of residential development of this site;
- The design and layout of the development;
- The amenity of existing and prospective residents;
- The drainage of the site and risk of localised flooding; and,
- The level of parking provision.

7.2 The principle of residential development of this site

7.2.1 The principle of residential development on this site has been long established. The proposal seeks to replace a consented 20 residential unit scheme (4 1-bed and 6 2-bed flats, and 10 4-bed houses) with a 15 unit scheme (7 3-bed and 8 4-bed houses).

7.2.2 Under the 2006 consent affordable housing for this phase was to be delivered as part of the wider site on earlier phases. This was set at 20%. Therefore the requirement would have been 4 units. The proposed scheme, which is being applied for by way of a stand-alone application and therefore needs to be assessed in line with current policy, would require a contribution of 40% as it is a greenfield site. This equates to 6 units. Furthermore, the mix of units now proposed is all family sized houses. No information has been submitted to satisfy the Council's affordable housing policies. In fact the affordable housing statement submitted refers to obsolete policies. If no affordable housing is being offered then the onus is on the applicant to demonstrate their position by way of a viability assessment. It would be appropriate and acceptable to include the cost of the 20% provision across the wider site as it relates to this application site, but this should only form one part of the appraisal. Current house values and current build costs based on the proposed mix of houses, and the land price (as it was at the time of purchasing) will be amongst other factors. As submitted though the proposal fails to meet the Council's adopted policy on delivering affordable housing.

7.3 The design and layout of the development

7.3.1 Both the consented scheme and the proposed one seek to develop a horseshoe arrangement of dwellings centred on the access and estate road. It is a relatively weak arrangement as it relates poorly to its surroundings, especially given that there is undeveloped land immediately to the north and south of the site that could be brought forward for development and resulted in a more comprehensive scheme. However, as with much of this proposal, it relates back to the 2006 consent, which is a material consideration in the determination of this application. The design and materials of the proposed dwellings would reflect the earlier phases of Miller Homes' development at Mossgate, which in principle is acceptable, though disappointingly there are no plans submitted with the application of 2 of the house types proposed on the site plan. These have not been provided despite the requests to the applicant.

7.3.2 The development appears to be designed around the car with driveways being the dominant feature on the streetscene. Whilst the consented scheme proposed 2 reasonable sized parking courts that were concealed in the rear corners of the site, the "tightness" of the horseshoe arrangement actually achieved a worse design solution as the properties that were afforded driveways were closer together meaning that parking very much dominated the "courtyard" within the buildings' horseshoe.

The proposal opens up the horseshoe resulting in more space between the driveways to allow for some limited soft landscaping, with the exception of plots 10 to 13.

7.4 The amenity of existing and prospective residents

7.4.1 It would appear (given the lack of plans to confirm) that 3 storey properties are proposed close to the rear boundaries of nos. 8-16 Silverdale Avenue, but the consented scheme had a similar arrangement which also affected No.6. The separation distances between the proposed 3 storey units and the existing dwellings on Silverdale Avenue remain very similar to those previously approved. Of greater concern is plot 2 that proposes a 2 storey dwelling 4m from the rear boundary of no.20 Silverdale Avenue. The first floor windows of the proposed property on plot 2 serve habitable rooms so the glazing would need to be transparent, giving rise to direct overlooking of the private amenity space of No.20. This is an unacceptable relationship. Whilst other overlooking issues would arise from the proposal, especially from the 3 storey units, given the principles established by way of the previous consent it would be difficult to sustain a reason for refusal in terms of those plots (4-9). Plot 2, however, would bring about a new issue, one which is significant enough to result in a negative recommendation. For completeness Plot 3 does not appear (again given the lack of plans to confirm) to have any first floor windows (that need to be transparent) that face towards the rear, though it does appear to have a side facing window that would have a direct view of the blank gable of plot 2 at a distance of 4m. This falls significantly below the required 12m separation distance of habitable window to blank gable, and as such has an insufficient outlook.

7.5 The drainage of the site and risk of localised flooding

A small part of the site is identified as being within a surface water flooding area. The one objection received from neighbouring residents reflects this in their comments, and surface water flooding is known to occur in the wider area. The issue of surface water drainage was raised by Officers with the applicant at a pre-application stage, yet insufficient information has been submitted as identified by the Local Lead Flood Authority. It can only be concluded that the scheme as proposed does not adequately deal with surface water un-off and could therefore increase the risk of on and off site flooding.

7.6 The Level of Parking Provision

The Highway Authority has raised an objection on the basis that a lack of parking provision within the development could result in overflow parking occurring on the spine road. Whilst highway efficiency and safety is a key material consideration, this proposal seeks to provide 32 parking spaces for 15 houses. The Council's parking standards would require a maximum of 38. Furthermore the approved scheme has 30 spaces for 20 dwellings, which based on the size of the units permitted would have a maximum parking requirement of 46 spaces in line with the Council's adopted policy. Therefore whilst the proposal does not meet the full maximum level of parking, it would be very difficult to sustain a reason for refusal given that the approved scheme provides for significantly less parking, the policy sets out maximum not minimum standards, and the level proposed still provides for at least 2 spaces per dwelling.

7.7 Other Matters

County Education has requested a sum of £72,178 towards 6 primary school places, but it is not clear from the submission if the development proposal could finance such a request. As with the comments above on affordable housing, the developer should have submitted a robust justification if seeking to avoid any planning obligations, but in the absence of such information it can only be assumed that as no affordable housing is to be provided that no contribution towards education would be offered either to the detriment of local services that would be placed under pressure by additional family housing.

8.0 Planning Obligations

8.1 There are no planning obligations to consider as part of this application as the application is recommended for refusal.

9.0 Conclusions

- 9.1 The submission is a poor one. There was a lack of sufficient plans, information and documentation, despite pre-application advice being provided. The proposal - whilst following many of the principles of the 2006 consent - raises new concerns that the current submission either does not address at all, or does not adequately address.

Recommendation

That Planning Permission **BE REFUSED** for the following reasons:

1. The proximity of the proposed dwelling house on Plot 2, and in particular its first floor windows that serve habitable rooms, with the rear boundary of 20 Silverdale Avenue gives rise to an unacceptable level of overlooking into the rear private amenity space of no.20. It would also appear that Plot 3 has a bedroom window facing onto a blank gable wall at a distance of only 4m, so resulting in an unacceptable level of outlook. The loss of privacy and inadequate outlook are contrary to policy DM35 of the Development Management DPD and paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The submission is a standalone full application to be assessed against current planning policy. Therefore it should include a robust justification if it proposes not to provide any affordable housing in line with the Council's policy, but the application fails to do so. Likewise due to the lack of adequate information it is not clear if other planning obligations could be sustained by the proposal to secure essential community facilities, such as primary school places for the future residents of the development. The application is therefore contrary to policies DM41 and DM48 of the Development Management DPD and paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework
3. The application as submitted lacks sufficient information on surface water drainage despite this being raised with the applicant at pre-application stage, and being raised during the determination period. In the absence of sufficient drainage information to assess the impacts of surface water runoff it can only be concluded that the development could increase the risk of on and off site flooding, which is contrary to policies DM39 of the Development Management DPD.

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

In accordance with the above legislation, the City Council can confirm the following:

Lancaster City Council takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals, in the interests of delivering sustainable development. As part of this approach the Council offers a pre-application service, aimed at positively influencing development proposals. Whilst the applicant has taken advantage of this service prior to submission, the resulting proposal is unacceptable for the reasons prescribed in the Notice. The applicant is encouraged to liaise with the Case Officer in an attempt to resolve the reasons for refusal.

Human Rights Act

This recommendation has been reached after consideration of the provisions of The Human Rights Act. Unless otherwise stated in this report, the issues arising do not appear to be of such magnitude to override the responsibility of the City Council to regulate land use for the benefit of the community as a whole, in accordance with national law.

Background Papers

None

Agenda Item A7	Committee Date 24 August 2015	Application Number 15/00714/OUT
Application Site Land At Bowerham Lane Lancaster Lancashire	Proposal Outline application for the erection of 20 dwellings	
Name of Applicant Messrs Huddleston	Name of Agent Mr Avnish Panchal	
Decision Target Date 21 September 2015	Reason For Delay	
Case Officer	Mr Philip Megson	
Departure	Yes – in respect of Key Urban Landscape	
Summary of Recommendation	Approval subject to conditions	

1.0 The Site and its Surroundings

1.1 The site is a greenfield wedge bounded by Hala Carr Farm to the north, the M6 motorway to the east and Bowerham Lane to the west. The site area is 0.52 hectares. The site slopes from the east (M6 boundary) to west (Bowerham Lane) and is more pronounced towards the west. The site consists of coarse grassland which has been colonised around the edges by blackthorn, gorse, bramble and bracken. There is an existing belt of trees punctuated by an access gate on the boundary to Bowerham Lane. These trees screen the site from existing 2 storey residential properties fronting the western side of Bowerham Lane. There are also existing hedgerows on the boundary to Hala Carr Farm and part of the boundary with the M6 motorway. An existing water trunk main enters the site from under the M6 (at a point opposite the junction of Bowerham Lane and Sandown Road) and exits the site to the south of Hala Carr Farm.

2.0 The Proposal

2.1 The outline proposal is for the erection of 20 dwellings. All matters are reserved, including layout and landscaping though indicative proposals have been submitted with the application.

3.0 Site History

3.1 An outline planning application for residential development comprising 20 market houses (10 2-bedroom and 10 3-bedroom dwellings) was submitted by the applicant in September 2014 (14/00960/OUT). The application was withdrawn in February 2015 due to an absence of detail on the line and depth of the trunk main and other issues arising from the consultation responses.

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
14/00960/OUT	Outline planning application for residential development	Withdrawn
1/89/0118	Outline planning application for residential development	Rejected on appeal

4.0 Consultation Responses

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

Consultee	Response
Natural England	Statutory nature conservation sites – no objection Protected species – apply Natural England’s Standing Advice to the application.
Highways England	Any grant of consent should be conditioned to ensure that the safety and integrity of the M6 motorway is maintained; and ensure that safe access for maintenance of the motorway boundary fence and landscape planting is preserved.
County Highways	No objections in principle. Have material concerns relating to pedestrian/vehicular access arrangements; the route of substantial water mains apparatus; method of surface water discharge; and implementation of a range of off-site highway improvement works. To address these concerns there should be full compliance with the adopted car parking standards 2011–2026; full regard to the water trunk main easement regulations; liaison with the County Council’s flood risk management organisation regarding appropriate methods of surface water discharge; and a requirement for the developer to provide a transport contribution towards the implementation of a range of transport improvement measures (pedestrian footway, pedestrian refuge in the vicinity of Bowerham Lane and Sandown Avenue, relocated street lighting and upgraded bus stop) considered necessary, reasonable and directly related in scale and kind such that the consequences of pedestrian / vehicular movements through construction of the development on the surrounding highway network could be suitably mitigated.
Lancashire County Council Planning & Development	LCC Education Team have not requested a planning contribution.
Environmental Health	The proposed development warrants specific planning controls relating to noise, dust control, contaminated land and bunding of tanks to prevent adverse impacts.
Planning & Housing Policy Team	The resubmission fails to recognise the Key Urban Landscape designation. Development in Key Urban Landscapes would not ordinarily be supported unless it can be shown that the application would preserve the open nature of the area and character and appearance of its surroundings and where the balance of considerations may lead to its support. The Council’s lack of a five year housing supply is of course one such consideration which could lead to the favourable consideration of this application. Significant consideration should also be given to the criteria of Policy DM35 ‘Key design principles’ and the extent to which this application is compatible with these criteria especially in relation to residential amenity and noise and air quality issues.
Tree Protection Officer	The development includes proposals to remove in part hedgerows on Bowerham Lane frontage and wholly within site. Mitigation in the medium to long term with replacement planting. Extensive new planting would be beneficial along the eastern and southern aspect to provide essential noise abatement, greening and visual screening between the site and the M6 motorway to the east. All other on and off site trees are to be retained and protected.
United Utilities	A large diameter trunk main runs straight through the proposed site. UU require 24 hour access for operating and maintaining it and will not permit development in close proximity to the main. This main requires an easement of 6 metres. The developer should consider drainage options in the following order of priority: a) an adequate soak away or some other adequate infiltration system; b) a watercourse; or c) a sewer (approval must be obtained from United Utilities).
Lancaster Civic Society	Concerns expressed about the density of the proposed development; no information relating to design of the individual units; noise and traffic implications arising from the proposed development.

5.0 Neighbour Representations

5.1 At the time of writing a total of 20 representations have been received from neighbouring residents.

All the representations raise objection to the proposed development. The main grounds for objection include:-

- Loss of greenfield site/priority should be given to brownfield sites.
- Loss of amenity.
- Increase in noise.
- Increase in traffic, impact on road safety, parking issues and traffic headlight issues relative to existing residential properties on Bowerham Lane due to elevation of site.
- Overlooking of existing residential properties (due to slope).
- Adverse impact on wildlife.
- Destruction of hedgerows.
- Increased risk of flooding through run-off.
- Proximity to the motorway creating amenity and health issues for occupants of the development.
- Water trunk main 10 metres easement.

6.0 Principal National and Development Plan Policies

- 6.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF):
Paragraphs 7, 14 and 17 – Sustainable Development and Core Principles
Paragraphs 32 - Access and Transport
Paragraphs 49 and 50 - Delivering Housing
Paragraphs 56, 58 and 60 – Requiring Good Design

Saved Policies of the Lancaster District Local Plan

E27 - Woodland Opportunity Areas
E31 - Key Urban Landscape

Core Strategy

SC1 - Sustainable Development
SC2 - Urban Concentration
SC4 - Meeting the District's Housing Requirements

Development Management DPD

DM28 - Development and Landscape Impact
DM29 - Protection of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland
DM35 - Key Design Principles
DM36 - Sustainable Design
DM37 - Air Quality Management and Pollution
DM41 - New Residential Dwellings

Other relevant material considerations

Draft Local Plan For Lancaster District 2011 – 2026
2015 Housing Land Supply Statement (July 2015)

7.0 Comment and Analysis

- 7.1 The key material considerations arising from this application are:
- Previous application / appeal decision
 - Principle of development / housing supply
 - Highway Safety
 - Trunk Water Main
 - Surface Water Run-off
 - Residential Amenity
 - Landscape and Biodiversity Impact

7.2 Previous Application / Appeal Decision

- 7.2.1 An appeal against the refusal of outline planning permission for residential development of 50–60 detached houses of 3 and 4 bedrooms in a mix of housing types on land adjacent to Hala Carr Farm, Bowerham Lane was held in January 1990. The Inspector considered the principal issue related to the effect of the proposed residential development on the character and appearance of this area of open land lying between Bowerham Lane and the motorway. The Inspector considered the appeal in the context of the then Lancaster Local Plan adopted in January 1989: the site was in an Area of Special Landscape (Policy 4), which will normally be conserved and land will not normally be taken for development (Policy 5). As the site is on the fringe of the built up area, it was also identified as a Priority Planting Area for trees (Policy 10). The Inspector reached the *“firm conclusion that the principle of residential development on this open site would be wholly unacceptable”*. In the Inspector’s judgement *“the steeply sloping site forms a critically important visual break between the urban area and the attractive countryside to the east to which it is physically linked by both road and footbridges across the motorway. However well designed the residential scheme may be, in my opinion development on this elevated and locally prominent site would be an unduly intrusive extension of the built-up area which would unacceptably dominate the neighbouring residential properties.”*
- 7.2.2 Whilst Policies 4, 5 and 10 of the 1989 Local Plan have been superseded and carry no material weight in the consideration of this application, the themes of protecting the site from development and tree planting were carried forward into the Lancaster Local Plan (adopted in 2004 and reviewed in 2008). Saved Policy E27 identifies the Lancaster Eastern M6 corridor as a Woodland Opportunity Area and saved Policy E31 identifies Key Urban Landscaping Areas, including the application site, where development would only be permitted if it preserves the open nature of the area and the character and appearance of its surroundings (see section 7.8 below).
- 7.3 Principle of Development / Housing Supply
- 7.3.1 The site lies on the edge of Lancaster with existing residential development on the western and northern boundaries of the site. The M6 forms the eastern boundary of the site. The site is identified as Key Urban Landscape and Woodland Opportunity Area in the saved policies of the Lancaster District Local Plan.
- 7.3.2 In terms of general housing need, the 2015 Housing Land Supply Statement (July 2015) sets out that only 3.3 years of housing supply can be demonstrated, with a persistent undersupply of housing over the last 11 years. As such, a 5 year supply of housing land cannot currently be demonstrated. Paragraph 49 of the NPPF sets out that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development and relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up to date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing sites. Development on the edge of Lancaster is considered to be sustainably located and as such would provide an important contribution towards housing supply in the District in a location that can be supported in principle.
- 7.3.3 The application proposes 8 affordable houses. This complies with the target of up to 40% affordable housing on greenfield sites set by Policy DM41 of the DM DPD.
- 7.4 Highway Safety
- 7.4.1 County Highways’ concerns are documented in Paragraph 4.1.
- 7.4.2 Access by residents of the proposed development to an immediate range of public services (community shops, post office, doctor’s surgery, bank, petrol station, limited public transport services) and in particular an area of significant employment, is likely to be highly reliant on the use of private vehicles and to a lesser extent availability of appropriate public transport services. It is essential that development on the site complies in their entirety with Lancaster City Council car parking standards (2011–2026) namely: the provision of two off-street spaces for 2/3 bedroom properties and three off-street spaces for 4 and more bedroom properties. For an external forecourt parking area to be considered a useable parking space its maximum dimensions should be 2.5 x 5.0 metres while minimum covered parking facility guidelines stipulate 3m x 6m there-by allowing for secure cycle storage as well as sufficient space for the parking of an average sized vehicle.

- 7.4.3 The water trunk main is subject to a 10 metres easement restricting substantial construction activities within a specific distance of such. The applicant will need to demonstrate that the parking requirements could be accommodated in full (see section 7.5 below).
- 7.4.4 There is a presumption that a development of this scale will lead to an increased frequency of pedestrian/vehicular movements along Bowerham Lane and to a lesser extent Sandown Road and Hala Hill to access public transport services. The construction of a pedestrian refuge on Bowerham Lane would assist in the creation of a safe walking route to such. Situated in the immediate vicinity of the site and Sandown Road, it would also serve as a protective feature for right turning vehicles from Bowerham Lane onto Sandown Road. Using methodology outlined in Lancashire County Council's *Planning Obligations Policy Document*, there would be a requirement for the developer to provide a transport contribution towards the implementation of a range of transport improvement measures considered necessary, reasonable and directly related in scale and kind such that the consequences of pedestrian/vehicular movements on the surrounding highway network could be suitably mitigated. As a condition of this outline application, County Highways considers it essential that funds are sought to implement certain specific off-site transport related improvement works as a means of mitigating the consequences of pedestrian/vehicular movements over the surrounding public highway network namely:
- Setting back of boundary hedging along the site's frontage with Bowerham Lane sufficient to allow for the construction of a 2 metre-wide length of pedestrian footway subject of a dedication agreement with the Highway Authority under the provision of Section 38 of the Highways Act 1980. Such would formalise driver forward visibility requirements while aiding pedestrian access along the public highway;
 - Relocation of existing street lighting equipment and upgrade where appropriate – such is particularly relevant along the sites frontage and in the vicinity of Bowerham Lane/Hala Hill/Sandown Road junctions;
 - Upgrade of bus stop (Bentham Rd/Hala Hill) to Lancashire County Council's quality bus stop standard; and,
 - Construction of a pedestrian refuge facility on Bowerham Lane in the vicinity of its junction with Sandown Road. Such would also serve as a protective feature for right turning vehicles onto the same.
- 7.4.5 The range of off-site highway improvement works outlined above are considered essential to make the application acceptable in highway terms. Without their inclusion in any prospective consent there is the potential for the consequences of a development of this nature to adversely affect the operation of surrounding lengths of the public highway network increasing the likelihood of risk to all of its users.
- 7.4.6 Highways England has concerns regarding the boundary interface between the development site and the motorway. The site in question lies adjacent to the western boundary of the M6 motorway. The development will have no traffic impact upon the Strategic Route Network. However, given the proximity of the development site to the motorway, Highways England formally recommends that conditions should be applied to any grant of planning consent to ensure that the safety and integrity of the M6 motorway is maintained; and ensure that safe access for maintenance of the motorway boundary fence and landscape planting is preserved.
- 7.4.7 It is considered that issues relating to Highway Safety and related matters can be addressed by the use of planning conditions.

7.5 Water Trunk Main

- 7.5.1 A large diameter trunk main runs straight through the proposed site. United Utilities requires 24 hour access for operating and maintaining the main. United Utilities will not permit development in close proximity to the main, which itself requires an easement of 6 metres (the applicant must comply with United Utilities standard conditions for work carried out on, or when crossing easements). The Applicant has submitted sections which show the relationship of the proposed dwellings to the main. The sections show that the proposed development can be accommodated on the site while maintaining the easement and, for the avoidance of doubt, the indicative layout shows that there would be no built development within the easement.

7.6 Surface Water Run-off

- 7.6.1 In accordance with the NPPF and Building Regulations, the site should be drained on a separate system with foul water draining to the public sewer and surface water draining in the most sustainable way. A hierarchy must be investigated by the developer when considering a surface water drainage strategy, based on the following order of priority:
- a) an adequate soak away or some other adequate infiltration system, (approval must be obtained from local authority/building control/Environment Agency); or, where that is not reasonably practical
 - b) a watercourse (approval must be obtained from the riparian owner/land drainage authority/Environment Agency); or, where that is not reasonably practicable
 - c) a sewer (approval must be obtained from United Utilities).
- 7.6.2 United Utilities has no objection to the proposal subject to a condition requiring a scheme for the disposal of foul and surface waters to be submitted to and approved prior to the commencement of development.

7.7 Residential Amenity

- 7.7.1 Policies DM35 'Key Design Principles', Policy DM36 'Sustainable Design' and Policy DM41 'New Residential Development' of the Development Management DPD are all relevant. These policies seek to ensure that development is as sustainable as possible and that new development makes a positive contribution to the surrounding landscape and townscape of the area. Criteria relating to the protection of residential amenity and minimisation of noise and air quality impacts are relevant to this application given its proximity to the M6 motorway.
- 7.7.2 In respect of noise, the Environmental Health Officer considers that the submitted Acoustic Survey and Assessment (dated October 2014) demonstrates that the internal design criteria specified within BS 8233:2014 can be met through the use of upgraded glazing units and provision of a passive ventilation system. Guideline noise values for external amenity areas adopted by BS8233:2014 and recommended World Health Organisation Guidelines for Community Noise 1999 can be met with provision of acoustic fencing. These requirements are to be secured by condition.
- 7.7.3 Dust emissions during construction and the need, if necessary, to remediate contaminated land or prevent the contamination or pollution of land are also to be secured by condition.
- 7.7.4 The layout shows that the garden to each house is located at the rear of the property. As forecourt parking is situated at the front of each house, the issue of overlooking of neighbouring houses from garden areas is not considered to be an issue on this particular scheme.
- 7.7.5 It is accepted that the proposal will alter the character of the locality, a point that has been emphasised by some of the residents who have opposed the application. However, even at this outline planning stage where the plans are indicative, there is scope for a scheme that is acceptable in terms of design and landscaping which can soften the appearance of the dwellings. Coupled with the proposed woodland/ecological buffer (see section 7.8 below, and particularly paragraph 7.8.5 overleaf), there is potential for this relatively modest form of development to bring some visual benefits to the locality. Given this, there is considered to be no grounds for resisting the development in terms of visual amenity.
- 7.7.6 Some of the correspondence received has also highlighted potential for negative impacts such as overlooking or overshadowing. Given that Bowerham Lane would separate the new dwellings from existing properties, and that the proposed properties are (indicatively) set back from Bowerham Lane to incorporate an area of front garden, Officers do not share these concerns.

7.8 Landscape and Biodiversity Impact

- 7.8.1 The site is located on the edge of Lancaster within land currently allocated as Key Urban Landscape and a Woodland Opportunity Area on the Local Plan Proposals Map. Both designations remain relevant and important considerations for the determination of this application.

- 7.8.2 Development Management DPD Policy DM28 'Development and Landscape Impact' states the continued appropriateness of this designation was reviewed by the Council via its 'Review of Key Urban Landscape Allocations in Lancaster District' Study (Woolerton Dodwell, 2012). The study concluded that Key Urban Landscapes continued to perform an important role in defining the character of the District. Individual assessments were undertaken for each of the identified Key Urban Landscapes in the District. In relation to this particular site the study recognised that this area of the District forms a green buffer between the M6 and residential properties on the eastern fringes of Lancaster.
- 7.8.3 Policy E27 'Woodland Opportunity Areas' of the adopted Lancaster District Local Plan remains relevant. This states that within identified areas the Council will seek to establish new areas of woodland allowing where practical for public access and the protection and enhancement of nature conservation interests. It goes on to state that development which would prejudice the establishment of new woodland areas will not be permitted. This policy is supplemented by Policy DM29 'Protection of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodlands' in the Development Management DPD which gives further support to the protection of trees and hedgerows and encourages additional planting.
- 7.8.4 Therefore the proposal is allocated on land currently identified for protection from development. It is recognised that development may be possible within these allocations where it can be shown to preserve the openness of the area and the character and appearance of its surroundings and, in the case of woodland opportunity areas, it would not prejudice the establishment of new woodlands.
- 7.8.5 The application seeks to identify a new native woodland area along the M6 which whilst not open to the public would serve to enhance nature conservation interests and add to wider ecological corridors in this area of the District. Given the site's proximity to the M6 a woodland management plan would be a good opportunity through its selection of tree species to contribute to improving the local air quality, provide a visual screen between the motorway and the proposed development and demonstrate expected net gains in biodiversity across the site. This resubmission application includes:
- a buffer zone 2 metres wide adjacent to the motorway boundary fence in which there would be no planting or obstruction of the surface of the site so as to establish a buffer zone for maintenance, as shown in drawing reference GA1889-SP-02 provided by the applicant;
 - a 2 metres wide strip from Bowerham Road in which there would be no planting or obstruction of the surface of the site to give access to the buffer zone referred to above; and
 - a 2 metres wide strip along the Bowerham Road frontage to allow the construction of the pedestrian footway along the frontage with Bowerham Lane.

A detailed landscape scheme would be required with an associated 10 year maintenance regime.

- 7.8.6 While the footprint of the proposed development would reduce the area of the 'Woodland Opportunity Area' it is considered that it will facilitate, not prejudice, the creation of a new woodland, with associated benefits for wildlife when compared to the current status of the land.

8.0 Planning Obligations

- 8.1 The applicant has offered 40% provision of on-site affordable housing provision. This is in line with the Council's Policy DM41, subject to a 50:50 split between intermediate housing and social rent. A legal agreement must be entered into to secure its provision.

9.0 Conclusions

- 9.1 The previous appeal decision relates to a larger development (50 – 60 dwellings) compared to up to 20 dwellings under the current planning application. The appeal was considered in the context of local plan policies that have been superseded, which carry no material weight in the consideration of this application.
- 9.2 Concerns about the proposed pedestrian/vehicular access arrangements; the route of water trunk main; the method of surface water discharge; and implementation of a range of off-site highway improvement works can be addressed by planning conditions and the provision of specific off-site transport-related improvement works.

- 9.3 Given the proximity of the site to the M6 motorway, noise minimisation and air quality impacts to protect the amenity of the future occupants of the proposed houses can be addressed by measures secured by condition. Dust emissions during construction and the need, if necessary, to remediate contaminated land or prevent the contamination or pollution of land can also to be secured by condition.
- 9.4 The indicative layout shows that the garden to each house is located at the rear of the property. As forecourt parking is situated at the front of each house overlooking neighbouring houses from garden areas is not considered to be an issue.
- 9.5 The proposal development, which is in a location identified as a woodland opportunity area, includes a new native woodland area along the M6. The woodland, while not open to the public, would serve to enhance nature conservation interests and add to wider ecological corridors in this area of the District. Given the site's proximity to the M6, woodland contribute to improving the local air quality and provide a visual screen between the motorway and the proposed development.
- 9.6 Subject to the proposed conditions referred to in the report, outline permission can be granted.

Recommendation

That Outline Planning Permission **BE GRANTED** subject to a legal agreement requiring 40% provision of affordable housing (50:50 split between intermediate housing and social rent) and the following conditions:

1. Outline planning permission – all matters reserved.
2. Pedestrian footway along the site's frontage with Bowerham Lane.
3. Visibility splay
4. Off-site highways improvement works (upgraded bus stop, street lighting, pedestrian refuge)
5. Submission and approval of a construction method statement prior to development (including wheel-washing facilities)
6. No development or planting adjacent to the M6 motorway embankment
7. Mitigation of noise from the motorway for the benefit of those occupying the proposed dwellings
8. Submission and approval of a scheme for foul and surface water drainage prior to development
9. Removal, containment or otherwise of any contaminants
10. Controls over any import of soils to avoid introduction of contaminants
11. Containment of spillage from tanks during construction
12. Details of hard and soft landscaping
13. Submission of Arboricultural Method Statement and 10 year (minimum) Landscape Management Plan
14. Removal of permitted development rights (hardstandings and vehicular access – i.e. to prevent loss of proposed front garden to hard surfaces)

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

In accordance with the above legislation, the City Council can confirm that, for the reasons stated in the report, this proposal departs from policies within the Development Plan. However, taking into account the other material considerations which are presented in full in the report, it considered that on this occasion these outweigh the provisions of the Development Plan, and in this case the proposal can be considered favourably.

In reaching this recommendation the local planning authority and the applicant have positively and proactively addressed the issues to enable permission to be granted subject to conditions.

Human Rights Act

This recommendation has been reached after consideration of the provisions of The Human Rights Act. Unless otherwise stated in this report, the issues arising do not appear to be of such magnitude to override the responsibility of the City Council to regulate land use for the benefit of the community as a whole, in accordance with national law.

Background Papers

None

<p>Agenda Item</p> <p>A8</p>	<p>Committee Date</p> <p>24 August 2015</p>	<p>Application Number</p> <p>15/00297/CU</p>
<p>Application Site</p> <p>Land Adjacent To Chipping House Chipping Lane Bay Horse</p>	<p>Proposal</p> <p>Retrospective application for change of use of agricultural land for the siting of mobile home for domestic use with domestic curtilage and associated landscaping</p>	
<p>Name of Applicant</p> <p>Mr Ben Morris</p>	<p>Name of Agent</p> <p>Mrs Melanie Lawrenson</p>	
<p>Decision Target Date</p> <p>27 May 2015</p>	<p>Reason For Delay</p> <p>Officer workload</p>	
<p>Case Officer</p>	<p>Mrs Eleanor Fawcett</p>	
<p>Departure</p>	<p>No</p>	
<p>Summary of Recommendation</p>	<p>Refusal</p>	

(i) Procedural Matters

This form of development would normally be dealt with under the Scheme of Delegation. However, a request has been made by Councillor Helen Helme for the application to be reported to the Planning Committee. The reason for the request relates to the need for the applicants to live in this location given the proximity to their place of work and the village of Dolphinholme which is identified as being suitable for further housing development.

1.0 The Site and its Surroundings

1.1 This application relates to an area of land located off Chipping Lane towards the southern end of the District, approximately 3 kilometres to the south east of Galgate and 1 kilometre to the west of Dolphinholme. It is situated to the rear of a residential dwelling, Chipping Road Barn, the majority of which was converted from a former barn. There is an agricultural contractor's business operating from this adjacent domestic property and includes a large detached building adjacent to the application site. The site and this business are both accessed via a track which runs adjacent to the south eastern boundary. It also serves another domestic property, Chipping House, which is set further back from the highway to the south west of the site.

1.2 The site comprises a relatively large grassed area, an area of hardstanding, a static caravan including a decking area and a small storage container. There is a low boundary wall and timber fence along most of the north eastern boundary with Chipping Road Barn and a stone wall, approximately 1.5 metres high which includes a pedestrian gate, along the south west boundary with Chipping House. Mature trees and a post and wire fence are situated along the northwest boundary with the adjacent field and there are also mature trees along the boundary with the access track, in addition to some timber fencing. There have been agricultural buildings on the site previously, extending across the land which is now within the curtilage of Chipping Road Barn. The application site has never had any formal application for a change of use to domestic curtilage associated with either of the adjacent dwellings and there are clear boundary treatments separating the site from these. As such, its use is still considered to be agricultural. The site is located within the open countryside, as set out on the Local Plan Proposals Map. There is a high pressure gas pipeline located approximately 190 metres to the south west.

2.0 The Proposal

2.1 Planning permission is sought for the change of use of agricultural land for the siting of a static caravan for residential use and the creation of a domestic curtilage. Consent is also sought for a small container. The caravan and container are sited towards the north west boundary of the site. The application is retrospective as the caravan is already on the site. The caravan came to Officers' attention in July 2014 when dealing with an application at the adjacent property. The owner of the land was contacted by the Enforcement Team which has resulted in the submission of the current application.

3.0 Site History

3.1 There is no relevant recent planning history on the application site. However, there is recent history on the property to the northeast of the site, Chipping Road Barn, including an agricultural contractor's business. In 2000 consent was granted for the reinstatement of the former dwelling including the conversion of the adjoining barn to form a single dwelling at Chipping Road Barn which had been used as a packing shed and store in relation to the poultry farm formally at the site. The existing site plan submitted as part of the application included the current application site and showed buildings on part of this. This consent defined the domestic curtilage of Chipping Road Barn in its current position.

4.0 Consultation Responses

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

Consultee	Response
Parish Council	Supports application.
Environmental Health	No objections.
County Highways	No objections.
National Grid	No comments received.

5.0 Neighbour Representations

5.1 No comments have been received.

6.0 Principal National and Development Plan Policies

6.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

- Paragraphs **7, 14** and **17** – Sustainable Development and Core Principles
- Paragraph **32** – Access and Transport
- Paragraphs **49** and **50** – Delivering Housing
- Paragraphs **56, 58** and **60** – Requiring Good Design
- Paragraph **109** – Protecting and Enhancing Valued Landscapes
- Paragraph **123** – Noise impacts from development

6.2 Lancaster District Core Strategy (adopted July 2008)

- SC1** – Sustainable Development
- SC5** – Achieving Quality in Design

6.3 Lancaster District Local Plan - saved policies (adopted 2004)

- E4** – Countryside Area

6.4 Development Management Development Plan Document

- DM20** – Enhancing Accessibility and Transport Linkages
- DM22** – Vehicle Parking Provision

DM28 – Development and Landscape Impact

DM29 – Protection of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland

DM35 – Key Design Principles

DM41 – New Residential dwellings

DM42 – Managing Rural Housing Growth

7.0 **Comment and Analysis**

7.1 The main issues to be considered in the determination of this application are:

- Principle of development
- Landscape and visual impacts
- Impact on residential amenity
- Access and highway impacts

7.2 Principle of development

7.2.1 Policy SC1 of the Core Strategy requires new development to be as sustainable as possible, in particular it should be convenient to walk, cycle and travel by public transport between the site and homes, workplaces, shops, schools, health centres, recreation, leisure and community facilities. Policy DM20 of the Development Management DPD sets out that proposals should minimise the need to travel, particularly by private car, and maximise the opportunities for the use of walking, cycling and public transport. Policy DM42 sets out settlements where new housing will be supported and that proposals for new homes in isolated locations will not be supported unless clear benefits of development outweigh the dis-benefits.

7.2.2 The proposal relates to the siting of a caravan on agricultural land to be used as residential accommodation by the applicants as an independent dwelling. The site is located in the open countryside, divorced from any of the villages identified in policy DM42, the closest being Dolphinholme. There are a few dwellings close to the site, however, the edge of the main built up area of Dolphinholme is located 1 kilometre to the east. There are no footpaths linking to the main part of the village so it would be difficult and potentially dangerous to walk to the primary school, particularly in winter. There are also no public bus services in the locality, so access to a private vehicle would be needed to reach any services. The Fleece Inn is located approximately 300 metres to the south east of the site and has planning consent for a small shop within the pub/hotel. However, this in itself does not make the site sustainable. Policy DM42 sets out that proposals for new residential development on non-allocated sites must be well related to the existing built form of the settlement. As set out above, it is not considered that this site meets with these requirements.

7.2.3 Paragraph 55 of the NPPF sets out that to promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities, and local authorities should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances. These include:

- The essential need for a rural worker to live at or near their place of work in the countryside;
- Where development would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset;
- Where development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and lead to an enhancement to the immediate setting; or
- The exceptional quality or innovative nature of the design of the dwelling.

The submission sets out that one of the occupiers of the caravan works in the school in Dolphinholme and regularly walks to work to save on costs and the applicant works on the agricultural land connected to the site. However, no details have been provided with regards to the nature of the work that is carried out by the applicant. The submission also sets out that one of the occupiers' family live in the barn conversion and Chipping House, which allows her to look in on the elderly relative in the house.

7.2.4 The justification that has been put forward to support the residential caravan in this location has been taken into the consideration. However, the NPPF is very clear that in only exceptional circumstances new isolated dwellings will be supported in the countryside. The proposal does not meet any of the exceptions set out in the NPPF or the Development Management DPD and as such it is contrary to both National and Local policy. In addition, an appeal for a new dwelling on Whams

Lane, within an existing row of dwellings, has recently been dismissed. This is approximately 1.3 kilometres to the south west of the site (by road) and the Inspector concluded that despite the proximity to other dwellings, the development is isolated for the purposes of assessment against Paragraph 55 of the NPPF and also sets out that the absence of a safe pedestrian environment would restrict the opportunities for a reliance on walking. It is noted that there have been some previous buildings on the site although these were in relation to an agricultural use which is common in a rural location and ceased some years ago. As such, this does not override the concerns with regard to the unsustainable location. The principle of a new dwelling in this location is therefore considered to be unacceptable.

7.3 Landscape and visual impacts

7.3.1 The submission sets out that the mobile home is 11.5 metres in length, 3.9 metres in width, 2.8 metres in height to eaves and has an internal floor area of 44.85 sq.m. It is sited towards the north east boundary and has additional decking on one side and end giving access to its main door on the south west elevation. It is raised from the existing ground level by 0.7 metres at the north eastern end and 1.7 metres at the end of the decking area to the south west of the caravan. A storage container is also included in the proposal and measures 2.7 metres by 4.8 metres with a height of 2.5 metres. The application site is approximately 33 metres wide and 46 metres deep and has a row of trees along the north west boundary and most of the south east boundary. The majority of the site is grassed and there is an area of hardstanding located adjacent to the north east boundary which is used for access and parking.

7.3.2 Although there are large trees along the north western boundary, the caravan and storage container are clearly visible from the highway to the north west of the site. As such, it is visible from public views outside the site. Both of the adjacent residential properties are constructed from stone and of a traditional character and appearance. The application seeks the retention of the static caravan on the site on a permanent basis. Policy DM35 sets out that the Council will expect development to contribute positively to the identity and character of the area through good design, having regard to local distinctiveness, appropriate siting, layout and palette of materials. The static caravan is finished in a cream colour and has a shallow pitched roof, sited close to but at an angle to the north west boundary of the site. As a result of its design and appearance, including the colour and materials, it is not considered to be in keeping with the character and appearance of the area and is therefore contrary to Policies DM35 and DM42. It does not represent a high quality design and is also considered to have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the landscape in this locality.

7.4 Impact on residential amenity

7.4.1 Given the distance separating the caravan from the two adjacent dwellings, it is not considered that there is a detrimental impact on the privacy or outlook/daylight to these properties. However, as already set out above, an agricultural contractor's business operates from the adjacent property, Chipping Road Barn, and the associated building and hardstanding area abut the boundary with the application site. Therefore, there is the potential for this business to have a detrimental impact on the amenities of the occupiers of the caravan. The business activities are restricted to between 7am and 9pm and this was considered to be appropriate in terms of the amenity of Chipping House which is located further to south west and of solid construction. However, the caravan on the application site is located in close proximity to the building and hardstanding area associated with the business and as such it is unlikely that the amenities of the occupiers would not be affected by noise particularly associated with the movements of machinery. As such, the relationship of the caravan to the existing business is considered to be unacceptable.

7.5 Access and highway impacts

7.5.1 The site utilises an existing access from Chipping Lane serving existing properties and provides sufficient provision for parking within the site. As such, it is not considered that the proposal has a detrimental impact on highway safety and County Highways has raised no concerns.

8.0 Planning Obligations

8.1 There are no planning obligations to consider as part of this application as the application is recommended for refusal. However, if the proposal was recommended for approval, as it relates to

a new residential dwelling, an affordable housing contribution would be required unless it was restricted to occupation by the applicants only.

9.0 Conclusions

9.1 Notwithstanding the need to boost significantly the supply of housing (as defined by the NPPF, Section 6, Paragraph 47 in particular), and the fact that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development (Paragraph 49), this proposal for an unrestricted residential property in the open countryside does not represent sustainable development. It is not a location that can be made sustainable and so approving the application would run contrary to the NPPF and Development Plan policies. The proposal does not represent a high quality design and will have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the area and the amenities of the static caravan due to the close proximity to an existing agricultural contractor's business.

Recommendation

That Planning Permission **BE REFUSED** for the following reasons:

1. The site is located within the open countryside, divorced from any services and as such is not considered to be sustainable in terms of its location. It is not considered that there are any special circumstances, in this instance, to justify a new dwelling in this isolated, unsustainable location. The proposal is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of the Core Planning Principles and Section 6 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy SC1 of Lancaster District Core Strategy and Policies DM20 and DM42 of the Development Management Development Plan Document.
2. As a result of the siting, design and appearance of the static caravan and storage container, it is considered that the proposal does not represent a high quality design, is not in keeping with the character or appearance of the area, and will have a detrimental visual impact on the landscape in this location. The proposal does therefore not accord with the aims and objectives of the Core Planning Principles, Section 7 and Section 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policy SC5 of the Lancaster District Core Strategy, Policies DM28, DM35 and DM42 of the Development Management Development Plan Document and Saved Policy E4 of the Lancaster District Local Plan.
3. Given the close proximity of the static caravan to the agricultural contractor's business, operated in association with the adjacent residential property, it is not considered that the proposal provides an acceptable level of amenity for the occupiers of the caravan. As such the proposal is contrary to the Core Planning Principles and Section 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework and Policy DM35 of the Development Management Development Plan Document.

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

In accordance with the above legislation, the City Council can confirm the following:

In accordance with the above legislation, the City Council can confirm that it takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals, in the interests of delivering sustainable development. As part of this approach the Council offers a pre-application service, aimed at positively influencing development proposals. Regrettably the applicant has failed to take advantage of this service and the resulting proposal is unacceptable for the reasons prescribed.

Human Rights Act

This recommendation has been reached after consideration of the provisions of The Human Rights Act. Unless otherwise stated in this report, the issues arising do not appear to be of such magnitude to override the responsibility of the City Council to regulate land use for the benefit of the community as a whole, in accordance with national law.

Background Papers

None

Agenda Item A9	Committee Date 24 August 2015	Application Number 15/00967/FUL
Application Site The Knoll Westbourne Road Lancaster Lancashire	Proposal Demolition of existing porch and erection of a single storey side extension	
Name of Applicant Dr And Mrs Whittle	Name of Agent Mr Barry Cleminson	
Decision Target Date 21 September 2015	Reason For Delay Committee Cycle	
Case Officer	Mrs Kim Ireland	
Departure	No	
Summary of Recommendation	Approval	

(i) **Procedural Matters**

This form of development would normally be dealt with under the Scheme of Delegation. However, the applicant is related to an employee of Lancaster City Council and as such the proposal is to be determined by the Planning Committee.

1.0 The Site and its Surroundings

1.1 The property which forms the subject of this application relates to a three storey detached property that is Grade II listed, located on Westbourne Road in Lancaster. The surrounding area mainly consists of detached and semi-detached residential properties.

1.2 The site is unallocated on the Lancaster District Local Plan proposals map but is situated within the Canon Hill Conservation Area (which was designated since the Local Plan was adopted).

2.0 The Proposal

2.1 The application proposes the demolition of existing porch and erection of a single storey extension to the side elevation of the property. The proposed extension is to project from the eastern elevation by 2.1m, the width will be 6.1m with a lean to roof. The materials that are proposed to be used are brickwork walls to match the existing dwelling, under a smooth grey fibreglass roof with three conservation rooflights and timber windows and doors. The proposed side extension will provide a utility room.

3.0 Site History

3.1 The following applications are the most relevant property history.

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
13/00223/CU	Change of use from resource centre (B1) to create single residential dwelling (C3)	Permitted
13/00301/LB	Listed building application for internal alterations to facilitate the change of use of building into a residential dwelling	Permitted

4.0 Consultation Responses

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

Consultee	Response
Conservation Officer	No objection, providing further details are received in relation to the proposed roof covering, i.e. type of materials, finish of materials.

5.0 Neighbour Representations

5.1 At the time of compiling this report no representations have been received.

6.0 Principal National and Development Plan Policies

6.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Paragraph 17 - 12 Core Principles

Paragraphs 67 and 68 – Requiring Good Design

Paragraphs 131 – 134 – Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

6.2 Development Management DPD

DM29 – Trees and hedges

DM30 – Development affecting Listed Buildings

DM31 – Development affecting Conservation Areas

DM35 – Key design principles

7.0 Comment and Analysis

7.1 There are 3 key considerations arising from the proposal:

- General design and impact upon heritage assets;
- Impacts upon residential amenity; and
- Impacts on trees and hedges

7.2 General Design and Impact upon Heritage Assets

The proposed development has been designed and is made up of materials to reflect that of the existing dwelling. Whilst the proposed extension will change the appearance of the side elevation the proposed extension will be well screened by the existing detached garage and a 1.8m high boundary wall and will not have a visual impact on the street scene when viewed from Westbourne Road. The proposed extension will be not be out of character with the existing dwelling as the materials that are proposed to be used are to reflect that of the existing dwelling and it is deemed not to have an adverse impact to the setting of the Conservation Area.

7.3 Impacts upon Residential Amenity

The proposed development is not seen to have any adverse or detrimental impacts upon residential amenity. The property is set back from the road and there is a 1.8m stone wall separating the application property and the adjoining dwellings and Westbourne Road and therefore the proposed works will have a minimal impact. The property borders The Hollies. However, there are large trees along the boundary that will screen the proposed development and therefore it is not thought to have

a detrimental impact upon the residential amenities.

7.4 Trees and Hedges

There are trees and hedges along the boundary of the property and the driveway of the adjoining property of Peveril. The proposed single storey extension will be built within the root protection areas of the trees and hedges along the boundary. However, the proposed extension is to project an additional 0.7m to the existing porch that is to be demolished and therefore a number of conditions are to be applied to safeguard the root protection areas, which include hand digging the foundations.

8.0 Planning Obligations

8.1 Given the nature of the proposal there are no requirements for a legal obligation.

9.0 Conclusions

9.1 The proposed erection of an extension has been found acceptable in terms of design and amenities of local residents. In respect of these matters, it is in compliance with the relevant Development Plan policies and guidance provided in the NPPF.

Recommendation

Subject to the application being delegated back to the Chief Officer to allow the Press Notice to expire (and no new material considerations arising as a consequence of that Notice are presented), that Planning Permission **BE GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard 3 year timescale
2. Development to be carried out in accordance with approved plans
3. Roof to be carried out in accordance with approved details
4. Foundations of the single storey extension must be hand dug
5. No site fires, chemical storage or cement wash out
6. No storage of materials, machinery or equipment
7. No tree within the site shall be cut down, up rooted, topped, lopped or destroyed

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

In accordance with the above legislation, the City Council can confirm the following:

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

Human Rights Act

This recommendation has been reached after consideration of the provisions of The Human Rights Act. Unless otherwise stated in this report, the issues arising do not appear to be of such magnitude to override the responsibility of the City Council to regulate land use for the benefit of the community as a whole, in accordance with national law.

Background Papers

None

<p align="center">Agenda Item</p> <p align="center">A10</p>	<p align="center">Committee Date</p> <p align="center">24 August 2015</p>	<p align="center">Application Number</p> <p align="center">15/00729/LB</p>
<p align="center">Application Site</p> <p align="center">The Knoll Westbourne Road Lancaster Lancashire</p>	<p align="center">Proposal</p> <p align="center">Listed building application for the demolition of existing porch and erection of a single storey side extension, removal of existing and installation of new internal partition walls, installation of windows, and erection of gates and fence</p>	
<p align="center">Name of Applicant</p> <p align="center">Dr And Mrs Whittle</p>	<p align="center">Name of Agent</p> <p align="center">Mr Barry Cleminson</p>	
<p align="center">Decision Target Date</p> <p align="center">30 July 2015</p>	<p align="center">Reason For Delay</p> <p align="center">Committee Cycle</p>	
<p>Case Officer</p>	<p>Mrs Kim Ireland</p>	
<p>Departure</p>	<p>No</p>	
<p>Summary of Recommendation</p>	<p>Approval</p>	

(i) **Procedural Matters**

This Listed Building Consent application would normally be dealt with under the Scheme of Delegation. However, the applicant is related to an employee of Lancaster City Council and as such the proposal is to be determined by the Planning Committee.

1.0 The Site and its Surroundings

1.1 The property which forms the subject of this application relates to a three storey detached property that is Grade II listed, located on Westbourne Road in Lancaster. The surrounding area mainly consists of detached and semi-detached residential properties.

1.2 The site is unallocated on the Lancaster District Local Plan proposals map but is situated within the Canon Hill Conservation Area (which was designated since the Local Plan was adopted).

2.0 The Proposal

2.1 The application proposes the demolition of existing porch and erection of a single storey side extension, removal of existing and installation of new partitioned walls, installation of windows and erection of gates and fence. The proposed extension is to project from the eastern elevation by 2.1m with a width of 6.1m and a lean to roof. The materials that are proposed to be used are brickwork walls to match the existing dwelling, under a smooth grey fibreglass roof with three conservation rooflights and timber windows and doors. The proposed side extension will provide a utility room. The removal of existing and installation of new partitioned walls is to facilitate the recently permitted change of use from a resource centre into a residential dwelling. The proposed installation of two windows to the east and north elevations is to provide natural light into the main entrance and hall. The proposed fence and gates are to be installed to the east of the dwelling and are to be 2m in height, 25m in length and are to be made up of interfaced bow topped black galvanised metal.

3.0 Site History

3.1 The following applications are the most relevant property history.

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
13/00223/CU	Change of use from resource centre (B1) to create single residential dwelling (C3)	Permitted
13/00301/LB	Listed building application for internal alterations to facilitate the change of use of building into a residential dwelling	Permitted

4.0 Consultation Responses

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

Consultee	Response
Conservation Officer	No objection, providing further details are received in relation to the proposed roof covering, i.e. type of materials, finish of materials.

6.0 Principal National and Development Plan Policies

6.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Paragraph 17 - 12 Core Principles
 Paragraphs 67 and 68 – Requiring Good Design
 Paragraphs 131 – 134 – Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

6.2 Development Management DPD

DM30 – Development affecting Listed Buildings
DM31 – Development affecting Conservation Areas
DM35 – Key design principles

7.0 Comment and Analysis

7.1 There are 2 key considerations arising from the proposal:

- General Design and Impact upon Heritage Assets; and
- Impacts upon residential amenity

7.2 General Design and Impact upon Heritage Assets

The proposed development has been designed to reflect that of the existing building and will fit comfortably when viewed from within the streetscene. The proposed demolition of the existing porch and erection of a single storey side extension, removal of existing and installation of new internal partition walls, installation of windows, and erection of gates and fence will sustain the significance of the heritage asset and therefore will not be out of character and have a detrimental impact upon the listed building. It is deemed not to have an adverse impact to the setting of the Conservation Area.

7.3 Impacts upon Residential Amenity

The proposed development is not seen to have any adverse or detrimental impacts upon residential amenity. The property is set back from the road and there is a 1.8m stone wall separating the application property and the adjoining dwellings and road of Westbourne Road and therefore the proposed works will have a minimal impact.

8.0 Planning Obligations

8.1 Given the nature of the proposal there are no requirements for a legal obligation.

9.0 Conclusions

- 9.1 The proposed demolition of existing porch and erection of a single storey side extension, removal of existing and installation of new internal partition walls, installation of windows, and erection of gates and fence have been found acceptable in terms of design, built heritage conservation and amenities of local residents. In respect of these matters, it is in compliance with the relevant Development Plan policies and guidance provided in the NPPF.

Recommendation

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

1. Standard 3 year timescale
2. Development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans
3. Roof to be carried out in accordance with the approved details

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

In accordance with the above legislation, the City Council can confirm the following:

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

Human Rights Act

This recommendation has been reached after consideration of the provisions of The Human Rights Act. Unless otherwise stated in this report, the issues arising do not appear to be of such magnitude to override the responsibility of the City Council to regulate land use for the benefit of the community as a whole, in accordance with national law.

Background Papers

None

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

LANCASTER CITY COUNCIL

APPLICATION NO	DETAILS	DECISION
14/01132/CU	Quernmore House, Littledale Road, Quernmore Change of use of offices (A2) and garage to a 2-bed dwellinghouse (C3) for Mr Carl Swinnerton (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00028/DIS	114 St Leonards Gate, Lancaster, Lancashire Discharge of conditions 5, 8 and 10 on planning permission 14/00040/CU for Mr Anas Mister (Bulk Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00031/CU	Former Milking Shed, Aughton Brow, Aughton Change of use of agricultural buildings to a 3-bed dwellinghouse (C3), erection of a single storey link and creation of a new access for Mr & Mrs M May (Halton With Aughton Ward)	Application Refused
15/00057/DIS	Lunecliffe Farm, Lunecliffe Road, Lancaster Discharge of conditions 3, 4 and 5 on planning permission 14/01185/FUL for Mr & Mrs David & Sarah Watson (Scotforth West Ward)	Initial Response Sent
15/00060/FUL	Netherbeck Farm, Over Hall Road, Ireby Erection of a single storey detached outbuilding comprising a garden store and ancillary residential accommodation in association with the main dwelling for Mr & Mrs N Dodd (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00069/DIS	Lancaster Moor Hospital Annex, Quernmore Road, Lancaster Discharge of condition 4 on approved application 14/00661/LB for Mr Andrew McMurtrie (Bulk Ward)	Initial Response Sent
15/00070/DIS	Lancaster Moor Hospital Annex, Quernmore Road, Lancaster Discharge of conditions 4,5,6,10 and 11 on application 14/00659/REM for Mr Andrew McMurtrie (Bulk Ward)	Initial Response Sent
15/00078/DIS	47 - 51 North Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Discharge of conditions 1 - 15 on approved application 13/01274/FUL for Mr Anas Mister (Bulk Ward)	Initial Response Sent
15/00079/DIS	Old Roof Tree Inn, Middleton Road, Middleton Discharge of conditions 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 18 and 19 on application 11/00702/FUL for Mr Nigel Brunt (Overton Ward)	Initial Response Sent
15/00079/FUL	Galley Hall Farm, Shore Road, Warton Change of use of agricultural buildings and land to provide five residential dwellings and curtilages (use class C3) with associated access for Mr R Close (Carnforth Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00087/OUT	Land Adjacent To 34 Wennington Road, Wray, Lancaster Outline application for the erection of 3 dwellings for Mr & Mrs Peter & Hazel Garrod (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00088/DIS	The Knoll, Westbourne Road, Lancaster Discharge of conditions 3, 4 and 5 on approved application 13/00301/LB for Mrs D Whittle (Castle Ward)	Request Completed

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

15/00093/DIS	Site For Fast Food Takeaway Unit, Caton Road, Lancaster Discharge of condition 9 on planning permission 14/00775/FUL for McDonald's Restaurants Ltd (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Initial Response Sent
15/00094/DIS	Site For Fast Food Takeaway Unit, Caton Road, Lancaster Discharge of conditons 15 and 16 on planning permission 14/00775/FUL for McDonald's Restaurants Ltd (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Initial Response Sent
15/00095/DIS	Site For Fast Food Takeaway Unit, Caton Road, Lancaster Discharge of conditions 25 on planning permission 14/00775/FUL for McDonald's Restaurants Ltd (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Initial Response Sent
15/00096/DIS	Site For Fast Food Takeaway Unit, Caton Road, Lancaster Discharge of condition 23 on planning permission 14/00775/FUL for McDonald's Restaurants Ltd (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Initial Response Sent
15/00097/DIS	Site For Fast Food Takeaway Unit, Caton Road, Lancaster Discharge of condition 24 on planning permission 14/00775/FUL for McDonald's Restaurants Ltd (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Request Completed
15/00098/DIS	Garages Opposite Kids Club, Dallas Road, Lancaster Discharge of conditions 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16 and 17 on planning permission 14/01225/FUL for Mr James Goddard (Dukes Ward)	Initial Response Sent
15/00100/ELDC	Flat 4, 2 Croftlands, Westbourne Road Existing Lawful Development Certificate for continued use of property as self-contained flat for Mr Piers Martin (Castle Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
15/00110/DIS	Land Bounded By , Chatsworth Road, Albert Road, Westminster Road And Regent Road, Morecambe Discharge of condition 7 on application 13/01237/FUL for Mr David Skidmore (Harbour Ward)	Request Completed
15/00111/DIS	Land To The East Of The Old Vicarage Retirement Home, 56 Main Street, Hornby Discharge of condition 5 on planning permission 15/00366/FUL for Mr Grant Jackson (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Request Completed
15/00114/DIS	Whitewalls, 39 Hatlex Lane, Hest Bank Discharge of conditions 5, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13 on application 13/01179/FUL for Mr & Mrs J Edmonds (Slyne With Hest Ward)	Request Completed
15/00116/DIS	Whitewalls, 39 Hatlex Lane, Hest Bank Discharge of condition 4 and 5 on application 13/01180/LB for Mr And Mrs J Edmonds (Slyne With Hest Ward)	Request Completed
15/00117/OUT	Land To Side Of 1 Ingleborough View, Station Road, Hornby Outline application for the erection of a 3-bed dwelling with associated access for Mr P Norris (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00121/DIS	Richmond Bank, Caton Green Road, Brookhouse Discharge of condition 3 and 4 on approved application 15/00474/CU for Mr & Mrs Birkett & Joan Platts (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Request Completed

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

15/00122/DIS	City Lab, 4 - 6 Dalton Square, Lancaster Discharge of condition 3 on planning permission 14/01370/LB for Mr David Barton (Dukes Ward)	Request Completed
15/00128/DIS	Site For Fast Food Takeaway Unit, Caton Road, Lancaster Discharge of condition 5 on approved application 14/00775/FUL for McDonald's Restaurants Ltd (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Request Completed
15/00257/FUL	6 Sunningdale Crescent, Hest Bank, Lancaster Demolition of existing garage and erection of a part 2, part 3 storey side extension for Rev P Nixon (Slyne With Hest Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00270/CU	Stone Bank Barn, Adjacent To Main Street, Cockerham Conversion of agricultural barn to two 4-bed residential dwellings (C3), change of use of agricultural land to domestic curtilage, excavation of site levels erection of a single storey side extension, erection of a detached double garage and store and creation of an access track for R.T. Halhead (Ellel Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00330/FUL	Field 4900, Hazelrigg Lane, Ellel Retrospective application for the retention of an agricultural building for hay storage and machinery for Mr Darren Hodgson (Ellel Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00333/OUT	Land To The Rear Of Butt Yeats, Station Road, Hornby Outline application for the demolition of existing workshop and erection of one residential dwelling for Mr John Kelly (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00337/CU	Hampson House Hotel, Hampson Lane, Galgate Retrospective application for the change of use of land for the siting of one mobile home for temporary living accommodation for 1 year for Mr Ken Drinkwater (Ellel Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00340/FUL	31 Whin Avenue, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Erection of a detached store room with car parking above for Mr William Burgess (Bolton Le Sands Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00357/FUL	Land Adjacent Walnut Gate, Bailrigg Lane, Lancaster Erection of a detached dwelling with associated landscaping and vehicular access for Mr And Mrs McMinnis (Ellel Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00360/FUL	Lane Head Cottage, Lancaster Road, Caton Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of a replacement single storey side extension for Mr And Mrs F And J Fawcett (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00368/FUL	Christ Church Church Of England School, Derwent Road, Lancaster Installation of an 8 bay cycle shelter for Lancaster Christ Church C Of E Primary School (Bulk Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00372/LB	Friends Meeting House, Meeting House Lane, Lancaster Listed building application for the installation of a stair lift for Mr Hugh Roberts (Castle Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00373/CU	20 Thurnham Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Change of use of ground floor from retail (A1) to dwelling (C3) including alterations to front facade and creation of two parking spaces to rear for Mr John Sanderson (Dukes Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

15/00451/FUL	Belmount Farm, Hasty Brow Road, Slyne Erection of an extension to an existing cattle building for Mr JOHN HOGGARTH (Slyne With Hest Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00458/CU	Sunnyside Camp Site, 268 Oxcliffe Road, Heysham Change of use for the siting of 9 residential static caravans for Mr W Howard (Westgate Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00462/LB	Grainger Cottage, Lancaster Road, Caton Listed building application for the erection of new garden walls for Mr Franklyn Weber (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00467/FUL	10 Sand Lane, Warton, Carnforth Erection of a single storey front extension and single storey rear extension for Mr And Mrs Alpin (Warton Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00481/VCN	The Sheiling, Kirkby Lonsdale Road, Arkholme Demolition of existing bungalow and outbuildings and erection of 14 dwellings with associated access and landscaping (pursuant to the variation of condition 2 on application 14/00895/FUL to amend house design of Plot 5 for the addition of a garden room to the rear) for Russell Armer Homes Ltd (Kellet Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00488/FUL	Lane House Farm, Kirkby Lonsdale Road, Arkholme Erection of an agricultural livestock building over existing slurry lagoon with an extension to existing slurry lagoon for Mr Richard Cornall (Kellet Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00489/ADV	9 Market Street, Carnforth, Lancashire Advertisement application for the display of an externally illuminated fascia sign and an externally illuminated projecting sign for Bestway Group (Carnforth Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00500/FUL	25 Artlebeck Road, Caton, Lancaster Erection of a single storey front extension for Mr & Mrs Nicholas Heywood (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00521/FUL	Greaves Hotel, Greaves Road, Lancaster Erection of an electrical substation for YourLife Management Services Ltd (Scotforth West Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00529/ELDC	133A Euston Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Existing Lawful Development Certificate for the continued use of upper floors as two self contained flats for Mr Anthony Fox (Poulton Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
15/00534/LB	Ripley St Thomas Church Of England Academy , Ashton Road, Lancaster Listed building application for the removal of existing internal metal screen and installation of new timber screen for Ripley St Thomas Church Of England Academy (Dukes Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

15/00546/VCN	Land Adjacent Station Yard, Kirkby Lonsdale, Carnforth Change of use of agricultural land to a touring caravan and camping pod site, including the erection of an ancillary amenity block, provision of an access road, footpaths and car parking areas, provision of landscaping and an external children's play area (pursuant to the variation of conditions 2 and 10 on planning permission 14/00336/CU relating to the approved plans and the number of pods) for Mr Kevin Woodhouse (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00559/FUL	Bazil Farm, Bazil Lane, Overton Erection of an extension to existing cattle building to form a manure store and erection of a new cattle building and hay/silage store for Mr Tim Butler (Overton Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00561/FUL	Green Hill House Farm, Dunald Mill Lane, Nether Kellet Demolition of existing building and construction of replacement building over existing midden for Mr I Ward (Halton With Aughton Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00563/FUL	First Carnforth Scout Group, Kellet Road, Carnforth Demolition of existing timber hut and erection of new building to be used as a scout hut and replacement septic tank for 1St Carnforth Scout Group (Carnforth Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00578/RCN	Golden Ball, Lancaster Road, Heaton With Oxcliffe Change of use of vacant land adjacent to the public house for the siting of three camping pods with associated landscaping (pursuant to the removal of condition 1 on planning permission 14/00050/CU to allow permanent continued use of the site for pods) for Mr Steve Hunt (Overton Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00579/FUL	12 Orchard Avenue, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Erection of a two storey rear extension and construction of a raised roof over part of the existing dwelling including a side dormer window for Mr G Knight (Bolton Le Sands Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00581/PLDC	2A Whinfell Drive, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a single storey rear extension and extension to existing dormer for Mrs Qian (Scotforth East Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
15/00583/FUL	Lancaster And Morecambe College , Morecambe Road, Lancaster Installation of replacement windows and recladding the existing link block between blocks B and C for Mrs Louise Evans (Torrisholme Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00609/FUL	2 Needham Avenue, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of a single storey rear extension to form a granny annexe for Mr & Mrs R. Storzaker (Harbour Ward)	Application Refused
15/00611/FUL	69 South Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of a single storey rear and side extension to replace existing garage and conservatory for Mr Paul Bowman (Torrisholme Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00614/FUL	Eskrigge Barn, Eskrigge Lane, Gressingham Demolition of existing single storey extension and erection of a two storey side (South East) extension for Mr & Mrs J & A Lumb (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

15/00620/CU	2 Goldfinch Close, Heysham, Morecambe Change of use of land to extend garden area and erection of a boundary fence for Mr Ken Parker (Heysham South Ward)	Application Refused
15/00625/FUL	41 Hatlex Lane, Hest Bank, Lancaster Erection of a front porch for Mr & Mrs N Sewell (Slyne With Hest Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00627/FUL	11 Johnson Close, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a two storey side extension for Mr And Mrs Lord (Castle Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00628/FUL	13 Nightingale Close, Heysham, Morecambe Erection of single storey front and rear extension for Mr L Kilifin (Heysham South Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00641/FUL	The Morecambe Hotel, 25 Lord Street, Morecambe Alterations and repairs to existing wall and access gate for Mr R. Taylor (Poulton Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00642/LB	The Morecambe Hotel, 25 Lord Street, Morecambe Listed building application for repairs and alterations existing wall and access gate for Mr R. Taylor (Poulton Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00643/FUL	Haweswater Bungalow, Moss Lane, Silverdale Erection of a 2 storey rear extension, creation of a first floor and re-cladding of entire outbuilding with construction of a balcony to form a garage with hobby/guest room for Mr Peter Palmer (Silverdale Ward)	Application Refused
15/00649/FUL	22 Endsleigh Grove, Lancaster, Lancashire Construction of a raised terrace to the rear for Mr Joel Pinnington (Skerton West Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00652/FUL	Dale Barns, Kellet Lane, Nether Kellet Erection of an agricultural livestock and storage building for Mr J Whittaker (Kellet Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00656/FUL	The Croft, Hest Bank Lane, Slyne Construction of a replacement raised roof with rear dormer window and erection of a detached garage for Mr J. Grayston (Slyne With Hest Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00657/FUL	56A Main Road, Galgate, Lancaster Retrospective application for the change of use from 7 bedsits to 7 bedroom house in multiple occupation (sui generis) for Mr Dennis Stamper (Ellel Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00660/FUL	Thornleigh, Hillcrest Avenue, Bolton Le Sands Erection of front porch for Mr John Whittaker (Bolton Le Sands Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00661/LB	The Old Toll House, Hornby Road, Farleton Listed building application for the erection of a single storey rear extension and installation of a window to the rear elevation for Mr & Mrs S Devenish (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00663/FUL	11 Montrose Crescent, Heysham, Morecambe Erection of single storey front and rear extensions for Mr L Darrell (Heysham South Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

15/00664/FUL	100 Sibsey Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Demolition of existing single storey rear extension and erection of a replacement single storey rear extension for Mr & Mrs A Hetherington (Castle Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00667/FUL	The High Farm, Docker Lane, Arkholme Erection of an agricultural livestock building for Mrs Pye (Kellet Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00671/FUL	4 High Crag Court, Warton, Carnforth Erection of a single storey side extension to existing attached garage for Mr & Mrs L Fishwick & Hebblethwaite (Warton Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00676/FUL	11A Coastal Road, Hest Bank, Lancaster Construction of a dormer window to the front elevation for Mr & Mrs Lee Fisher (Slyne With Hest Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00677/FUL	3 Hall Close, Caton, Lancaster Demolition of existing rear conservatory and erection of a replacement single storey rear extension for Mrs Liz Hayhurst (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00685/FUL	Brookside Cottage, Kellet Road, Over Kellet Erection of a two storey side extension and a single storey side porch for Dr Chris Orton (Kellet Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00686/LB	Brookside Cottage, Kellet Road, Over Kellet Listed building application for the erection of a two storey side extension and a single storey side porch for Dr Chris Orton (Kellet Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00687/PAM	Communication Station And Mast, Caton Pumping Station, Station Road Prior approval for a replacement 17.5m high monopole for WHP Wilkinson Helsby - Acquisition Design And Construction (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Prior Approval Not Required
15/00693/FUL	26 Wakefield Avenue, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of a single story rear extension for Mr G Lowthian (Bare Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00694/FUL	185 Brookhouse Road, Brookhouse, Lancaster Erection of a two storey side extension and alterations to the existing front and rear eaves for Mr I Hall (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Application Refused
15/00698/FUL	The Old Toll House, Hornby Road, Farleton Erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr S Devenish (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00699/FUL	Gregson Institute, 33 Moor Gate, Lancaster Removal of existing dormer windows to the side elevations and installation of replacement rooflights for Mr William Pye (Bulk Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00718/VCN	Squires Snooker Club, Penny Street, Lancaster Demolition of existing building and erection of a 5 storey building comprising retail (use classes A1 and A2) at ground floor and student accommodation to the upper floors including 6 cluster flats and 10 studio apartments with associated car parking and servicing/landscaping area (pursuant to the variation of conditions 14, 15, 17, 24 and 26 on planning permission 14/01295/FUL to vary the management arrangements of the car parking bays and phase the timing of the submission of details required by these conditions) for Cityblock (Dukes Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

15/00741/PLDC	34 Rochester Avenue, Morecambe, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a single storey side extension for Mr J. Braithwaite (Westgate Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
15/00743/PLDC	9 Park Avenue, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a single storey side extension for Mr & Mrs R. English (John O'Gaunt Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
15/00744/FUL	21 Queens Drive, Morecambe, Lancashire Demolition of existing rear conservatory and erection of a replacement single storey rear extension and construction of a chimney to the rear elevation for Mr Ian Winder (Bare Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00745/CU	12 - 14 Westbourne Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Change of use of four flats into two houses (C3) for Mr John Roff (Castle Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00747/FUL	143 West End Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of a single storey side extension and raised decking area to the rear for Mr R. Murray (Harbour Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00769/FUL	Carus Lodge, Main Street, Arkholme Demolition of existing attached garage, erection of 2 single storey side extensions and installation of a raised replacement roof over part of the existing dwelling and one of the side extensions to create first floor accommodation for Mr & Mrs Graham & Debbie Atkinson (Kellet Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00778/FUL	15 Kintyre Way, Heysham, Morecambe Erection of a single storey side and rear extension and retention of the front facing window in place of garage door for Mr & Mrs David Mace (Heysham South Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00789/PLDC	8 Hayfell Avenue, Morecambe, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a dormer window to the rear elevation for Mr & Mrs A. Brooks (Westgate Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
15/00798/FUL	10 Lathom Avenue, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of a single storey side and rear extension for Mr And Mrs Graham Duckworth (Poulton Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00846/LB	Greystones, Main Street, Wray Listed building application for the re-slating of the roof of existing dwelling for Roger Lumb (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Application Withdrawn
15/00862/NMA	Whitewalls, 39 Hatlex Lane, Hest Bank Non-Material Amendment Application for relocation of garage with change of timber to stone and render, additional first floor en-suite and sash window, change study door to a sliding door and removal of a joist above kitchen on previously approved planning application 13/01179/FUL for Mr And Mrs Edmonds (Slyne With Hest Ward)	Application Permitted