



**Committee:** PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS REGULATORY COMMITTEE

**Date:** MONDAY, 19 OCTOBER 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 21<sup>st</sup> September 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.

<b>5</b>	<b>A5 15/00913/FUL</b>	<b>University Of Cumbria , Bowerham Road, Lancaster</b>	<b>John O'Gaunt Ward</b>	<b>(Pages 1 - 6)</b>
		Partial demolition of the Askwith Building and erection of a new three storey teaching block with associated landscaping and replacement car parking and the erection of a single storey extension and installation of new windows to the retained part of the Askwith Building for University Of Cumbria		
<b>6</b>	<b>A6 15/00876/FUL</b>	<b>Land North Of Saddler Nook Lane, Whittington, Lancashire</b>	<b>Upper Lune Valley Ward</b>	<b>(Pages 7 - 15)</b>
		Installation of arrays of 2.7m high PV panels, underground cabling, inverter and transformer cabinets, substation, control room, 2m high deer proof fencing and CCTV mounted on 3.5m high masts, together with construction of internal access roads to form a solar farm for Mr Alexander Miejimolle		
<b>7</b>	<b>A7 15/00847/OUT</b>	<b>Warton Grange Farm, Farleton Close, Warton</b>	<b>Warton Ward</b>	<b>(Pages 16 - 24)</b>
		Outline application for the demolition of the existing farm buildings and the erection of up to 23 dwellings with associated access and landscaping for Mr Mike Barker		
<b>8</b>	<b>A8 15/01014/FUL</b>	<b>Former Focus Do It All, Westgate, Morecambe</b>	<b>Westgate Ward</b>	<b>(Pages 25 - 31)</b>
		Demolition of existing building and erection of a retail warehouse with associated access, car parking and landscaping for TJ Morris		

9	A9 15/00091/FUL	<b>Land To The Rear 38 To 42 North Road, Nile Street, Lancaster</b>	<b>Bulk Ward</b>	<b>(Pages 32 - 38)</b>
		Erection of a 4 storey building for student accommodation comprising of one 4-bed cluster, four 5-bed clusters and five 1-bed studios for Bayt Ltd		
10	A10 15/01117/PLDC	<b>Water Treatment Works, Littlefell Lane, Lancaster</b>	<b>University and Scotforth Rural Ward</b>	<b>(Pages 39 - 42)</b>
		Proposed lawful development certificate for the installation of a floating photovoltaic solar array comprising solar panels, supporting floating frames, 2 switch gear houses and cabling for United Utilities Water Limited		
11	A11 15/00996/FUL	<b>39 Dale Street, Lancaster, Lancashire</b>	<b>John O'Gaunt Ward</b>	<b>(Pages 43 - 45)</b>
		Erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr & Mrs M Lunat		
12	A12 15/00999/FUL	<b>95 Dale Street, Lancaster, Lancashire</b>	<b>John O'Gaunt Ward</b>	<b>(Pages 46 - 48)</b>
		Erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr & Mrs Zuber Patel		
13	A13 15/01029/FUL	<b>10 Jackson Terrace, Warton, Carnforth</b>	<b>Warton Ward</b>	<b>(Pages 49 - 51)</b>
		Erection of a replacement front porch for Mr A Dobson		

#### **Category D Applications**

Applications for development by the City Council

14	A14 15/01168/FUL	<b>Storey Institute, Meeting House Lane, Lancaster</b>	<b>Castle Ward</b>	<b>(Pages 52 - 54)</b>
		Installation of 3 replacement gates for Miss Helen Ryan		

- |           |   |  |                    |                        |
|-----------|---|--|--------------------|------------------------|
| <b>15</b> | <b>A15 15/01169/LB</b>  | <b>Storey Institute, Meeting House Lane, Lancaster</b>                                 | <b>Castle Ward</b> | <b>(Pages 55 - 57)</b> |
|           |   | Listed building application for the fitting of 3 replacement gates for Miss Helen Ryan |                    |                        |
| <b>16</b> | <b>Quarterly Reporting - July to September 2015 (Pages 58 - 64)</b> |  |                    |                        |
| <b>17</b> | <b>Delegated Planning Decisions (Pages 65 - 72)</b>                 |  |                    |                        |

## **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), 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](mailto:smoorghen@lancaster.gov.uk).

### **(iv) Changes to Membership, substitutions or apologies**

Please contact Democratic Support, telephone 582170, or alternatively email [democraticsupport@lancaster.gov.uk](mailto:democraticsupport@lancaster.gov.uk).

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

Published on Wednesday 7<sup>th</sup> October 2015.

<b>Agenda Item</b> A5	<b>Committee Date</b> 19 October 2015	<b>Application Number</b> 15/00913/FUL
<b>Application Site</b> University Of Cumbria Bowerham Road Lancaster Lancashire	<b>Proposal</b> Partial demolition of the Askwith Building and erection of a new three storey teaching block with associated landscaping and replacement car parking and the erection of a single storey extension and installation of new windows to the retained part of the Askwith Building	
<b>Name of Applicant</b> University Of Cumbria	<b>Name of Agent</b> Mr Alexander McCallion	
<b>Decision Target Date</b> 27 October 2015	<b>Reason For Delay</b> None	
<b>Case Officer</b>	Mr Mark Cassidy	
<b>Departure</b>	No	
<b>Summary of Recommendation</b>	Approve with conditions	

## **1.0 The Site and its Surroundings**

- 1.1 The Lancaster Campus of the University of Cumbria occupies a prominent position within the city, fronting the main highways of Bowerham Road, Coulston Road and Wyresdale Road. The site is allocated as education (Campus) land.
- 1.2 Part of the wider campus also enjoys Key Urban Landscape designation, but that does not apply to the land that is within the application red edge. Other areas of the campus are designated as Open Space, Sports and Recreation land, including the adjacent football pitch.
- 1.3 None of the buildings within the wider site are listed, although there are a number of buildings (including the Keep and the perimeter wall) which are identified as non-designated heritage assets, and thus are 'locally-important'.

## **2.0 The Proposal**

- 2.1 This is a full application for partial demolition and extension of an existing structure (known as the Asquith Building), and the construction of a new teaching 'hub', along with associated landscaping. The works form the first phase of wider transformation of the Lancaster Campus. It should be noted that the wider Campus Masterplan has not yet been formally submitted as a planning application, but the current proposal for a single teaching block can be considered in advance of any wider masterplanning proposals.
- 2.2 The new building will accommodate a lecture theatre and 2 flexible teaching rooms on the ground floor, along with an open foyer and learning zone. This level will also provide back-office, boiler room, toilets and lift. The first floor has similar teaching facilities and a plant room, whilst the upper floor provides 6 separate teaching spaces.
- 2.3 Externally, new landscaping is proposed in a number of locations around the building, not least in the remodelled area known as the 'Quad', which is due north of the structure. Realigned (and

resurfaced) pedestrian footways seek to improve accessibility around this part of the campus.

- 2.4 Other smaller structures - including part of the inner perimeter wall complex known as The Range, (which provided music rooms) and the modern drama block - are identified for demolition as part of a separate Prior Approval application (see Paragraph 3.1 of this report below).

### **3.0 Site History**

- 3.1 The campus has been the series of many planning applications. However the most relevant application is a Prior Approval application (Ref: 15/01007/PAD) for the demolition of buildings to accommodate the current proposal. The Council considered that further details were required, and those details have now been submitted (these details also help to inform the current proposals). The Prior Approval decision is a technical one as to whether the method of demolition and related details are acceptable, and any decision on the Prior Approval does not prejudice consideration for the current proposal.

The applicant also formally submitted a pre-application proposal as a forerunner to the current scheme (Ref: 15/00557/PRETWO).

### **4.0 Consultation Responses**

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

Consultee	Response
<b>County Strategic Planning</b>	No comments received within statutory consultation timescale.
<b>County Highways</b>	<b>Initial objection</b> – absence of construction traffic details and implications for car parking. Further details provided; any comments will be verbally reported.
<b>Environmental Health</b>	<b>No objection</b> – conditions recommended (hours of construction; unforeseen contamination; scheme for dust control)
<b>Tree Protection Officer</b>	<b>Initial objection</b> – acknowledged receipt of planting proposals, which are acceptable, but absence of detailed Arboricultural Implications Assessment (AIA) justifies initial objection. AIA since submitted, verbal update will be provided.
<b>Conservation Officer</b>	<b>No objection</b> – removal of unsympathetic later additions are a positive. Proposal has been designed to minimise the impact upon surrounding structures. Conditions requested regarding materials and finishes.
<b>Public Realm Officer</b>	No comments received within statutory consultation timescale.
<b>Lancaster Civic Society</b>	<b>Comments</b> – observations made regarding consultation/wider masterplan. Proposals will rationalise the wider site and the layout is effective. More details regarding materials and appearance would be welcome. Reservations regarding landscaping layout. Contractor's parking will need to be controlled during construction.
<b>Lancashire Constabulary</b>	<b>Comments</b> – secured by design principles including specific window and door lock matters. Planning considerations include a request for low-level planting only to aid security, sufficient lighting columns and consideration given to CCTV.

### **5.0 Neighbour Representations**

- 5.1 At the time of compiling this report, 4 items of correspondence have been received from 3 residents. Of these, one supports the development (but has made comments in relation to the separate Prior Approval application, and the possibility of retaining existing features such as plaques, benches, etc). The remainder object to the proposal on the grounds of car parking congestion on the local roads; loss of daylight; overbearing development; loss of privacy; inappropriate design and confusion as to where the proposal is located.

### **6.0 Principal National and Development Plan Policies**

- 6.1 The most relevant National and Development Plan policies are:

National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Paragraphs 7, 14 and 17 - Sustainable Development and Core Principles  
Paragraph 32 – Access and Transport  
Paragraphs 56-65 – Requiring Good Design  
Paragraphs 131-136 – Historic Environment

### Lancaster District Local Plan (Saved Policies)

Policy R13 – (refers to) University College of St Martin

### Lancaster District Core Strategy (adopted July 2008)

Policy SC1 – Sustainable Development  
Policy SC5 – Achieving Quality in Design  
Policy SC6 – Crime and Community Safety  
Policy ER1 – Higher and Further Education  
Policy E1 – Environmental Capital

### Development Management DPD (adopted December 2014)

Policy DM23 – Transport Efficiency and Travel Plans  
Policy DM32 – Setting of Heritage Assets  
Policy DM35 – Key Design Principles  
Policy DM36 – Sustainable Design

## **7.0 Comment and Analysis**

7.1 There are six main issues to consider regarding this proposal, namely:

- Principle of use and integration with the remainder of the campus;
- Materials, design, scale and massing;
- Impacts upon heritage assets;
- Impacts upon car parking spaces;
- Impacts upon residential amenity; and,
- Landscaping

### **7.2 Principle of Use and Campus Integration**

The intention to upgrade teaching accommodation is most welcome and appropriate in the location specified. The structures identified for removal are either (a) of poor quality; or (b) provide an obstacle to logical redevelopment due to their difficult orientation (e.g. The Range). The proposed building will not impinge upon the usable part of the adjacent football pitch. It will also provide greater coherence in terms of the site layout, by providing improved pedestrian accessibility in an area that currently suffers from a confusing layout. Much more will need to be done as the wider masterplan evolves, but this first phase is a promising start.

### **7.3 Materials, Design, Scale and Massing**

There is a slight difference in ground levels across the site, and so the building will sit on a plinth to create a level floor slab. The external walls will be buff brick and zinc rainscreen cladding. The brickwork identified – Grantchester Blend – appears to be a sympathetic colour respecting the surround sandstone of the College Main and North buildings, and the brickwork of the nearby existing teaching block. However officers intend to work with the applicant regarding the submission of samples to ensure that the most appropriate materials are selected. An aluminium curtain-walling system is also proposed as are aluminium windows and doors. The flat, membrane roof will have a parapet and the soffits will be red cedar.

7.4 The longest elevation is broken-up by the full-height curtain walling system. This incorporates a series of side-hung windows to assist with natural ventilation, and vertical ‘fins’ which will provide shade to the façade. The end elevations have added interest with the protruding, glazed stairwells. These protrusions help limit the massing of the building.

7.5 This building cannot be accommodated without alterations to the Asquith Building. The loss of the more modern additions to Asquith (link building and drama block) is to be welcomed; and this will allow a small, canopied lobby extension which will also provide accessible toilet facilities. This modest extension will be clad in zinc to match the new teaching block.

7.6 At three storeys high, the teaching block will have sufficient scale to create impact without overwhelming the existing, retained buildings. The flat roof clearly assists in delivering sleek, clean lines to the structure. Those clean lines could be compromised by the manner in which the cladding meets the brickwork on the south-east elevation facing the playing fields (which given that this elevation provides access to the boiler room and electrical room, isn't as aesthetically pleasing as the opposite elevation). It is for this reason that further material detail will be necessary prior to construction. However, the building is acceptable both as an individual set-piece and in the manner it will complement existing structures.

### 7.7 Impact upon Heritage Assets

The applicant has worked with officers, including Conservation Officers, during the evolution of these proposals. In the context of this proposal, five non-designated heritage assets have the potential to be affected; some more than others. They are:

- The Keep;
- Askwith;
- College North;
- College Main; and,
- The part of the former perimeter wall known as The Range.

7.8 The setting of The Keep is considered to be improved by the removal of the 1960's drama block. The new building is of sufficient distance away from the Keep as to not compromise the improved setting. The Asquith Building will be less visible from the playing fields, but it will also enjoy a much-improved setting as a consequence of the drama block's demolition. The new single-storey extension to Asquith will act as a visual (but not physical) link to the proposed teaching block.

7.9 With regard to College North and College Main, these buildings sit due south and due north respectively. Views of College Main will continue to be uninterrupted from the playing fields, and the angled nature of the new structure will enhance its prominence. Part of College North will be obscured in longer-range views, although the impact of this is significantly lessened by the fact that the existing collection of 1960/1970s buildings (including the existing nursery building) already compromise views of College North.

7.10 There is a stone perimeter wall around much of the wider site, and this is the former defensive barracks wall. Where this wall abuts public highway, those areas are unaffected by the proposal. The wall also exists along an internal part of the site known as The Range. The three small existing structures that comprise The Range are to be demolished, with some of the wall being removed. This is compensated for by the removal of the current music accommodation from its position adjacent to the wall, and the restoration of significant parts of the structure. Existing openings in the wall would be retained and steel steps will provide access to three new 'social seating' areas. New planting (see 'Landscaping') will also improve the legibility of this important feature.

7.11 Notwithstanding the absence of any listed building or conservation area status across the application site, the proposals will improve the visual relationship between buildings of local importance, and from a heritage perspective the development is acceptable.

### 7.12 Impact upon Car Parking Spaces

Whilst the overall masterplan for the site has yet to be formally submitted, this stand-alone development will have implications for car parking during the construction phase. A Construction Management Plan has already been submitted which indicates that building demolition will be a separate, distinct phase to building construction. The former will require increasing the width of the campus access road from Coulston Road and the provision of a site cabin. Following completion of demolition, the site cabin will be removed and site operations will be relocated to the existing nursery building. Whilst car parking within the car park fronting Coulston Road will be affected during the



works, construction disturbance itself is not a reason for withholding consent, unless the transport impacts arising from the activity is severe.

7.13 In this case, County Highways initially expressed concern about the construction element, although they had no objections to the new building in principle. The applicant subsequently pointed out that discussions with other Officers at the County had already taken place and that given that the net level of activity on the campus would not change following construction, the planning application could be supported from a travel and parking perspective. This would appear to remove the highway objection, although at the time of report preparation final confirmation from County Highways was outstanding. This matter will be verbally clarified at Committee.

7.14 Despite the footprint of the building, there are remarkably few existing formal car-parking spaces that are permanently affected – just four in total. These four spaces would be replaced with four new spaces prior to opening, located directly to the south-east of the new building. On this basis, there is no objection in terms of parking provision.

7.15 The applicant is in contact with the County Council's Sustainable Transport Adviser regarding new travel survey work for the entire campus, and both parties have agreed that this would make sense to be undertaken post-construction (i.e. 2017).

### 7.16 Impact upon Residential Amenity

The location of the application site away from residential property (almost 90m to the nearest rear garden boundary of Anderson Close) means that there will be no loss of outlook or privacy arising from the proposal. Hours of construction will be enforced by planning condition. The nearest residential blocks within the campus are closer (approximately 58m) but given the intervening buildings, the impacts arising from demolition and construction can be adequately mitigated via planning condition.

### 7.17 Landscaping

The proposals are accompanied by a detailed planting schedule, with six separate areas for new landscaping. These will be:

- Areas 1 & 2 - two new planting beds around the existing open area known as The Quad, which will frame the setting of the pedestrian entrance into the new block. New hard-surfacing will provide pedestrian linkage across this area with external seating areas and down-lighting.
- Area 3 – a linear bed of planting along the western elevation of the new block.
- Areas 4 & 5 – two separate borders around the Asquith Building and College North, further softening the main pedestrian walkway.
- Area 6 – this area will provide 12 new trees located around a series of remodelled external seating areas adjacent to the football pitch.

In addition to the above, 17 trees will be lost to the development with 51 new specimens planted around the campus. The ratio accords with the Council's Tree Policy. At the time of report-writing 2 further specimens that were due to be retained adjacent to the new block were instead identified for replacement by 2 more 'upright' specimens. Subject to precise details, this minor change is considered acceptable.

7.18 The Council's Tree Protection Officer has been a participant in the pre-application process. Her objection at the time of writing this report is a technical objection, due to the fact that the proposal does not provide a full Arboricultural Implications Assessment (AIA). This outstanding AIA is anticipated to be submitted before the Committee date, and it is expected to reflect the principles that have been agreed during the pre-application stage. A verbal update will be provided.

## **8.0 Planning Obligations**

8.1 There are no planning obligations required for this proposal.

## **9.0 Conclusions**

- 9.1 The University's Lancaster Campus has suffered due to poor legibility, wayfinding and poorly designed (1960/1970) building stock. The Gateway Building has improved this at the Bowerham Road end of the site. It is anticipated that the proposed Teaching Hub will have a similar, positive effect upon the campus at the Coulston Road part of the site.
- 9.2 Subject to the planning conditions listed and satisfactory resolution of the landscaping and highway matters, this is a scheme that will provide improved educational accommodation and it will deliver an enhanced public realm and setting to existing, important buildings. Notwithstanding future phases of the eventual Campus Masterplan, this stand-alone phase can now be supported.

## **Recommendation**

That subject to the satisfactory receipt of the Arboricultural Implications Assessment, and the removal of the outstanding highway objection, Planning Permission **BE GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard 3 year consent
2. Development as per approved plans
3. Prior to construction (not including demolition or site clearance) details of the following materials and finishes to be agreed:
  - All external materials and finishes to all buildings, including samples of elevational and roofing materials (the latter to include projection, soffit and fascia details);
  - All windows, doors and rainwater goods;
  - Depth of recess of horizontal flashings at floor levels;
  - Curtain-walling, including the vertical mullions/fins and projecting frame to the walling; zinc cladding and louvres;
  - Finish of the newly-exposed north-east elevation of the Asquith Building;
  - The dormer and entrance lobby to the Asquith Building;
  - All hard landscaping, floor surfaces and boundary treatments (including details of the retaining walls/plinth, steps, fixings, copings, mortar/pointing (including a sample panel), gabion wall, handrail, external lighting and seating features; and,
  - Paint colour of the cast iron railings.
4. Development to accord with the Arboricultural Implications Assessment (due to be submitted)
5. Landscaping and tree planting to accord with Planting Schedule
6. The four replacement parking spaces to be provided prior to the building being brought into first use
7. Scheme to accord with Construction Management Plan, including hours of construction (0800-1800 Monday to Friday and 0800-1400 Saturday, No working Sunday or Bank Holidays) and Scheme for Dust Control
8. Standard unexpected land contamination condition

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

In accordance with the above legislation, the City Council can confirm that it 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.

<b>Agenda Item</b> A6	<b>Committee Date</b> 19 October 2015	<b>Application Number</b> 15/00876/FUL
<b>Application Site</b> Land North Of Saddler Nook Lane Whittington Lancashire	<b>Proposal</b> Installation of arrays of 2.7m high PV panels, underground cabling, inverter and transformer cabinets, substation, control room, 2m high deer proof fencing and CCTV mounted on 3.5m high masts, together with construction of internal access roads to form a solar farm	
<b>Name of Applicant</b> Mr Alexander Miejimolle	<b>Name of Agent</b>	
<b>Decision Target Date</b> 9 November 2015	<b>Reason For Delay</b> N/A	
<b>Case Officer</b>	Mr Philip Megson	
<b>Departure</b>	No	
<b>Summary of Recommendation</b>	Approval	

## **1.0 The Site and its Surroundings**

- 1.1 The proposed application site is approximately 10.1 hectares and comprises agricultural land, located north of Saddler Nook Lane, Whittington. The site is 1km north west of Whittington and 2km south west of Kirkby Lonsdale.
- 1.2 The site is split into two separate fields by a dry stone wall. The western site slopes gently downwards towards the east; the northern part of the eastern site slopes gently downwards towards the south; and the southern part slopes gently downwards towards the north. The boundaries of the site comprise dry stone walls, with intermittent mature trees and low hedges. Existing gates permit access to each field.
- 1.3 The site is bounded to the north and west by agricultural fields and to the east by Saddler Nook Lane and to the south by an unnamed road linking Whittington and Burton-in-Kendal.

## **2.0 The Proposal**

- 2.1 The principal elements of the proposed development are as follows:

Solar arrays – Fixed solar PV panels, mounted on metal frames and set into the ground by piling. The panels are non-reflective. They would be arranged in east-west rows and are tilted southwards at approximately 25-30 degrees from the horizontal, with a maximum height above ground of approximately 2.7m to the top of the panel frame on level ground. The lower edge of the array would vary in height above ground, but would be generally between 0.7m and 0.9m above the ground level, which would allow grazing beneath and around them or would promote biodiversity. There would be approximately a 5m gap between the rows of panels.

Inverters and transformers – PV panels generate direct current (DC) electricity, which must be converted to usable alternating current (AC) power for the electricity distribution network. This is done by inverters. Each megawatt (MW) capacity also requires a transformer to increase the AC

current from low voltage to high voltage for efficient transportation around the site and to the point of grid connection. These components are stored in cabinets which are approximately 12.8m length x 2.5m width x 3.1m height.

Sub-station – This would consist of two pre-fabricated cabins, located next to each other. One would be for the internal connection of the electrical output from the site, with the other required by the Local Distribution Network Operator (ENW) for connection into the wider electricity network via underground cables (a grid connection agreement with ENW has been secured). The former would be 5.9m long, 2.9m wide and 3.5m high including a 400mm concrete platform whilst the latter would be 5m long, 4.5m wide and up to 4m in height, including a 400mm platform.

Control Room – A control room would be situated next to the substation buildings near the northern boundary of the site. The control room would be a single storey building and would measure up to 12.2m length x 4.1m width x 2.9m height.

Fencing – A security/deer fence up to 2m high is required around the perimeter of the solar farm. The fence would be welded mesh with steel/wooden posts.

Lighting – No permanent lighting is proposed. Manually operated lights may be attached to the substation and transformer and/or inverter cabinets in the event of an emergency maintenance visit being required in the hours of darkness.

CCTV – Twenty four infra-red security cameras would be located around both sites, at a height of approximately 3.5m.

- 2.2 Existing vegetation that forms the boundaries to the site would be augmented by additional boundary planting to mitigate the landscape and visual impacts of the proposed development. Particular reinforcement would be made to south and south west facing boundaries to mitigate the visual impacts of the arrays that would be exacerbated by the sloping nature of the site.
- 2.3 The proposed development will generate up to 5 megawatts (MW) of electricity, which is capable of supplying electricity up to 1,375 homes.
- 2.4 The operational life of the solar farm is expected to be 30 years, the anticipated time that the development will be economically viable. When the solar farm ceases operation it would be decommissioned and the site would revert to the agricultural current use.

### **3.0 Site History**

- 3.1 The only relevant site history relates to the current proposal.

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
15/00682/PRETWO	Installation of a solar farm	Pre-application advice

### **4.0 Consultation Responses**

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

Consultee	Response
<b>Environmental Health</b>	No adverse comments, advisory notes or recommendations
<b>Tree Protection Officer</b>	No objection to the proposed development subject to conditions relating to subject to the submission and approval of a Tree Works Schedule and carrying out works in accordance with the submitted Arboriculture Implications Assessment and Arboriculture Method Statement.
<b>South Lakeland DC</b>	No comments received
<b>Burton in Kendal PC</b>	Extremely concerned about the route chosen for the construction traffic. Request the applicant consider alternative routes to the site from M6.
<b>Casterton PC</b>	Strongly objects to the proposed development on grounds of traffic; visual impact and

	substantial harm to the character and appearance of this rural area, and impact on tourism.
<b>Whittington PC</b>	Support renewable energy generation and need to reduce dependency on fossil fuels but object to the proposed development. The proposed development will cause significant harm to the character of the Lune Valley and its environs with attendant loss of visual amenity to its residents and visitors. Construction traffic will impact on highway safety.
<b>Kirkby Lonsdale TC</b>	Observations made relate to the scale of development; semi industrial use; fencing / lighting; no dwellings directly affected by the development; development can be viewed from one small stretch of road; no light pollution; change to rural character; potential cumulative issues; screening is supported; support renewable energy development in principle.
<b>County Highways</b>	No objection subject to conditions to reduce the impact of the construction phase on the local highway network.
<b>Lead Local Flood Authority</b>	No objection subject to conditions relating to development is in accordance with the submitted Flood Risk Assessment; appropriate surface water drainage scheme to be submitted; No Occupation of Development until completion of SuDS in accordance with agreed SuDS Scheme and Management & Maintenance Plan; Surface Water Lifetime Management and Maintenance Plan; and Construction Phase Surface Water Management Plan Approval
<b>GM Ecology Unit</b>	Concerned that there is only a 5m stand off from Pinfold Brook to the solar farm (recommend 8m). The Applicant has accepted the GM Ecology Unit recommendation and submitted an amended plan to give an 8m stand off from the Brook to the solar farm. The enhancement measures are limited. The proposed wildflower grassland is not included in the Landscape Strategy Plan. Details of long term management proposals are required.
<b>CPRE</b>	No comments received
<b>RSPB</b>	No comments received
<b>MOD Safeguarding</b>	No safeguarding objections
<b>NATS</b>	NATS (En Route) Public Limited Company (“NERL”) has no safeguarding objection to the proposal.
<b>Civil Aviation Authority</b>	No comments received
<b>BAE Systems Warton</b>	Supports the response of the MOD
<b>Blackpool Airport</b>	No comments received
<b>Air Ambulance</b>	No comments received
<b>County Archaeology</b>	The proposed development site is c. 100m north of the supposed line of the Over Burrow to Watercrock Roman road line. It is however considered that the impact of the proposals on the overall road route will be negligible. No further archaeological work is recommended.
<b>Historic England</b>	The development has the potential to impact on grade II listed buildings and their settings. No adverse impact on grade II* Sellet Hall.
<b>Natural England</b>	No objection on biodiversity grounds. Consider that the proposed development would not have a significant direct impact upon the Yorkshire Dales National Park and proposed extension, Forest of Bowland AONB and Arnsdale & Silverdale AONB due to distance and the intermediate landscape / features.
<b>Environment Agency</b>	No comments
<b>Friends of Eden, Lakeland &amp; Lunesdale Scenery (FELLS)</b>	FELLS has found the proposal difficult to assess and reach a clear conclusion but confirm that the array would not be seen directly from any dwelling in the area; the array would be hidden (to all intents and purposes) from all local viewpoints and local footpaths; there would be little direct impact on heritage assets or on important wildlife; and apart from the construction period, there should be little disturbance caused by the array. FELLS recognise that the impact will be very high on regular users of the road to and from Burton in Kendal, that the quality of the landscape in and around the application site was acknowledged in the area of search for the YDNP extension as having “High to Very High Sensitivity” and that the whole district is popular for vacations.

**5.0 Neighbour Representations**

5.1 At the time of writing 3 representations in support and 137 objections have been received from neighbours and others with an interest in the area. The grounds for objection may be summarised as follows:

- Contrary to national and local planning policy
- Adverse impact (and cumulative impacts) on landscape and visual amenity, including views from nearby landscape features and designations
- Inadequate information to assess landscape and visual impacts
- Detrimental impact on biodiversity
- Potential for ground and noise pollution arising from the proposal
- Inappropriate development for a greenfield site – solar panels should only be located on brownfield sites or roofs
- Loss of high grade agricultural land quality for an upland area (grade 3);
- Adverse traffic impacts / rural roads unable to support traffic movements
- Adverse impact on tourism and the wider economy;
- Proposal is a response to current subsidies from Central Government;
- Community benefits are being offered to Parish Councils to secure acceptance of the proposal

**6.0 Principal National and Development Plan Policies**

6.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

14 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

17 – Core Planning Principles

Section 10 Meeting the Challenge of Climate Change (particularly paragraphs 93 and 97)

6.2 Lancaster District Core Strategy Policies

SC1 – Sustainable Development

SC5 – Achieving Design in Quality

ER7 – Renewable Energy

E1 – Environmental Capital

6.3 Development Management DPD Policies:

DM7- Economic Development in Rural Areas

DM17 – Renewable Energy Generation

DM20 – Enhancing Accessibility and Transport Linkages

DM25 – Green Spaces and Green Corridors

DM27 – Protection & Enhancement of Biodiversity

DM28 – Development & Landscape Impact

DM29 – Protection of Trees Hedgerows & Woodland

DM30 – Development Affecting Listed Buildings

DM31 – Development affecting Conservation Areas

DM32 – The Setting of Heritage Assets

DM35 – Key Design Principles

6.4 Other Material Considerations

Lancashire Landscape Character Assessment

National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) 013 - The particular planning considerations that relate to large scale ground-mounted solar voltaic farms.

Two extensions to the Yorkshire Dales National Park (YDNP) are proposed by means of Variation Orders: Yorkshire Dales North and Yorkshire Dales West. The latter would include Leck Fell and the Upper Lune Valley to the north of Kirkby Lonsdale. The Inquiry into the proposal was held in June 2013 but a decision has yet to be issued. The Orders will not take effect unless they are confirmed (with or without modifications) by the Secretary of State.

The applicant is offering community benefits (£5,000 per annum for 20 years) to the most affected Parish and Town Councils (Whittington, Hutton Roof and Kirkby Lonsdale).

## **7.0 Comment and Analysis**

7.1 The main material considerations arising from the development are:

- the principle of the proposal, including versatility of the agricultural land;
- landscape and visual impact;
- impact on ecological assets;
- impact on heritage assets;
- traffic and highways considerations; and
- impact on residential amenity.

## 7.2 The principle of the proposal

7.2.1 In assessing proposals for any energy development, including solar farms, it should be recognised that access to an economically viable and technically feasible grid connection is a key driver to site selection process. The applicant has secured a grid connection agreement with ENW to connect to the existing 11/33kV electricity network. The search area for a site to accommodate the proposed development was restricted to 1km either side of the electricity line and, in line with policy requirements, avoided land that is subject to ecology, heritage and landscape designations. Whilst policy gives preference to previously developed sites, the applicant identified no suitable non-agricultural or previously developed sites within the search area. The applicant has undertaken a detailed analysis of all available agricultural land within the search area. Seven sites were identified by the applicant. Taking into account all technical, environmental and planning considerations, and the willingness of land owners to host a solar farm, the application site emerged as the applicant's preferred site for the proposed development. The area of the application site is 10.1 hectares.

7.2.2 Both the NPPF (paragraphs 97 and 98), Policy ER7 of the adopted Core Strategy and Policy DM17 of the adopted Development Management DPD are supportive of renewable energy developments provided that the direct and indirect impacts arising are (or can be made) acceptable.

7.2.3 National Planning Practice Guidance (paragraph 013) advises that, although the use of previously developed land is preferable, local authorities, when considering applications for solar farms on greenfield land, should consider whether

- (i) the proposed use of any agricultural land has been shown to be necessary and poorer quality land has been used in preference to higher quality land; and
- (ii) the proposal allows for continued agricultural use where applicable and/or encourages biodiversity improvements around arrays.

7.2.4 The quality of the land at the application site is classed as grade 3b. In a national context, the best and most versatile agricultural land is classed as grades 1, 2 and 3a. Grade 3b represents higher quality agricultural land in the local context. The solar farm would be a temporary structure. Planning conditions will secure the removal of the installations when no longer in use and restoration of land to its previous use should planning permission be granted for the proposal.

7.2.5 Paragraph 5.2 of the submitted Design and Access Statement states that the site could be used for grazing (e.g. sheep) between and around the arrays, subject to agreement with the landowner, and the planting of species rich grasses and wildflowers, which would represent a biodiversity improvement.

7.2.6 It is considered that the proposed development is acceptable in principle.

## 7.3 Landscape and Visual Impact

7.3.1 The site and its immediate adjoining landscape is not covered by any landscape designations. In the wider context the Arnside & Silverdale AONB lies over 8km to the west, the Forest of Bowland AONB lies over 7km to the south of the site and the Yorkshire Dale National Park (YDNP) lies over 6km to the east and north.

- 7.3.2 Within the localised context of the site vegetation cover forms a key component with a number of small hills and drumlins accentuating the undulating landscape. Established, managed hedgerows are interspersed with established hedgerow trees. Low drystone walls define the boundaries of the field network. Extensive mature wooded areas and woodland belts also exist within the localised context. A small established copse is situated to the north eastern corner of the site and a number of scattered mature trees are located just beyond the western site boundary and throughout the localised landscape.
- 7.3.3 The proposals will maintain the existing field boundaries and include further reinforcement to existing hedgerows where gaps exist to ensure that a robust and a consistent landscape buffer is achieved between the proposed development and the wider setting. A woodland belt and new hedgerow is included along the southern edge. Further woodland copses are proposed on the south western edges and hedgerows are included adjacent to Saddler Nook Lane and Pinfold Beck watercourse. Internally the existing field network will be retained with the internal stone walling separating the two fields being retained. The proposals have also been set a suitable distance from Pinfold Beck, which is to be retained in full and will include enhancements in the form of appropriate wetland wildflower species to promote biodiversity.
- 7.3.4 Guidance recommends that the cumulative effects of proposals should be considered against similar schemes which are in operation, under construction, consented or in planning awaiting a decision. There are currently no operational or proposed solar farms (or wind farms) located on sites that are inter-visible with the application site that would give rise to issues of cumulative impact.
- 7.3.5 It is considered that the development can therefore be integrated within this landscape without significant adverse cumulative effects upon the either the landscape character or visual setting.
- 7.4 Visual Impact
- 7.4.1 The applicant's landscape consultants have prepared a Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) model to illustrate the inter-visibility of the proposed development and the wider area. The ZTV shows that the site is visually contained. Within a 1km radius of the site views of the proposed development are limited to approximately 50% of the area, with views predominantly restricted to within much of the first 0.5km of the localised area and a number of small areas of localised high points.
- 7.4.2 The site could be viewed from Saddler Nook Lane for a length of approximately 735m. Parts of the site would also be viewed from the unnamed road running between Whittington and Burton in Kendal for a length of approximately 750m. Existing trees and hedgerows on the unnamed road frontage provide partial screening. It is proposed to reinforce screening by additional planting and, particularly, in the south west corner of the site. The local topography assists in mitigating views of the site from the north west. To the north, the site could be viewed from a section of Gallowber Lane, which runs between Hutton Roof and the A65 to the west of Kirkby Lonsdale.
- 7.4.3 Beyond these areas to the north, north west and south west there are no potential views of the site, with the exception of a small area on the highest part of Hutton Roof Crags.
- 7.4.4 Theoretical views of the proposed development are available to the north east, east and south east from approximately 3km to 5km from the site, beyond the River Lune, and is more apparent due to the higher ground rising up from the river valley towards the western edge of the YDNP. Beyond the 5km radius theoretical views to the east and south east diminish somewhat due to the extent of intervening topography and distance involved.
- 7.4.5 Should the extension to the YDNP go ahead, the boundary of the YDNP would be 2km from the site. The ZTV indicates that the nearest parts of the extended YDNP that would be affected by views of the proposed development would be in excess of 3km from the site. The proposed extension to the YDNP would include Casterton Fell. The proposed development would impact on views of Casterton Fell, from the unnamed road running between Whittington and Burton in Kendal. The significance of the impact on Casterton Fell from this road is mitigated by distance (9-10km).
- 7.4.6 It is considered that the proposed development would not have a significant visual impact on the YDNP, proposed extension to the YDNP and the Arnside & Silverdale and Forest of Bowland AONBs due to boundary screening (existing and proposed), distance and intervening landscape features.



## 7.5 Impact on Ecological Assets

7.5.1 There are potential impacts during construction on the following assets:

- Birds;
- Bluebell;
- Several trees with features characteristic of bat roosts are present within or adjacent to site boundaries; and
- Foraging habitats for Badgers.

7.5.2 There is one record for the presence of badgers within a 1km radius of the application site at West Hall Park (Big Wood). There is suitable habitat on site for foraging badgers, some of which would be lost to the proposed development. It is considered unlikely that badgers currently use the site due to a lack of evidence found during survey, and historic records. However, suggested precautionary mitigation would prevent the loss of foraging opportunities. In mitigation, security fencing would be raised to 0.1m above ground for a 0.3m width, at approximately 100m intervals around the boundary of the site to allow the continued movement of badgers across the site to continue any use of the site for foraging and commuting.

7.5.3 No impacts on reptiles, amphibians, or other mammals such as otter or water vole, are envisaged as the habitats present on site are not considered suitable for supporting these species. Rare invertebrate species are not likely to be present on site due to current pastoral land use. These species are unlikely to be affected by the proposed development.

7.5.4 The applicant is proposing the following mitigation measures:

- Retention of the woodland in the north east corner of the site with a 5m buffer;
- Minimum 5m boundary between existing boundaries and the proposed security fence to allow for hedgerow strengthening post-construction and to prevent damage to marginal woodland habitat and also the bluebell associated with it close to the site boundary;
- Minimum 8m buffer (in response to comments of GM Ecology Unit) throughout the length of Pinfold Beck to prevent shading and allow for management of the scheme;

In addition, specific measures are proposed for birds, bats and mammals.

## 7.6 Impact on Heritage Assets

7.6.1 Documentary and archaeological sources do not record any heritage assets within the site. The proposed development has the potential to have an impact upon designated heritage assets and their settings in the area around the site. Historic England is satisfied that the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on Whittington Castle (Scheduled Monument); and Church of St. Michael, Whittington, Whittington Hall and Sellet Hall (all Grade II\* Listed Buildings).

7.6.2 It is considered that the proposed development would not have an impact on the settings of Grade II Listed Buildings and the Whittington Conservation Area due to the limited Zone of Visual Influence of parts of the development, and due to the screening effects of trees and hedges.

## 7.7 Traffic and Highways Considerations

7.7.1 The Highways Authority considers that the location of the site and the low impact that the development would have on traffic movements in the area would not give rise to any objection on highways grounds but during the construction phase seek, through the imposition of planning conditions, to reduce the impact of the construction phase on the local highway network.

7.7.2 During the construction period, a site access will be constructed for a temporary compound area at the eastern end of the site in the position of a pair of existing field gates. The existing drystone wall would be reduced to, and maintained at, a height of 1m to ensure adequate visibility for the drivers of vehicles entering and leaving the site. The layout of the development would include provision for vehicles to enter and leave the site in a forward gear.

7.7.3 When the solar farm is operational, subject to the granting of planning permission, the only vehicle movements would relate to both monitoring and maintenance, which are likely to occur every two weeks. The inverters and transformers would be monitored remotely by telemetry.

## 7.8 Residential Impact

7.8.1 The array would not be seen directly from any dwelling in the area.

7.8.2 There are no properties immediately adjoining the site. The closest properties are Lane House situated approximately 700m to the east on Hosticle Lane, High House Farm situated approximately 700m to the south east on the edge of Whittington, and Sellet Hall situated approximately 750m to the east opposite the junction of Saddlers Nook Lane, High Biggins Manor situated 850m to the north east and a row of properties of The Moorlands approximately 1km to the west.

## 8.0 Planning Obligations

8.1 There are no planning obligations to consider as part of this application. However, the developer would need to enter into a section 278 agreement with Lancashire County Council to secure the delivery of the required off site highway measures: Temporary highway signage and advanced warning signs alerting drivers to the likelihood of large slow moving vehicles at the following junctions:

- A6070 (Burton Road) at its junction with the C522 (Dalton Lane)
- C522 (Hutton Roof Road) at its junction with the C593 Saddler Nook Lane)

## 9.0 Conclusions

9.1 The Council supports proposals for renewable energy subject to where the direct and indirect impacts are or will be made acceptable. Areas of the site are identified as being Grade 3b according to the agricultural land classification; as such it is a locally important resource. The proposed development would be temporary and the land would be returned to its previous use at the end of the solar arrays' viable life.

9.2 The site and its immediate adjoining landscape is not covered by any landscape designations. The proposals will maintain the existing field boundaries and include further reinforcement to existing hedgerows where gaps exist to ensure that a robust and a consistent landscape buffer is achieved between the proposed development and the wider setting. There are no other solar farms, either existing or proposed, near to the site.

9.3 The Zone of Theoretical Visibility shows that the site is visually contained. Within a 1km radius of the site views of the proposed development are limited to approximately 50% of the area, with views predominantly restricted to within much of the first 0.5km of the localised area and a number of small areas of localised high points. Existing trees and hedgerows along the unnamed road running between Whittington and Burton in Kendal provide partial screening, which would be reinforced by additional planting and, particularly, in the south west corner of the site. The local topography assists in mitigating views of the site from north west.

9.4 Theoretical views of the proposed development are available to the north east, east and south east from approximately 3km to 5km from the site, beyond the River Lune. Beyond the 5km radius theoretical views to the east and south east diminish due to the extent of intervening topography and distance involved. It is considered that the proposed development would not have a significant visual impact on designated landscapes and on the proposed extension to the Yorkshire Dales National Park.

9.5 The Council's ecology consultants advise that the ecological impacts of the proposed development could be satisfactorily mitigated. The proposal would not have an adverse impact on heritage assets.

9.6 The Highways Authority has no objection to the proposed development on highway grounds but seeks, through appropriate planning conditions to reduce the impact of the construction phase on the local highway network.

9.7 The array would not be seen directly from any dwelling in the area.

9.8 The landowners are willing and able to host the solar farm and will continue agricultural practices alongside the solar farm.

**9.0 Recommendation**

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

1. Standard 3 year timescale.
2. Development in accordance with approved plans.
3. Ecology: Provision of 8m stand off to Pinfold Beck; and submission and approval of long term Management Plan.
4. Submission and approval of Tree Works Schedule; approved Arboriculture Implications Assessment and Arboriculture Method Statement to be implemented.
5. Submission and approval of a scheme indicating the type and distribution of all new trees and hedgerows to be provided to reinforce boundary planting.
6. Highways and Traffic: Construction Method Statement; access dimensions and paving, vehicle manoeuvres in forward gear, visibility splays on Sadler Nook Lane, offsite highway improvements.
7. Surface Water Drainage: development in accordance with the submitted FRA; appropriate surface water drainage scheme to be submitted; no occupation of development until completion of SuDS in accordance with agreed SuDS Scheme and Management & Maintenance Plan; Surface Water Lifetime Management and Maintenance Plan; and Construction Phase Surface Water Management Plan Approval.
8. Removal of the solar installation at the end of its operational life and restoration of site to previous use.

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

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

**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"><b>Agenda Item</b></p> <p align="center">A7</p>	<p align="center"><b>Committee Date</b></p> <p align="center">19<sup>th</sup> October 2015</p>	<p align="center"><b>Application Number</b></p> <p align="center">15/00847/OUT</p>
<p align="center"><b>Application Site</b></p> <p align="center">Warton Grange Farm Farleton Close Warton Carnforth</p>	<p align="center"><b>Proposal</b></p> <p align="center">Outline application for the demolition of existing farm buildings and erection of up to 23 dwellings with associated landscaping and access</p>	
<p align="center"><b>Name of Applicant</b></p> <p align="center">Mr Mike Barker</p>	<p align="center"><b>Name of Agent</b></p> <p align="center">Harrison Pitt Architects</p>	
<p align="center"><b>Decision Target Date</b></p> <p align="center">Time extension agreed until 30<sup>th</sup> November 2015</p>	<p align="center"><b>Reason For Delay</b></p> <p align="center">Amended Plans / negotiation with the applicant</p>	
<p><b>Case Officer</b></p>	<p align="center">Mr Mark Potts</p>	
<p><b>Departure</b></p>	<p align="center">No</p>	
<p><b>Summary of Recommendation</b></p>	<p align="center">Approval</p>	

## **1.0 The Site and its Surroundings**

- 1.1 The application site relates to an area of land of approximately 0.96 hectares and is currently used as a working dairy farm. The proposed development is located to the south of the village and is located approximately 1.35km from Carnforth train station. There are a number of existing agricultural sheds (serving cattle farming) that occupy the site, and the majority of the site is surfaced in tarmac and concrete.
- 1.2 The neighbouring uses comprise of residential properties to the north and west which lie on Main Street and Farleton Close. The majority of these properties are traditional stone built terraced units. Open fields are located to the south and east. The site rises to approximately 6.5 metres at its highest point and circa 5 metres at its lowest point, therefore it is relatively level with a slight fall to the south. Access to the site would be taken from the existing farm access off Farleton Close.
- 1.3 The proposed development is within the Arnside & Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB); is designated as a Countryside Area, and lies within Flood Zones 2 and 3 (the site benefits from flood defences). The existing trees within the site are subject to Tree Preservation Order 551. The site is approximately 360m south of Warton Crag which is designated as a Regionally Important Geological Site, in part a Biological Heritage Site, Nature Reserve, Ancient Woodland and Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). It is also subject to Limestone Pavement Orders. There is also a Scheduled Ancient Monument located on Warton Crag and a grade II listed building at 5, Main Street, Warton. Morecambe Bay is located approximately 650m to the west and is designated as a SSSI, Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Ramsar Site.

## **2.0 The Proposal**

- 2.1 The proposed development consists of the demolition of the existing farm buildings to be replaced by the erection of up to 23 dwellings, an improvement to the existing access, the provision of a new footway, car parking, drainage and associated landscaping.
- 2.2 The application is in outline form, with only access being applied for. An indicative plan has been submitted showing an arrangement of 23 units, mainly terraced blocks with one detached unit. At

this stage members are only approving the principle of development, not the form as illustrated on the submitted plan.

- 2.3 Access is being applied for, this will consist of the enlargement of the existing farm access track to 5.5m together with the provision of a footway of 2m. It is also proposed to have a new footway to the east of the site which would be on the line of the existing farm access. This is proposed to be 2m in width and connect to Main Street.
- 2.4 The vast majority of the existing trees on the site will remain and where there are losses these are proposed to be replaced.

**3.0 Site History**

- 3.1 The site has been subject to a number of planning applications

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
14/00012/FUL	Replacement of existing agricultural building with a steel framed agricultural building for livestock, storage and workshop	Approved
12/00182/AD	Erection of a silo clamp	Prior Approval Granted
12/00938/FUL	Erection of a slurry storage tank	Approved
08/01424/OUT	Outline application for agricultural workers dwelling	Refused
08/00838/CU	Retrospective application for the retention of use of land for siting of a temporary agricultural workers caravan	Approved
07/01652/CU	Retrospective application for the retention of use of land for siting of a temporary agricultural workers caravan	Refused
07/00260/FUL	Retention of a temporary agricultural workers caravan	Withdrawn

**4.0 Consultation Responses**

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

Consultee	Response
<b>Lancashire County Council (Highways)</b>	Initially raised an objection on the basis that the applicant had not provided a suitable means of access. Following amended plans, <b>No Objection</b> , however reservations with regards to adopting lengths of carriageway which lies beneath a public sewer.  In addition to standard conditions, they recommend off site highway improvements comprising the closure of the farm access opposite 17 Main Road and reinstatement of verge/footway, complete with signage and a new 2m-wide pedestrian means of access; hedgerow management at the junction of Mill Lane/ Farleton Close down to 1m height for a distance of 40m from the site’s access point and Farleton Close; a range of off-site improvement works including laying of stop/give way thermoplastic lining; upgrade of 2 public transport facilities to Lancashire County Council quality bus stop standards; and a review of street lighting in the vicinity.
<b>Environmental Health</b>	<b>No Objections</b> , conditions requested include electric charging points for vehicles; dust control and also hours of construction. The Council’s Contaminated Land Officer has concerns with some of the content of the contaminated land report, however this can be addressed by condition. No information on odour has been submitted with the application.
<b>Planning Policy</b>	<b>No Objection</b> , the principle of redevelopment of this site for housing is accepted, however has raised concern with flood risk and insurance.
<b>Lead Local Flood Authority</b>	<b>No Objection</b> subject to development being carried out in accordance with the submitted drainage strategy.
<b>Lancashire Fire and Rescue</b>	<b>No Objection</b>
<b>Lancashire Police</b>	<b>No Objection</b> - concern with the large car parking bays as initially proposed.

<b>Warton Parish Council</b>	<b>No Objection</b> - recommend conditions concerning affordable homes, landscaping, construction of a footpath and affordable housing should be for local people.
<b>Arnsdale and Silverdale AONB Unit</b>	<b>No Objection</b> , - the AONB Management Plan prioritises housing development that meets local affordable housing need, failure to do so would be contrary to National and Local Planning Policy. The provision of affordable housing should be included as part of development of this site and the mix should meet the local identified need.
<b>Environment Agency</b>	<b>No Objection</b> subject to finished floor levels being a minimum of 6.17m Above Ordnance Datum. This is a further 700mm above the predicted 1 in 1000 year flood level and will increase flood resilience further.
<b>City Council Drainage Engineer</b>	<b>No Objection</b>
<b>Natural England</b>	<b>Object</b> – due to increasing pressure on the SAC/SPA/RAMSAR/SSSI and impact upon SPA birds which may use the fields that adjoin the south and eastern boundary of the proposed development as supporting habitat.
<b>Greater Manchester Ecology Unit</b>	Observations awaited and will be verbally reported.
<b>Strategic Housing Officer</b>	<b>No Objection</b> , but the scheme should deliver 30% of on-site affordable housing, in the form of 50% intermediate and 50% social rented housing.
<b>United Utilities</b>	<b>No Objection</b> subject to conditions protecting the existing sewer that crosses the site and also other drainage conditions.
<b>Lancashire County Council Education</b>	<b>No Objection</b> , however recommend a contribution of <b>£36,253</b> for 2 places for secondary school provision.
<b>Tree Protection Officer</b>	<b>No Objection</b> subject to the imposition of conditions.
<b>Public Realm Officer</b>	<b>No Objection</b> however recommends that a financial contribution of <b>£10,000</b> for off-site improvements in addition to incorporating the existing amenity space into the proposed development is secured.

## **5.0 Neighbour Representations**

- 5.1 To date there has been **2** letters received, one neither objects, nor supports the application, but raises concern regarding the highway relationship with Farleton Close. The other letter - whilst not averse to the development - has concerns, regarding an incorrect red line plan (which has been corrected), the positioning of some of the units in relation to existing properties, noise, potential vermin issues and over-development of the site.

## **6.0 Principal National and Development Plan Policies**

### **6.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**

Paragraphs 7, 12, 14 and 17 - Sustainable Development and Core Principles  
Paragraph 32, 34 and 38 Access and Transport  
Paragraphs 49, 50 and 55 - Delivering Housing  
Paragraphs 56, 58, 60, 61 and 64 – Requiring Good Design  
Paragraphs 69,70, 72 and 73 – Promoting Healthy Communities  
Paragraph 103 – Flooding  
Paragraphs 109, 115,117,118 – Conserving the Natural Environment  
Paragraphs 128-134 – Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment  
Paragraphs 186, 187, 196, 197, 203-206 – Decision-taking

### **6.2 Lancaster District Core Strategy (adopted July 2008)**

SC1 – Sustainable Development  
SC4 – Meeting the District’s Housing Requirements  
SC7 – Development and the Risk of Flooding

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

E3 – AONB  
E4 – Countryside Area

6.4 Development Management DPD

- DM20 – Enhancing Accessibility and Transport Linkages
- DM21 – Walking and Cycling
- DM22 – Vehicle Parking Provision
- DM26 – Open Space, Sports and Recreational Facilities
- DM27 – Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity
- DM28 – Development and Landscape Impact
- DM29 – Protection of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland
- DM32 – The Setting of Designated Heritage Assets
- DM35 – Key Design Principles
- DM38 – Development and Flood Risk
- DM39 – Surface Water Run-off and Sustainable Drainage
- DM41 – New Residential dwellings
- DM42 – Managing Rural Housing Growth

6.5 Other Material Considerations

- National Planning Practice Guidance
- Meeting Housing Needs Supplementary Planning Document
- Lancaster City Council 2014 Housing Land Supply Statement
- Landscape Character Assessment, Lancashire County Council (2000)

**7.0 Comment and Analysis**

7.1 The application raises a number of issues and therefore the main elements of consideration include the following matters;

- Principle of Development and Housing Needs
- Flood Risk and Drainage
- Design and Amenity
- Landscape
- Highways
- Ecology
- Trees and Hedgerows
- Open Space and Education
- Other Material Considerations

7.2. **Principle of Development and housing needs**

7.2.1. The site is home to an existing dairy farm which includes various steel framed buildings, many in very close proximity to existing properties on Main Street and Farleton Close. The applicant has an alternative site at Cotestones which is 1km away, and it is proposed to relocate the business there, with the surrounding fields remaining in agricultural use as pastureland. The previous planning history of the application site suggests considerable investment in the business, including a slurry storage tank (discussed later in this report) and replacement agricultural buildings. Notwithstanding this each application has to be assessed on its merits and given there is a commitment from the applicant that the operations will be re-located to Cotestones and the land around the site will continue to be farmed for agriculture, this is considered acceptable.

7.2.2 DM DPD Policy DM42 identifies Warton as a sustainable settlement where new housing could be supported in principle provided it meets a local housing need. The policy does state that regard should be had to the Arnside and Silverdale AONB DPD. Work has commenced on this document however it is not yet at an advanced stage. Once adopted the DPD will seek to identify sites for the delivery of new housing. Until such time that the AONB DPD is adopted, development proposals will be expected to give material consideration to all policies within the DM DPD and the NPPF. The application is for major development in a protected area (as set out in NPPF paragraph 116), but is acceptable in principle at this location because of the opportunity to meet local housing needs on previously-developed land without an adverse impact on the environment or encroachment into the undeveloped AONB . When combined with the shortfall of housing supply as described above, the principle of the redevelopment of this site for housing is therefore considered acceptable.

- 7.2.3 Policy DM41 supports 'sustainable' residential development where the environment, services and infrastructure can or could be made to accommodate the impacts of expansion and that proposals provide an appropriate dwelling mix in accordance with the Council's housing needs evidence and policy guidance. Policy DM42, clauses IV to VIII, expand on a range of specific requirements for rural housing, designed to ensure that new residential development on non-allocated sites is well related to its surroundings. The site relates well to the existing built form of Warton and is considered that the scale of the development is proportionate to the character of Warton. Whilst Natural England object to the development, none of the other consultees raise objection with the proposal, and therefore on balance it is considered that this is a site that can accommodate this form of development. It is also considered at reserved matters stage a scheme can be devised which demonstrates good siting and design which will enhance the character and quality of the landscape.
- 7.2.4. In terms of housing needs, it is considered that the scheme is in relative accordance with the Housing Needs Survey undertaken for the AONB. Whilst layout is not being applied for the applicant has included a selection of units that will include 1-4 bedroom properties. The development appears to create a farmstead-type development with the terraces of buildings akin to converted barns. There is no strategic housing objection and the overall mix of housing is appropriate.
- 7.2.5 The AONB Partnership, together with the Parish Council have raised concerns regarding whether the units will be affordable in line with development plan policies. The applicant has committed to providing 30% of the units to be affordable which equates to 7 units. This would make a small but valuable contribution to the affordable housing needs of the local area. Any deviation from providing 30% would need to be evidenced by a financial viability assessment if this figure was not to be proposed. This would be examined at reserved matters stage.

### 7.3 **Flood Risk and Drainage**

- 7.3.1. According to the Environment Agency's flood map the site lies in Flood Zones 2 and 3 and an area that benefits from flood defences. Flood Zone 3 is defined as having a high probability of flooding in the NPPG. Ordinarily developments in this flood zone would only be permitted whereby the Sequential and Exception Tests had been fulfilled in line with guidance.
- 7.3.2 This site is somewhat different however as the detailed topographical survey shows the proposed dwellings are on land which is above 5.47m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD) and this places them above the 1 in 1000 year predicted on site Tidal Level. Furthermore the finished floor levels will be set to a minimum of 6.17m AOD, and this is a further 700mm above the predicted 1 in 1000 year flood level and will increase flood resilience further (albeit the EA have only requested that levels need to be 600 mm above 5.47m). This also raises the proposed dwellings above the 1 in 100 year *plus climate change* predicted flood level. Given this it is not considered in the circumstances that the applicant needs to undertake a Sequential Test as according to the topographic survey the levels where the properties are proposed would be - in essence - Flood Zone 1 (low risk of flooding). The Environment Agency raise no objection and agree with the applicant's assertions with respect to levels, and given the discrepancies in terms of levels relative to the Flood Zone classification it is considered that there is no requirement for the development to pass the Sequential Test and/or Exception Test. It is also considered given the Environment Agency raise no objection to the scheme and agree with the levels of the site, that gaining buildings and contents insurance would be possible to allow this to be a deliverable site.
- 7.3.3 Overall there would be a significant decrease in areas of impermeable surfacing (in the region of 72%), with surface water run-off taken out of the existing combined sewer and diverted to a local watercourse and SUDs features are proposed to deal with surface water drainage. Given the above, and the betterment that will be achieved, it is considered that that the proposal in terms of flood risk and drainage is acceptable, a view that is supported by Environment Agency, United Utilities, Lead Local Flood Authority and the Council's own Drainage Engineer. It is considered that planning conditions addressing finished floor levels and drainage strategies can be imposed to ensure that an acceptable form of development occurs.
- 7.3.4. There is a United Utilities sewer that crosses the site, and concern was originally raised from United Utilities as to whether the proposed layout had considered the pipeline and associated 3m wide easement. As part of the amended plans the development has taken account of its route and easement, with only the access crossing the pipe/easement. United Utilities raise no objection



subject to the imposition of conditions regarding protection of this pipe (to be addressed by informative note) and also surface water drainage conditions. A planning condition is recommended regarding foul water also.

### 7.4 **Design and Amenity**

7.4.1 Layout is not being applied for, but the applicant has submitted an indicative layout for up to 23 units. Initially one further was proposed but given concerns in terms of the layout this has been since been removed, as have amendments to the parking arrangements, boundary treatments and the positioning of some of the plots. This application is only for approval of the principle of the development. Whilst the design would not be acceptable in its current format the final design will be considered at any Reserved Matters stage and it is considered that the amenity of those residents along Main Street and Farleton Close can be protected via a sensitively designed scheme, using appropriate materials and strong boundary treatments befitting of the sites location within the AONB.

### 7.5 **Landscape**

7.5.1. Special consideration is required in terms of whether the proposed development is acceptable in landscape terms given the AONB status of the land. Planning policy is explicit in its protection of nationally important protected landscape designations, AONBs are afforded the same protection as National Parks, and in view of this the applicant has submitted a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) as part of this application.

7.5.2. During the construction process it is considered that there will be some minor adverse landscape impacts when viewed from certain viewpoints. However overall it is considered that a sensitively designed scheme has the potential to offer a landscape gain in landscape terms once built out and the landscaping established. The AONB Partnership also echo this view in that redevelopment of the site as proposed has the potential to improve the visual amenity of this part of the village. It is therefore concluded that whilst there may be some short term minor adverse impacts during construction, once the development has been completed with the associated landscaping established, a beneficial effect in landscape terms should occur and therefore it is considered that the scheme accords with Policy DM28 of the DM DPD 'Development and Landscape Impact'.

### 7.6 **Highways**

7.6.1 An initial objection from the highway authority has been overcome by the provision of an access which is 5.5m with an associated footway of 2m. The County Council have recommended a number of conditions as reported in Section 4.1. These conditions are considered necessary and reasonable to make the development acceptable and the applicant is amenable to the elements of off-site highway work that have been requested from them. A new footway is proposed on the route of the secondary farm access to the east of the site, this will be of benefit not only to new residents however by other pedestrians in Warton Village who may wish to cut through the site for instance to access the village centre.

7.6.2 The Parish Council have requested that provision is made for a footway to Millhead along Mill Lane, given the existing footway is not appropriate. This will be reported further at committee following discussions with the County Council.

7.6.3 The County have raised reservations with regards to adopting lengths of carriageway with an easement and public sewer running beneath them. This is noted, however the applicant may well wish to divert the existing sewer, or failing this, as long as the roads are built to an adoptable standard in line with Lancashire County Council advice, the site could be a private estate and a management company could be set up to maintain the roads, and therefore the County's concerns are noted however there is a solution. It is considered an informative note be attached to the grant of any planning permission should make the applicant aware of this, together with a management company to be set up to be secured by Section 106 Agreement.

### 7.7 **Ecology**

7.7.1 The application site is located at its closest point approximately 650m from the Morecambe Bay RAMSAR/SPA/SAC/SSSI boundary. There are fields, roads, a train line and residential dwellings between this and the application site. The designations are used throughout the year for a wide

range of bird species. In summer, areas of shingle and sand hold breeding populations of terns, whilst very large numbers of geese, ducks and waders not only overwinter, but (especially for waders) also use the site in spring and autumn migration periods. The bay is of particular importance during migration periods for waders moving up the west coast of Britain.

- 7.7.2 Natural England raise an objection to scheme on the basis that there is likely to be an increase in people using Warton Marsh which is less than 1km from the site, and given it supports important wader roosts these species are sensitive to disturbance by walkers and dogs and therefore the integrity of the designation could be undermined. Natural England state that the Marsh is subject to access restrictions under the Countryside Rights of Way Act (2000), but this is not being adhered to by the local population. They are also concerned that there will be an increase in disturbance to birds that may use the adjacent fields (to the south and east). Natural England consider that these fields may be used as supporting habitat by overwintering SPA birds.
- 7.7.3 In terms of the first issue the designated boundary is at its closest point 650 metres away from the boundary of the application site, it is considered that whilst that an additional 23 households in this location has the potential to lead to more people walking and dog walking on the Marsh, in reality, it is unlikely to be any greater than already occurs, and given the site is subject to access restrictions these should be made clearer and/or enforced, and dog walkers should ensure dogs are on leads to limit any potential disturbance. For people wishing to walk there is more likelihood of people utilising the designated public footpaths in the vicinity of the site and walking to Warton Crag or via footpath 1 into Millhead for example.
- 7.7.4 Natural England are also concerned regarding the use of the adjacent fields by birds connected to the SPA, and that the use of the site for a residential use may mean there is potential for disturbance. The applicant in their ecology appraisal undertook a desk based assessment which did not show any records of birds utilising the fields to the south of the site. However, that is not to state that this does not happen, and the applicant has not undertaken any vantage work, or walkover surveys to confirm this is the case. Notwithstanding this, the footprint of the development is essentially the same as the existing farm operation on the site. Whilst not being applied for at this stage the applicants have proposed additional tree planting to the south of the site which will act as a further screen to these fields. Natural England consider that the construction work alone has the potential to cause disturbance and the potential to displace birds, and the applicants have not considered the effect on SPA birds using the surrounding fields once the development is occupied.
- 7.7.5 The use of the site as a dairy is considered to be on a par in respect to noise and disturbance as the proposed use of the site for a residential use. One of the letters of representation has stated that the site is relatively noisy. Whilst Natural England's comments are noted, it is not considered that the development will create any further disturbance than is already the case, furthermore once the development is constructed and the landscaping implemented, a net gain could be delivered.
- 7.7.6 As a means of alleviating some of Natural England's concerns, it is recommended that homeowner packs could be issued to all new occupiers, an information board erected on the Warton Grange site setting out the adjacent fields may be used by species in connection with the designated site, (together with notices advising dogs to be kept on leads on land within the applicants control at Cotestones Farm and Warton Grange Farm) and as part of the construction process a scheme for education of the contractors should occur, aimed at minimising disturbance during the construction process. Conditions should be attached in connection with construction noise, dust and the use of hoarding adjacent to the site during the construction process could also be imposed. With these measures in place it is considered there will be no likelihood of significant effects arising from the proposals either on its own or in combination, and whilst Natural England's concerns are understood it is considered that there would be no likelihood of significant effects arising from this development.
- 7.8 **Trees and Hedgerow**
- 7.8.1. The vast majority of the trees will remain; some losses will occur to facilitate the access, and some whereby they prohibit the development of some of the units. Whilst landscaping is not being applied for, the applicant has shown where compensatory planting can occur. Overall there will be a net gain by this development including a new landscaped boundary to the eastern and south-eastern side. The council's Tree Protection Officer raises no objection subject to conditions and it is considered that at reserved matters stage a well devised landscaping scheme can be secured which provide a high level of greening and screening but have public amenity benefit and wildlife value.

7.9 **Open Space and Education Provision**

7.9.1 The County Council in their role as education authority for Lancashire has requested that as part of this development a contribution of £36,253 is sought, which is for 2 secondary places, the County are not requesting any contribution towards primary education. The applicant is amenable to the contribution and this can be secured by Section 106.

7.9.2 The Council's Public Realm Development Manager has no objections on the basis that 436.8m<sup>2</sup> of open space is provided, together with the contribution of £10,000 for off-site provision, together with linking the existing amenity space (which is currently a grassed square located adjacent to 13 Main Street) into the proposed development. The applicant is amenable to the request, however the land in question is unregistered land and not within the control of the City Council, although it is the understanding that this land may be within the ownership of Warton Parish Council. Because the land would be outside the control of the applicant and outside the application boundary it is considered that this cannot be secured by way of condition. A legal agreement could be used, however the landowner would need to be party to this agreement, which may not be forthcoming. Whilst it may be preferable to tie this land into the proposal, resisting the development on the basis that this may not occur cannot be a reason for refusal. In view of this it is considered that discussions should be had with the Parish Council as to whether they are amenable to this land being integrated with the applicant's proposal for open space and considered at reserved matters stage.

7.10 **Contaminated Land**

7.10.1 Given the historic nature of the farming activities on the site the application is supported by a Phase 1 land contamination assessment. The report identifies a limited number of sources of potential contamination on site including the storage and use of substances on site associated with the operation of a dairy, potentially deleterious materials from infrastructure and two areas of unknown fill material. The report concludes that a phase 2 intrusive survey should occur. The Council's Contaminated Land Officer has highlighted some issues with the report but has suggested conditions are imposed, these are considered reasonable to protect the future users of the site.

7.11 **Other Material Considerations**

7.11.1 There is a slurry lagoon tank on land located outside of this application boundary, (the associated pipework does encroach within the application boundary – Ref 12/00938/FUL). The applicants have stated in their submission that this tank will remain as the applicants will continue to farm the fields in the locale and it is not essential that it needs to be pumped directly from within the farm site. A planning condition on that permission requires if the farm is no longer operating this should be removed. The applicant has stated that farming operations will be undertaken on land at a different site located 1km away, however it is noted that the adjacent fields will be used for farming. It is therefore considered an informative note is attached to the permission reminding the applicant of the need to remove the tank should the farm be demolished and made way for the development subject to this application. A condition could be imposed on any reserved matters application.

**8.0 Planning Obligations**

8.1 The applicant is amenable to securing the following requirements by way of legal agreement.

- The provision of up to 30% of affordable housing to be based on a 50:50 (social rented : shared ownership) tenure split as required by policy (percentage, tenure, size, type, phasing to be address at Reserved Matters stage based on local housing needs and viability);
- The payment of **£36,253** towards the provision of 2 secondary school places;
- Contribution of **£10,000** towards offsite amenity space/equipment;
- Long term maintenance of open space, drainage and landscaping.
- Off-site mitigation in respect of deterring dog walking on land within the control of the applicant at Cotestones Farm.

With Committee's support, Officers seek delegation to ensure that the Section 106 Agreement is signed within the agreed extended period for decision-making (i.e. before 30 November 2015).

## **9.0 Conclusions**

9.1 The application site offers the unique opportunity of being able to deliver sustainable housing on a brownfield site within the AONB which will deliver properties that will meet a local housing need. The Council does not have a five year housing land supply and as such the application should be considered in the context of sustainable development. This means granting planning permission unless adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, or specific policies in the NPPF indicate development should be restricted.

9.2 It is considered that the proposal is acceptable in terms of residential amenity, flooding and drainage, highway safety, ecology and landscape terms and will make a valuable contribution to meeting the housing needs of the Arnsdale and Silverdale AONB. Taking all matters into consideration, it is not considered that any adverse impacts of granting consent significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits and there are no specific policies in the NPPF that indicate development should be restricted. As such, it is considered that the proposal represents a sustainable form of development and accords with the National Planning Policy Framework.

## **Recommendation**

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

1. Reserved Matters to be submitted
2. Development in accordance with the approved plans
3. Details to be submitted to show access
4. Scheme for off-site highway works to be submitted
5. Protection of visibility splays
6. Scheme for foul water provision
7. Surface water drainage scheme to be submitted
8. Finished floor levels are set no lower than 700mm above 5.47m above Ordnance Datum (AOD).
9. Development in accordance with flood risk assessment
10. Construction Method Statement to include demolition statement
11. Protection of trees and development to be carried out in accordance with the submitted AIA
12. Tree works schedule
13. Scheme submitted for ecological mitigation
14. Scheme to be submitted for electric vehicle charging points
15. Standard contaminated land condition
16. Contaminated land – Importation of soils, materials and hardcore
17. Prevention of new contamination

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

Lancaster City Council has made the recommendation in a positive and proactive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development, working proactively with the agent 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**

1. 12/00938/FUL, Erection of a slurry storage tank at Warton Grange Farm Farleton Close Warton Carnforth Lancashire LA5 9PE

<b>Agenda Item</b> A8	<b>Committee Date</b> 19 October 2015	<b>Application Number</b> 15/01014/FUL
<b>Application Site</b> Former Focus Do It All Westgate Morecambe Lancashire	<b>Proposal</b> Demolition of existing building and erection of a retail warehouse with associated access, car parking and landscaping	
<b>Name of Applicant</b>	<b>Name of Agent</b> Mr Kirill Malkin	
<b>Decision Target Date</b> 12 November 2015	<b>Reason For Delay</b> N/A	
<b>Case Officer</b>	Mr Philip Megson	
<b>Departure</b>	Yes	
<b>Summary of Recommendation</b>	Approval (subject to the submission of amended plans)	

## **1.0 The Site and its Surroundings**

- 1.1 The 0.76 hectare application site is located on the south side of Westgate. It is occupied by a vacant unit (formerly occupied by Focus Do It All) towards the front of the site. The existing former Focus Unit, with maximum dimensions of 85m length x 36m wide x 7.2 m high, is constructed in brick (front elevation) and brick (lower) and corrugated panel (upper) to the side. There is limited car parking to the front and the east side, with the majority of the parking provision at the rear. The site is located within the White Lund Industrial Estate. The surrounding area is predominantly industrial in nature. Immediately to the west, south and east of the building lie various industrial and commercial uses, with a focus on car repair garages and associated uses. To the north of Westgate are residential properties.

## **2.0 The Proposal**

- 2.1 The proposed development involves the demolition of the existing vacant Focus retail unit (2,620 square metres floor space Gross Internal Area) and the erection of a retail warehouse (Class A1) at Westgate, Morecambe. The proposed development comprises 2,415 square metres of floor space (Gross Internal Area), associated access, parking, servicing and external works.
- 2.2 The proposed unit would be set back from the road to allow the customer to see the car park and safely park away from Westgate. The store would have would have maximum dimensions of 55m length x 50m width and 7m high except for a sign and entrance tower on principal elevation of the building, which would be 9.2m high. Excluding the entrance tower, the massing would be less than the existing vacant unit.
- 2.3 The external envelope of the building would be a double portal frame with an external skin of brick piers with render in between at low level to 3.6m and vertical ribbed cladding above on all elevations, except for the sign and entrance tower, which would be predominantly curtain glazing.
- 2.4 The proposed parking provision is 92 car parking spaces (including four parent and child spaces), six disabled car parking spaces, five motorcycle spaces and 14 cycle spaces. Landscaping is proposed on the Westgate frontage and to the rear of the neighbouring premises to the west.

2.5 The proposal would create 70 full time equivalent jobs.

**3.0 Site History**

3.1 Relevant site history is set out below:

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
1/79/1597	Erection of a building for retail builder's merchants/DIY and garden supplies with car parking	Approved
1/80/190	Erection of a retail builder's merchants building with car parking.	Approved
03/01594/FUL	Variation of Condition 2 (range of goods to be sold)	Approved

3.2 The first two planning consents (reference 1/79/1597 and 1/80/190) contained a condition limiting the range of goods to be sold. This condition was varied in February 2004 (reference 03/01594/FUL) and permitted the following goods to be sold: builders' merchant supplies; DIY supplies and equipment including tools; garden supplies and equipment including tools and accessories and all products ancillary to these; furniture, textiles and appropriate accessories; electrical and gas appliances and equipment including lighting equipment and accessories and all products ancillary to these; carpets, tiles and flooring coverings and all products ancillary to these; decorating supplies and equipment and all products ancillary to these; and pets and ancillary products. Condition 3 of the permission limits the sale of pets and pet related products to no more than 600 square metres, with condition 4 also imposing an additional 600 square metres restriction on the area used for the sale of furniture, home furnishings, textiles and carpets.

**4.0 Consultation Responses**

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

Consultee	Response
<b>Environmental Health</b>	No objection. Recommends an hours of construction condition
<b>County Highways</b>	No objection. Recommends conditions relating to vehicles entering and leaving site in a forward gear, secure cycle and motorcycle parking and off-site highway works
<b>Lancashire Fire &amp; Rescue</b>	Provides advice on need to meet requirements of relevant building regulations
<b>United Utilities</b>	No objection. Recommends condition requiring submission and approval of scheme for the disposal of surface water.

**5.0 Neighbour Representations**

5.1 At the time of writing one representation in support of the proposed development has been received citing the removal of an eyesore.

**6.0 Principal National and Development Plan Policies**

6.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)  
 Paragraph 14 Presumption in favour of Sustainable Development  
 Paragraphs 18 and 19 Building a strong competitive economy  
 Paragraphs 24, 26 and 27 Out of centre proposals

6.2 Development Management DPD Policies  
 DM1 Town Centre Development  
 DM15 Employment Land and Premises  
 DM20 Enhanced Accessibility and Transport Linkages  
 DM22 Vehicle Parking Provisions  
 DM23 Transport Efficiency and Travel Plans  
 DM35 Key Design Principles

### Appendix B Car Parking Standards

- 6.3 Lancaster District Core Strategy Policies  
SC1 Sustainable Development  
SC5 Quality in Design  
ER2 Regeneration Priority Area  
ER3 Employment Land Allocations  
ER4 Town Centres and Shopping  
ER5 Retail Development  
ER7 Renewable Energy  
E1 Environmental Capital  
E2 Transportation Measures
- 6.4 Lancaster District Local Plan  
Saved Policy EC5 Existing Employment Areas.
- 6.5 Emerging Land Allocations DPD  
Draft policy EMP2 White Lund Employment Area  
Draft policy RPA1 Regeneration Priority Areas

## **7.0 Comments and Analysis**

- 7.1 The main material considerations arising from the development are:
- The principle of the development
  - Sequential testing
  - Retail impact

### 7.2 Background

- 7.2.1 The applicant is to redevelop the currently vacant unit to provide a new, purpose built Home Bargains store that will satisfy the retailer's commercial requirement for additional representation in the Morecambe and Lancaster area. Home Bargains currently has stores in Morecambe Town Centre (Euston Road) and Lancaster City Centre (Marketgate Shopping Centre), which are in the smaller 'in centre' format. The proposed Westgate store would be significantly larger than the 'in centre' format aimed at car borne customers. Home Bargains has confirmed their intention to retain the existing town centre store, and trade two stores within the Morecambe catchment area. The proposed development will give rise to up to 70 new full time equivalent jobs and local investment in excess of £5 million.

### 7.3 The Principle of Development

- 7.3.1 White Lund has been identified as an area for general employment uses (Class B uses and those sui generis uses of an employment nature) for a number of years. The thrust of emerging policy (Land Allocations DPD Preferred Options), is to retain White Lund as an area for general employment purposes and a Regeneration Priority Area.
- 7.3.2 Policy DM15 states that *"proposals which involve the use of employment land for alternative uses will only be permitted where...The re-use of employment land meets the wider regeneration objectives set out in the Local Plan or where the benefits of the proposal outweighs the loss of the site for employment purposes"*.
- 7.3.3 The site has been in a retail use for over 30 years with the range of goods on offer restricted by condition to specified types of non-food goods. The existing vacant Focus store closed in May 2011 when the retailer entered administration, resulting in the loss of 25 local jobs, and has remained vacant since that time. The proposed development therefore offers an opportunity to bring the site back into active economic use, contributing positively to the local economy.
- 7.3.4 The proposed development is, in policy terms, in an out of centre location. Therefore the key to whether the proposed development is acceptable is whether a proposal can pass the requirements of the sequential test. Provided that there are no sequentially preferable sites, the proposed development is acceptable in principle.

- 7.3.5 The Home Bargains business model means that for a product to be sold it has to be between 10% and 30% cheaper than elsewhere. As such approximately, 70% of the retailer's stock is regular lines, while the other 30% changes continually.
- 7.3.6 The company's core product range is focused on the following: household goods; home furnishings; furniture and furnishings; health and beauty products; toys and games; baby products; seasonal products (including Christmas decorations); and ancillary ambient food and drink products. Whilst there is some overlap with the range of goods which is permitted by the existing planning permission, the range of goods to be sold from the proposed store is more diverse: health and beauty products, toys and games, baby products, food and drink, and some clothing products would form part of the offer.
- 7.3.7 Food and drink would be limited to no more than 30% of the proposed floor space (724 square metres) with non-food products being sold from the remaining 70% of the proposed floor space (1,691 square metres).
- 7.4 Sequential Testing
- 7.4.1 Paragraph 24 of the NPPF states that Local Planning Authorities "*should require applications for main town centre uses to be located in town centres, then in edge of centre locations and only if suitable sites are not available should out of centre sites be considered. When considering edge of centre and out of centre proposals, preference should be given to accessible sites that are well connected to the town centre*".
- 7.4.2 Policy DM1 of the Development Management DPD requires applicants to demonstrate that the sequential test has been applied to development proposals for main town centre uses which are not located in town centre locations, as set out in paragraph 24 of NPPF.
- 7.4.3 Home Bargains business model is to devote 70% floor space to non-food items and 30% floor space to food and drink. The applicant contends that this complete product range is necessary to attract customers to the store; that it is not possible to disaggregate the product range between alternative smaller units as it would not provide the required critical mass of products within the store; and that it is not viable to exclude any of the above goods from being sold at the retail unit.
- 7.4.4 A recent Secretary of State decision on the interpretation of what "suitable" means in practice is relevant to the proposed development (APP/G2815/V/12/2190175). The Inspector noted that "*if a site is not suitable for the commercial requirements of the developer in question then it is not a suitable site for the purposes of the sequential approach*". The same decision also addressed whether there is a requirement to assess the scope for disaggregation of the scheme. The Inspector stated that "*there is no longer any such requirement stated in the NPPF... had the Government intended to retain disaggregation as a requirement it would and should have explicitly stated this in the NPPF. It is too large a point to rest on implication. If it had been intended to carry on with the requirement then all that would have been required is the addition of the word "disaggregation" at the end of NPPF [24]*".
- 7.4.5 The applicant's agent undertook a survey of all vacant units within and on the edge of Morecambe Town Centre on 10 June 2015. The survey demonstrated that there were no vacant units that were suitable to accommodate the proposed development within the centre or in the edge of centre locations.
- 7.4.6 The Lancaster Retail Park (Sunny Cliff Retail Park) at Mellishaw Lane is located out of centre. The survey demonstrated that there were no vacant units that were suitable to accommodate the proposed development within that retail park.
- 7.4.7 The Bay Shopping Park, adjacent to the existing Morrison's store in Morecambe is currently under construction. This is likely to be open in Spring 2016. This retail park will offer 7,500 square metres of unrestricted retail floor space. For the purposes of the sequential test this site is not available. It is understood that a direct competitor to Home Bargains has secured space within the retail park, which has resulted in a commercial restriction on any other national non-food discount retailers occupying space.
- 7.4.8 It is considered that the application site complies with the requirements of the sequential approach



as set out in paragraph 24 of the NPPF.

### 7.5 Retail Impact

7.5.1 The Local Plan does not set a threshold for the assessment of retail impact. The amount of retail floor space proposed (2,415 square metres) falls below the threshold of 2,500 square metres where a retail impact assessment is required (paragraph 26 of NPPF). Notwithstanding, the applicant has provided a high level assessment of impact that is proportionate to the scale of development proposed.

7.5.2 Consistent with an accepted like-for-like approach to trade diversion, the store would attract a bulk of its turnover from other large format retailers that are capable of providing a similar product range within their stores, such as large food stores and discount food stores, and mixed goods discount retailers of a comparable scale and offer. The proposed store would attract 20% of its trade from two nearby Aldi stores, 45% from Sainsbury's, Morrison's and a number of retailers at Central Drive Retail Park, 25% from existing retailers within Morecambe Town Centre and 10% from other similar provision beyond the Morecambe core catchment area. The impact on Morecambe Town Centre, with a 1.1% trade diversion in 2018, would not represent a significant adverse impact, but through appropriate use of conditions this impact can be minimised.

### 7.6 Other matters

7.6.1 The proposed car parking provision complies with the City Council's Car Parking Standards, though the applicant has not brought forward advice provided at the pre-application stage regarding its layout and landscaping and therefore both elements are conditioned accordingly. Likewise advice provided on design has not been brought forward, with the submitted plans being unacceptable in design terms. Amended plans are being sought in this regard and a condition is recommended regarding materials and finishes.

7.6.2 The Highways Authority has requested improvements to local bus stops and the introduction of unspecified traffic calming measures. In the applicant's opinion these measures are unnecessary having regard to the limited impact of the proposed development compared to the previous use. The Highways Authority maintains that improvements to the bus stops are necessary and that an automatic speed survey should be undertaken by the developer to inform whether or not "speed reducing features" are a necessary element of the off-site highway works.

7.6.3 The proposed development is expected to generate approximately 96 two-way trips in the weekday afternoon peak period and 118 two-way vehicle trips in the Saturday peak period. Compared to the previous use (former Focus Store) the proposed development is expected to result in a small reduction in vehicular trips (11 trips) in the weekday afternoon peak and a small increase in vehicular trips (3 trips) in the Saturday peak period. It is considered that impact of the proposed development would be broadly neutral compared to the former use. It would not have a material impact upon the safety or operation of the surrounding local highway network.

7.6.4 In these circumstances it is considered that improvements to the nearest bus stops, while desirable, are not necessary to make the development acceptable in highways terms. The Highways Authority has not evidenced the need for speed reduction measures and, therefore, not necessary for the development to proceed.

7.6.5 In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework 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. In order of priority, drainage options are an adequate soakaway or infiltration system, then a watercourse, and then a sewer.

7.6.6 The applicant is proposing to drain surface water into a main sewer. The drainage options available to deal with surface water appear to be limited, however, the Applicant will need to satisfy the Local Lead Flood Authority that no alternative means of means of surface water drainage is practicable. It is proposed to deal with the means of surface water drainage by condition.

### **8.0 Planning Obligations**

8.1 There are no planning obligations to consider as part of this application. However, the developer would need to enter into a section 278 agreement with Lancashire County Council to secure the

delivery of the required off site highway works.

## **9.0 Conclusions**

- 9.1 The proposed development will give rise to up to 70 new full time equivalent jobs and local investment in excess of £5 million in a Regeneration Priority Area. Application of the retail sequential test demonstrates that there are no suitable alternative sites available in Morecambe centre or edge of centre locations. As such, the proposed development is acceptable in principle. The impact of the proposed development on Morecambe Town Centre, with a trade diversion of 1.1% in 2018, is not significant.
- 9.2 The assessment of the proposed development has recognised that the site has been in a retail use for over 30 years with the range of goods on offer restricted by condition to specified types of non-food goods. The assessment has taken into account the business model of Home Bargains and that the format would be complementary to the existing 'in centre' format of the operational Home Bargain stores. White Lund has been identified as an area for general employment uses (Class B uses and those sui generis uses of an employment nature) for a number of years. Emerging policy proposes a continuation of these uses at White Lund.
- 9.3 To avoid the policy position at White Lund being diluted and any town centre being more adversely impacted, it is considered that the total amount of floor space should be limited by condition to 2,415 square metres of floor space (Gross Internal Area) and the proportion of food, drink and clothing to be limited by condition to no more than one-third of the total floor space. Should the occupier vacate the site in the future, the Council would then be able to control future development at the site.

## **Recommendation**

Subject to the submission of amended plans that satisfy the design concerns raised, that Planning Permission **BE GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard 3 year timescale
2. Development in accordance with the list of approved plans
3. Hours of construction – 0800-1800 Mon to Fri and 0800-1400 Sat only  
Hours of deliveries – 0730 and 1900 Monday to Saturday and 1000 to 1600 Sundays and Public Holidays
4. Hours of opening - 0700 to 2200 Monday to Saturday and 1000 to 1800 Sundays and Public Holidays
5. Highway condition relating to vehicles entering and leaving site in a forward gear, secure cycle and motorcycle parking
6. Submission and approval of surface water drainage scheme
7. Restriction on the amount of total amount of floor space 2,415sq.m (Gross Internal Area) and restrict the amount of food, drink and clothing to no more than one-third of the net sales floor space
8. Landscaping scheme and maintenance
9. Notwithstanding plans - materials and finishes to be agreed
10. Notwithstanding plans – car parking layout to be agreed

## **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 account of other material considerations which are presented in full in the report, it is considered 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.

<b>Agenda Item</b>  A9	<b>Committee Date</b>  19 October 2015	<b>Application Number</b>  15/00091/FUL
<b>Application Site</b>  Land To The Rear 38 To 42 North Road Nile Street Lancaster Lancashire	<b>Proposal</b>  Erection of a 3 storey building for student accommodation comprising of one 3-bed cluster, one 4-bed cluster, two 5-bed clusters and five 1-bed studios	
<b>Name of Applicant</b>  Bayt Ltd	<b>Name of Agent</b>  Mr Michael Harrison	
<b>Decision Target Date</b>  20 October 2015	<b>Reason For Delay</b>  N/A	
<b>Case Officer</b>	Mrs Eleanor Fawcett	
<b>Departure</b>	No	
<b>Summary of Recommendation</b>	Refusal	

## 1.0 The Site and its Surroundings

- 1.1 This application relates to an area of mostly vacant land located to the rear of a terrace of three 3-storey former Georgian houses which front onto North Road within Lancaster City Centre. The site is currently divided by a large stone wall, to the south east of which is land associated with a planning approval in 2014 for the change of use of the upper floors of 38-42 North Road to student accommodation. This proposal also included a three storey rear extension. The site is accessed off Nile Street, which is a cul-de-sac mainly serving an industrial building to the north east of the site and the fire station to the north west.
- 1.2 The site is located within the Lancaster Conservation Area and to the south west is St. John's Church (1755) which is Grade II\* listed. The adjacent buildings fronting onto North Road are also considered to positively contribute to the Conservation Area. There are no trees within the site, although there are some close to the boundary within the adjacent church yard. Along this boundary there is a concrete panel fence on approximately half its length, with a lower stone wall adjacent to this within the church yard. The remainder of the boundary comprises a larger stone wall, approximately 3m in height, which continues along the north western boundary with the fire station. This appears to be the remnants of a former building on the site. A small part of the site, closest to North Road, is within the Lancaster Air Quality Management Area (AQMA).

## 2.0 The Proposal

- 2.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a building to form student accommodation. It was originally proposed to be predominantly four-storey, with three and two storey elements, comprising five shared cluster flats and five separate studio flats. Following concerns regarding the scale of the development and the amenity of future residents, amended plans have been received which reduce the majority of the building to three storeys, maintaining a two-storey element. The level of accommodation now proposed comprises four shared cluster flats and 5 studio flats.
- 2.2 The building is proposed to front onto Nile Street, set back from the main part of the carriageway, with a gate at ground floor in the centre of the elevation leading to an internal courtyard and access to the various parts of the accommodation. This external space is proposed to be shared with the

previously approved and implemented student accommodation scheme in the upper floors and extension of the adjacent building fronting onto North Road. It is proposed to have shared bicycle and bin storage within this courtyard, and there will also be access from an existing underpass within the building fronting onto North Road.

2.3 The building would be three storey fronting Nile Street, comprising a gable and pitched roof slope extending up to the boundaries of the neighbouring properties to the north east and south west. To the rear of the gable, the building would extend up to the boundary with the church yard, resulting in windows predominantly facing south east onto the courtyard, with an additional three storey projection to the north west. An additional smaller three-storey gable projection is proposed to the rear of the pitched roof slope facing Nile Street, with a two storey element attached to this, extending towards the existing two storey extension at the rear of 38-42 North Road, leaving a gap of 1.9m. The building is proposed to be predominantly stone, with most of the north elevation finished in render, and the roof finished in slate.

**3.0 Site History**

3.1 There is no recent planning history on the whole of the site. However, there has been a proposal for the conversion of the upper floors of 38-42 North Road to student accommodation, which included a rear extension and the use of some of the application site for access, bicycle and bin storage. There has also been an application relating to the ground floor of this building. The relevant details are set out below:

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
15/00496/CU	Retrospective application for change of use of ground floor shop (A1) to mixed retail unit and professional services (A1 and A2).	Pending Consideration
13/01246/CU	Change of use of upper floors, demolition of rear outriggers, erection of three storey rear extension to provide for 10 student rooms and 1 self-contained studio, and alterations to shop front	Approved

**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 conditions requiring: a construction management plan; creation of a length of footway between the application site and Nile Street; details of secure cycle storage facilities.
Environmental Health	No objection subject to conditions requiring: standard thermal double glazing and ventilation; a preliminary risk assessment in relation to contaminated land; and standard contamination conditions.
Historic England	No objection in principle, but considers that the current scheme causes harm to the setting of St John's Church through the scale of the development and its design. Awaiting response in relation to amended plans.
Conservation Officer	Concerns regarding the height, scale and massing of the building, including the overall footprint, in addition to some of the design elements given the proximity of the site to a II* Listed Building and location within the Conservation Area.
Lancaster Civic Society	Welcome the development of a near-derelict site and find the overall exterior design acceptable, with a sympathetic choice of materials. However, the height of the four storey element will dominate the adjacent Grade 2* listed St John's Church, especially when viewed from Chapel Street and North Road.
Georgian Society	No comments received within the statutory consultation period.
Churches Conservation Trust	No comments received within the statutory consultation period.
Lead Local Flood Authority	Not listed in the 'When to Consult the LLFA' document or in the Development Management Procedure Order 2015.

<b>Parking and Administration</b>	The applicant should be advised that the occupiers of the property will not be eligible for residents parking permits for the Lancaster City Council Residents Parking Scheme – Central Zone A.
<b>United Utilities</b>	No comments received within the statutory consultation period.
<b>Lancashire Constabulary</b>	In order to reduce the risk of the types of crimes affecting the students living within the proposed development suggest various security measures.

**5.0 Neighbour Representations**

5.1 None 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 124 – Air Quality Management Areas  
 Paragraphs 131 – 134 and 137 – Designated Heritage Assets  
 Paragraph 135 – Non-designated Heritage Assets

6.2 Lancaster District Core Strategy (adopted July 2008)

SC1 – Sustainable Development  
 SC5 – Achieving Quality in Design  
 SC6 – Crime and Community Safety

6.4 Development Management Development Plan Document

DM20 – Enhancing Accessibility and Transport Linkages  
 DM22 – Vehicle Parking Provision  
 DM29 – Protection of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland  
 DM31 – Development Affecting Conservation Areas  
 DM32 – The Setting of Designated Heritage Assets  
 DM33 – Development Affecting Non-Designated Heritage Assets or their settings  
 DM35 – Key Design Principles  
 DM46 – Accommodation for Students

Appendix D: Purpose Built and Converted Shared Accommodation  
 Appendix F: Studio Accommodation

6.5 Other Material Considerations

Section 66 of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended states that the local planning authority shall have regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. Section 72 sets out that special attention should be paid to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area.

**7.0 Comment and Analysis**

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

- Principle of development
- Scale, design and impact on heritage assets
- Impact on amenity of neighbouring properties
- Standard of Accommodation
- Highway Safety
- Impact on trees

## 7.2 Principle of development

7.2.1 The use of the application site for student accommodation is acceptable in principle. It is situated in a central sustainable location, close to local services and facilities. It is also within walking distance of the Bowerham Campus of the University of Cumbria and close to good bus routes to Lancaster University. The need for student accommodation in the city centre is identified within the DM DPD and Policy DM46 sets out criteria by which proposals will be assessed.

## 7.3 Scale, design and impact on heritage assets

7.3.1 The site is located within the Lancaster Conservation Area and adjacent to the Grade II\* St John's Church. It is to the rear of existing three-storey properties fronting onto North Road, although the site is visible from this road across the church yard. The proposal would cover a large proportion of the site, extending up to four of the boundaries. Although the proposal has changed in terms of scale and composition, the footprint is still similar to that originally proposed, with the building moved slightly off the boundary with the churchyard.

7.3.2 Given the importance of the adjacent listed building, Historic England has been consulted. St John's Church was possibly designed by Henry Sephton and was consecrated in 1755. The west tower was designed by Thomas Harrison and added in 1784, with minor alterations in the 19th and 20th century and the church is vested in the Churches Conservation Trust. It is designed in a Georgian style with urbane character and was built at a time of prosperity and expansion in the city of Lancaster.

7.3.3 In response to the original plans, Historic England raised concerns regarding the scale of the proposed development and the impact on the II\* Listed church. They set out that, in a historic area such as Lancaster, there is a hierarchy of development with taller principal buildings to the main routes and smaller scale subservient buildings to the rear and that the proposed scale of the development runs contrary to this historic pattern. Historic England considered that the scheme represented an overdevelopment of the yard to the rear of North Road, which is overbearing to the eastern side of St. John's Church. They advised that this domination of the church would be alleviated by the reduction of the scale of the development by one storey and by the building being set back from the churchyard boundary. Concerns were also raised regarding the blank elevation to the churchyard which further emphasises the scale and overbearing qualities of the development and recommended that this elevation have some form of articulation. Historic England has been consulted on the amended proposals and comments will be reported at the Committee Meeting.

7.3.4 In addition to the issues raised by Historic England, there were also concerns with the initial scheme in relation to the design and the impact that the proposal would have on the Conservation Area, both from immediate and more distant views of the site. It was suggested that the overall footprint was reduced by removing the two storey element which would give more visual separation between the proposed development and the adjacent buildings fronting North Road. Concerns were also raised regarding the use of render on some of the elevations and the mix of fenestration. Following these being raised with the agent, initial amended plans were received. The main alteration to the scheme involved the reduction in the height of the four storey element to three storeys.

7.3.5 Further concerns were raised with the agent and these have resulted in the current set of amendments. There are still significant concerns regarding the scheme and it is considered that the issues highlighted have not been fully addressed. In particular, there are still concerns regarding the scale and massing and it is considered that it represents an overdevelopment of the site. The overall mass of the building is excessive, particularly from Nile Street, and it was advised that there should be more variation in height between the development on North Road and the proposal. To break up the bulk, it was suggested that the element closest to the public house was reduced to two storey and set back slightly. There was a step in the height of the building on the original plans but this has not been replicated when the height of the main part of the building was reduced. The detailing between the gable and remainder of the elevation facing Nile Street is considered to be poor. The plans originally showed quoins but with no difference in the position of the wall, and now the quoins have just been removed, rather than the wall set back. Concerns were raised regarding the mock warehouse appearance of the windows on this elevation and it was suggested that this glazing be broken up more. It was also suggested that the windows were casement with a horizontal glazing bar rather than trying to replicate the Georgian buildings surrounding by using sliding sash, given the overall design of the building. The large warehouse type openings have been replaced with a pair of

sash windows divided by a mullion. It is considered that these give an overly horizontal appearance to this elevation. The other sash windows have not been altered.

7.3.6 The building has been moved slightly off the boundary with the churchyard, however, the footprint has not been significantly reduced by removing the two storey element as suggested. This extends very close to the rear of the extension on 38-42 North Road and as such gives little visual separation between the existing and proposed buildings and emphasises the bulk of the building. As set out above, the traditional form of the city centre would be larger buildings facing the main routes with lower buildings behind. Historically, it is understood that part of this site would have contained court housing, which would have been two storey. The ground floor of the building also extends fully up to four of the boundaries of the site. This leaves no room to accommodate overhanging verges and eaves within the site boundary, which is considered to be a poor aspect of the overall design. It was also suggested that a narrow window on each floor was inserted within the gable facing the churchyard to add more interest to this elevation, as suggested by Historic England. This has not been done, though the floor plan shows a window at the end of the corridor on each floor which would be towards one side of the gable and would give an unbalanced appearance.

7.3.7 In accordance with the Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act, when considering any application that affects a Conservation Area or the setting of a listed building, the local planning authority must pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of that area or the setting of the building. This is reiterated in policies DM31 and DM32, with the former setting out that new buildings within Conservation Areas will only be permitted where it has been demonstrated that:

- Proposals respect the character of the surrounding built form and its wider setting in terms of design, siting, scale, massing, height and the materials used; and,
- Proposals will not result in the loss or alteration of features which contribute to the special character of the building and area; and,
- Proposed uses are sympathetic and appropriate to the character of the existing building and will not result in any detrimental impact on the visual amenity and wider setting of the Conservation Area.

7.3.8 Whilst it is considered that some form of development could be accommodated on the site, containing a three-storey element, the current proposal represents an overdevelopment of the site, resulting in a cramped form of development in a sensitive location within the Lancaster Conservation Area and adjacent to a Grade II\* Listed building. It is also not considered that it represents a high quality design as advocated by the NPPF. On the basis of the above, it is not considered that the proposal preserves or enhances the character and appearance of the Conservation Area or conserves the setting of the Grade II\* listed building. The proposal is therefore contrary to the requirements of both national and local planning policies.

#### 7.4 Impact on amenity of neighbouring properties

7.4.1 To the east of the rear part of the site, beyond part of the church yard, are apartments fronting onto Chapel Street. However, within the elevation facing the application site there are no windows. The nearest openings are at more of an oblique angle approximately 13m from the closest part of the building. Given the separation distance, and position of the windows, in addition to the reduction in height by one storey, it is considered that there will not be an adverse impact on the amenities of these properties. The existing development to the north is the fire station and on the opposite side of Nile Street is an industrial use. As such, there will be no loss of residential amenity to these properties.

7.4.2 The proposed two-storey element is in close proximity to the extension at the rear of 38-42 North Road which contains student accommodation. In the ground floor of this extension is a self-contained studio room providing sleeping and living accommodation for one occupier with a window facing the proposed development. Appendix D sets out standards in relation to student accommodation and states that all living spaces must have an adequate level of natural light and adequate outlook, with a separation distance of at least 12m between the windows and any wall structure. Although there are two windows serving this self-contained accommodation, the one in the side wall is only approximately 3m from the boundary wall. As the two storey element will be less than 2m from the window in the rear wall of the room, it is considered that the proposal will have a



detrimental impact on the amenities of the occupier of the studio apartment and will result in an unacceptable standard of accommodation.

### 7.5 Standard of Accommodation

7.5.1 Appendix D sets out standards in relation to shared student accommodation and Appendix F refers to size standards in relation to studio apartments. There were initially concerns that some of the rooms were not afforded adequate light or outlook as they faced onto a boundary wall in close proximity. A landlord store has now been proposed at ground floor at the rear to overcome these concerns. In terms of the sizes of rooms and level of amenity, the development is considered to be acceptable. The only rooms which are below the standards set out in the appendices are the shower rooms on the ground, first, and second floors serving three of the cluster flats. However, this in itself is not considered to result in an unacceptable form of development in terms of amenity.

7.5.2 A noise assessment was requested given the nearby, potentially noisy uses, that could impact on the occupiers of the development, including the fire station and adjacent public house. The noise assessment concludes that there will be no adverse impacts from the noise sources described within the report if mitigation is included. It concludes that standard thermal double glazing will be sufficient in controlling noise levels so that standards required by BS8233:2014 are achieved. Environmental Health has advised that a scheme of alternative ventilation will be required to retain internal noise levels whilst providing adequate ventilation and therefore window-mounted trickle ventilators should be incorporated into the glazing units of habitable rooms.

### 7.6 Highway Safety

7.6.1 No parking provision is proposed as part of the scheme. However, the site is highly accessible to services, facilities, cycle lanes and bus routes. Cycle storage facilities are also proposed. It does occupy a predominantly commercial area of the city and suffers from all of the parking problems one would associate with a city centre location. On-street parking adjacent to and in the immediate vicinity of the site is considered to be at a premium with surrounding businesses competing for available on street parking space. Continuous unobstructed access to the fire station is a feature of Nile Street as well as extensive parking restrictions applying to specific lengths of this highway as well as North Road. Given these issues, the Highway Officer has requested a condition requiring a construction management plan, which is considered to be appropriate in this instance.

7.6.2 The Highway Officer has also raised concerns regarding the lack of footway up to the entrance to the accommodation on Nile Street. It currently ends at the edge of land associated with the public house where the highway widens to provide turning to the front of the site. It has been advised that a footway is constructed in front of the site, on Nile Street, to provide a continuous pedestrian route from the site's point of access onto Nile Street through to North Road and to provide a degree of protection to the building's face from vehicles accessing and requiring to turn around within the public highway. This would have to be constructed to Lancashire County Council adoptable standards and be dedicated to be maintained in perpetuity by the County Council. It would be within Highway Authority land and could be controlled by condition.

### 7.7 Impact on Trees

7.7.1 There are no trees within the site but there are some within the adjacent church yard. As these are within the Conservation Area they are afforded protection. No information has been submitted with regards to the implications on these trees. Given the location outside the site, it is likely that the development could be constructed without impacting on the trees, although it may require special foundations if within the root protection areas. The Tree Protection Officer has been requested to advise on this and any comments will be reported at the Committee Meeting.

## **8.0 Planning Obligations**

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

## **9.0 Conclusions**

9.1 Whilst the NPPF places a strong emphasis on the presumption in favour of sustainable development and places significant weight on the need to support sustainable economic growth, it highlights that

sustainable development has three roles; an economic role; a social role and an environmental role and that these roles are mutually dependent. Pursuing sustainable development involves seeking positive improvements in the quality of the built, natural and historic environment, as well as in people's quality in life. The Local Authority has highlighted concerns during the application process and unfortunately, there are still several design issues have not been addressed. Given the prominence of the site and its sensitive location within the Conservation Area, adjacent to a Grade II\* Listed Building, the proposed design is unacceptable. There are also significant concerns regarding a loss of daylight and outlook to the adjacent student studio apartment.

### **Recommendation**

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

1. By reason of its, scale, height, massing and design, the proposed development would unduly impact upon the appearance of the Lancaster townscape and the wider setting of the Lancaster Conservation Area. It is therefore considered that the proposal does not represent high quality design and will not preserve or enhance the character of the Conservation Area. As such the development is contrary to the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular the core planning principles, and Sections 7 and 12, Policy SC5 of the Lancaster District Core Strategy and policies DM31, DM32 and DM35 of the Development Management Development Plan Document.
2. As a result of its scale, height, massing and design the proposal would unduly impact upon the character and setting of the adjacent grade II\* Listed building. As such the development is contrary to the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular the core planning principles, Section 7 and Section 12, Policy SC5 of the Lancaster District Core Strategy and policy DM32 of the Development Management Development Plan Document.
3. By reason of the proximity of the development to the rear of 38-42 North Road, the proposal will have a detrimental impact on the amenities of the occupier of the studio apartment at ground floor and will result in an unacceptable standard of accommodation. It is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular the core planning principles and Section 7, and Policies DM35, DM46 and appendix D 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:

Lancaster City Council takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals, in the interests of delivering sustainable development. As part of this approach the Council offers a pre-application service, aimed at positively influencing development proposals. Regrettably the applicant has failed to take advantage of this formal service, although some informal discussions have taken place, and the resulting proposal is unacceptable for the reasons prescribed in this report. The applicant is encouraged to utilise the pre-application service prior to the submission of any future planning applications, in order to engage with the local planning authority to attempt to resolve the reasons for refusal.

### **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

<b>Agenda Item</b> A10	<b>Committee Date</b> 19 October 2015	<b>Application Number</b> 15/01117/PLDC
<b>Application Site</b> Water Treatment Works Littlefell Lane Lancaster Lancashire LA2 0RF	<b>Proposal</b> Proposed lawful development certificate for the installation of a floating photovoltaic solar array comprising solar panels, supporting floating frames, 2 switch gear houses and cabling	
<b>Name of Applicant</b> United Utilities Water Limited	<b>Name of Agent</b> Mrs Sarah Bevan	
<b>Decision Target Date</b> 11 November 2015	<b>Reason For Delay</b> N/A	
<b>Case Officer</b>	Mr Andrew Drummond	
<b>Departure</b>	No	
<b>Summary of Recommendation</b>	Planning Consent is not required	

**(i) Procedural Matters**

The application is one which would normally be dealt with under delegated powers but has been placed before the Planning Committee as the application site is over 1 hectare and as such would normally be classified as a “major” proposal.

**1.0 The Site and its Surroundings**

1.1 The site that forms the subject of this application is Langthwaite Reservoir which is situated about 3km to the south east of Lancaster city centre. It is the larger and more northerly of the 2 reservoirs that are located along the hill ridge that runs north-south to the east of the M6 motorway. It is also the more concealed of the 2 reservoirs with very limited public views (restricted to 2 public rights of way) afforded of the water and its immediate surroundings. It is owned and operated by United Utilities, the statutory undertaker for water supply in the north west of England.

1.2 Whilst the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty boundary is about 300m to the east of the site, the only designation affecting the site is the District’s Countryside Area.

**2.0 The Proposal**

2.1 This is not a planning application but a Proposed Lawful Development Certificate (PLDC). PLDC applications seek to establish whether a building, use or activity is ‘permitted development’ under the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order. If it is considered to be permitted development (and thus, does not require planning permission), then a Certificate is granted and the development/use in question can proceed. It is purely a determination based upon whether the proposal is lawful for planning control purposes.

2.2 In this particular case the applicant has submitted a PLDC application to clarify whether the proposed development requires the benefit of planning consent or whether it is ‘Permitted Development’ by virtue of Schedule 2, Part 13, Class A of the abovementioned Order. Class A refers to development for the purposes of their undertaking by statutory undertakers for the supply of water

or hydraulic power.

- 2.3 The proposed works seek to create an array of about 12,000 solar panels set on a floating frame that would cover about a third of the reservoir’s water surface (maximum length of 250m and width of 200m). 2 containers would be sited on the land but close to the water’s edge to accommodate the switch gear. These would each measure 4.6m (length) by 2.4m (width) by 2.6m (height). An underground cable would be laid along a length of about 125m from these containers to an existing sub-station via a ring main unit. This unit would measure 3m (length) by 3m (width) by 2.6m (height)
- 2.4 Whilst it is not a consideration in the determination of whether this proposal is permitted development or not (but rather to provide some context) it is anticipated that the proposal could generate approximately 1,340 MWh per annum of electricity, which is equivalent to the electrical needs of more than 320 houses. The electricity generated is intended to be used by United Utilities to meet a proportion of the electrical needs of the water treatment works for the purposes of their statutory undertaking.

**3.0 Site History**

- 3.1 There have been no previous applications at this site which are relevant to this proposal, though an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) Screening Request was received in relation to the same proposal earlier this year. The Local Planning Authority reviewed the Request in light of the EIA Regulations and provided an Opinion stating that an Environmental Statement was not required. If one had been required, the proposal would have required the benefit of planning permission (i.e. it could not be deemed to be permitted development).

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
15/00456/EIR	Screening request for the installation of photovoltaic arrays	No Environmental Statement required

**4.0 Consultation Responses**

- 4.1 As this application is a legal determination there is no consultation involved.

**5.0 Neighbour Representations**

- 5.1 At the time of compiling this report there had been no objections to this legal determination.

**6.0 Principal Development Plan Policies**

- 6.1 None.

**7.0 Comment and Analysis**

- 7.1 There are no matters for Members to consider other than whether this proposal requires planning permission or not.

For the purposes of determining this development the proposal should be considered under Schedule 2, Part 13, Class A of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 which, to reiterate, allows for certain development for the purposes of their undertaking by statutory undertakers for the supply of water or hydraulic power. The wording of this legislation is provided below:

*Class A – Water or hydraulic power undertakings*

Permitted development

- A. *Development for the purposes of their undertaking by statutory undertakers for the supply of water or hydraulic power consisting of:*

- (a) development not above ground level required in connection with the supply of water or for conserving, redistributing or augmenting water resources, or for the conveyance of water treatment sludge;
- (b) development in, on or under any watercourse and required in connection with the improvement or maintenance of that watercourse;
- (c) the provision of a building, plant, machinery or apparatus in, on, over or under land for the purpose of survey or investigation;
- (d) the maintenance, improvement or repair of works for measuring the flow in any watercourse or channel;
- (e) the installation in a water distribution system of a booster station, valve house, meter or switch-gear house;
- (f) any works authorised by or required in connection with an order made under section 73 of the Water Resources Act 1991 (power to make ordinary and emergency drought orders)(a);
- (g) any other development in, on, over or under operational land other than the provision of a building but including the extension or alteration of a building.

*Development not permitted*

*A.1 Development is not permitted by Class A if:*

- (a) in the case of any Class A(a) development, it would include the construction of a reservoir;
- (b) in the case of any Class A(e) development involving the installation of a station or house exceeding 29 cubic metres in capacity, that installation is carried out at or above ground level or under a highway used by vehicular traffic;
- (c) in the case of any Class A(g) development, it would consist of or include the extension or alteration of a building so that:
  - (i) its design or external appearance would be materially affected;
  - (ii) the height of the original building would be exceeded, or the cubic content of the original building would be exceeded by more than 25%, or
  - (iii) the floor space of the original building would be exceeded by more than 1,000 square metres; or
- (d) in the case of any Class A(g) development, it would consist of the installation or erection of any plant or machinery exceeding 15 metres in height or the height of anything it replaces, whichever is the greater.

*Condition*

*A.2 Development is permitted by Class A(c) subject to the condition that, on completion of the survey or investigation, or at the expiration of 6 months from the commencement of the development, whichever is the sooner, all such operations cease and all such buildings, plant, machinery and apparatus are removed and the land restored as soon as reasonably practicable to its former condition (or to any other condition which may be agreed with the local planning authority).*

- 7.2 The floating solar arrays come under Class A(g), which is defined as “development for the purposes of their undertaking by statutory undertakers for the supply of water or hydraulic power consisting of any other development [Officer’s comment: nothing within (a) to (f)] in, on, over or under operational land other than the provision of a building but including the extension or alteration of a building. The development in question is not an extension or alteration of a building so A.1(c) does not apply. However, A.1(d) does apply, but the plant does not exceed 15m in height so the proposed development falls within the parameters set by the Order. The floating solar arrays are therefore permitted under Class A(g).
- 7.3 The switch gear houses would each have a volume of c28.9 cubic metres. This is less than 29 cubic metres as allowed by Class A(e).
- 7.4 The ring main unit would have a volume of c23 cubic metres. This is less than 29 cubic metres as

allowed by Class A(e).

**8.0 Planning Obligations**

8.1 None.

**9.0 Conclusions**

9.1 It is considered that the development in the form proposed meets the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 Schedule 2, Part 13, Class A and as such would not require planning consent.

**Recommendation**

That Planning Consent **IS NOT REQUIRED** for the proposed works, and a Certificate can be granted.

**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.

<b>Agenda Item</b> A11	<b>Committee Date</b> 19 October 2015	<b>Application Number</b> 15/00996/FUL
<b>Application Site</b> 39 Dale Street Lancaster Lancashire LA1 3AP	<b>Proposal</b> Erection of a single storey rear extension	
<b>Name of Applicant</b> Mr & Mrs M Lunat	<b>Name of Agent</b> Mr David Tarbun	
<b>Decision Target Date</b> 25 September 2015	<b>Reason For Delay</b> Committee cycle	
<b>Case Officer</b>	Mr Robert Clarke	
<b>Departure</b>	No	
<b>Summary of Recommendation</b>	Approval	

**(i) Procedural Matters**

The proposed development would normally fall within the scheme of delegation. However, the applicant is related to an employee of Lancaster City Council and as such the proposal must 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 mid-terrace house located on Dale Street.
- 1.2 The surrounding area mainly consists of terraced properties with a small number of commercial properties, which include a hot and cold food takeaway, convenience shop, a laundrette and a public house.
- 1.3 The site is unallocated in the Lancaster District Local Plan proposals map.

**2.0 The Proposal**

- 2.1 The application proposes the erection of a single storey extension to the rear elevation of the property. The proposed extension is to project from the west elevation of the existing single storey outrigger by a maximum of 5m. It will have a maximum width of 3.2m and a maximum height of 3.2m to the ridge of the hipped roof. The walls of the extension will be rendered to match the walls of the original dwelling. The roof will be constructed using slate tiles and matching hip tiles. White matching UPVC doors and windows will be installed throughout. The proposed rear extension will provide space for a larger kitchen and shower room.

**3.0 Site History**

- 3.1 There is no site history affecting this property.

## **4.0 Consultation Responses**

4.1 Due to the nature of the proposal and the location of the application site neither statutory nor non-statutory consultees were consulted.

## **5.0 Neighbour Representations**

5.1 No comments received within the statutory consultation period.

## **6.0 Principal National and Development Plan Policies**

### **6.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**

Paragraph 17 – 12 Core Principles  
Paragraphs 56 and 57 – Requiring Good Design

### **6.2 Development Management DPD**

**DM35** – Key Design Principles

## **7.0 Comment and Analysis**

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

- General design
- Impacts upon residential amenity

### **7.2 General design**

The proposed materials will ensure that the single storey rear extension will reflect the appearance of the original dwelling, ensuring the character of the property and those around it is preserved. Furthermore, there are a considerable number of similar rear extensions along Dale Street, ensuring that this proposed extension will not look out of place in the wider street scene. Although the ridgeline of the proposed extension is 0.1m higher than that of the outrigger, it is deemed that this will not pose any detrimental impacts to the character of the building and those around it. The difference in height allows the extension to maintain its proposed floor space and still match the pitch of the hipped roof to the outrigger. The extension will reduce the size of the rear yard, however, it is acknowledged that the property will have sufficient residual amenity space.

### **7.3 Impacts upon residential amenity**

The proposed development is not seen to have any adverse or detrimental impacts upon residential amenity. An (approximate) 1.8m high wall forms the party boundary with No.37 and a (approximate) 2.2m high wall with 41 Dale Street which will provide a screen to the proposed rear extension and ensure that acceptable levels of privacy for the neighbouring properties are maintained. Furthermore, there are three side facing windows which will face the 2.2m high wall and therefore pose no issues of overlooking. The impact on the light to the window in the rear elevation of 37 Dale Street will be minimal, as the proposed eaves height of the extension will only be 0.3m higher than the existing boundary wall. Overall, it is deemed that the proposed rear extension will have minimal impacts upon the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties.

## **8.0 Planning Obligations**

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

## **9.0 Conclusions**

9.1 It is concluded that the proposed single storey rear extension represents a congruent form of development, which by means of its scale, form and design will act to preserve the character of the original dwelling and the surrounding area. Furthermore, it is found to pose no significant threats to the amenities of the nearby occupiers. In respect of these matters, the proposed extension is in compliance with the relevant DPD policies and the NPPF.



## **Recommendation**

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. WC window on the south elevation to be obscure glazed.

## **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"><b>Agenda Item</b></p> <p align="center">A12</p>	<p align="center"><b>Committee Date</b></p> <p align="center">19 October 2015</p>	<p align="center"><b>Application Number</b></p> <p align="center">15/00999/FUL</p>
<p align="center"><b>Application Site</b></p> <p align="center">95 Dale Street Lancaster Lancashire LA1 3AP</p>	<p align="center"><b>Proposal</b></p> <p align="center">Erection of a single storey rear extension</p>	
<p align="center"><b>Name of Applicant</b></p> <p align="center">Mr &amp; Mrs Zuber Patel</p>	<p align="center"><b>Name of Agent</b></p> <p align="center">Mr David Tarbun</p>	
<p align="center"><b>Decision Target Date</b></p> <p align="center">25 September 2015</p>	<p align="center"><b>Reason For Delay</b></p> <p align="center">Committee cycle</p>	
<p><b>Case Officer</b></p>	<p align="center">Mr Robert Clarke</p>	
<p><b>Departure</b></p>	<p align="center">No</p>	
<p><b>Summary of Recommendation</b></p>	<p align="center">Approval</p>	

**(i) Procedural Matters**

The proposed development would normally fall within the scheme of delegation. However, the applicant is related to an employee of Lancaster City Council and as such the proposal must 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 mid-terrace located on Dale Street.
- 1.2 The surrounding area mainly consists of terrace properties with a small number of commercial properties, which include a hot and cold food takeaway, convenience shop, a laundrette and a public house.
- 1.3 The site is unallocated in the Lancaster District Local Plan proposals map.

**2.0 The Proposal**

- 2.1 The application proposes the erection of a single storey rear extension to the rear elevation of the property. The proposed extension is to project from the west elevation of the existing two storey outrigger by a maximum of 5.5m. It will have a maximum width of 3.7m and a maximum height of 2.7m to the flat roof. The walls of the extension will be smooth rendered to match the existing property. There will be a grey fibreglass flat roof and brown matching UPVC doors and windows will be installed throughout. The proposed extension will provide space for an enlarged kitchen, ablution room and shower room.

**3.0 Site History**

- 3.1 No relevant planning history.

**4.0 Consultation Responses**

4.1 Due to the nature of the proposal and the location of the application site neither statutory nor non-statutory consultees were consulted.

**5.0 Neighbour Representations**

5.1 No comments received within the statutory consultation period.

**6.0 Principal National and Development Plan Policies**

6.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Paragraph 17 – 12 Core Principles  
Paragraphs 56 and 57 – Requiring Good Design

6.2 Development Management DPD

**DM35** – Key Design Principles

**7.0 Comment and Analysis**

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

- General design
- Impacts upon residential amenity

7.2 General design

The proposed materials will ensure that the single storey rear extension will reflect the appearance of the original dwelling, ensuring the character of the property and those around it is preserved. Furthermore, there are a considerable number of similar rear extensions along Dale Street, ensuring that this proposed extension will not look out of place in the wider street scene. A flat roof has been used so as not to block the window on the first floor of the rear elevation, it is deemed that this does not detract from the character of the original dwelling. The extension will reduce the size of the rear yard, but it is acknowledged that the property will have sufficient residual amenity space.

7.3 Impacts upon residential amenity

The proposed development is not seen to have any adverse or detrimental impacts upon residential amenity. A 1.9m high wall encloses the rear yard and forms the party boundary between No. 93 and 97 Dale Street. The wall will act to screen the proposed development effectively and ensure acceptable privacy levels will be maintained. The impact on the light to the window in the rear elevation of 93 Dale Street will be minimal, as the proposed eaves height of the extension will only be 0.55m higher than the existing boundary wall. Overall, it is deemed that the proposed rear extension would have minimal impacts upon the residential amenities of the neighbouring properties.

**8.0 Planning Obligations**

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

**9.0 Conclusions**

9.1 It is concluded that the proposed single storey rear extension represents a congruent form of development, which by means of its scale, form and design will act to preserve the character of the original dwelling and the surrounding area. Furthermore, it is found to pose no significant threats to the amenities of the nearby occupiers. In respect of these matters, the proposed extension is in compliance with the relevant DPD policies and the NPPF.

**Recommendation**

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

1. Standard three year timescale
2. Development to be carried out in accordance with approved plans
3. WC and ablution room windows on the south elevation to be obscure glazed
4. Control the use of the flat roof

### **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

Agenda Item A13	Committee Date 19 October 2015	Application Number 15/01029/FUL
<b>Application Site</b> 10 Jackson Terrace Warton Carnforth Lancashire	<b>Proposal</b> Erection of a replacement front porch	
<b>Name of Applicant</b> Mr A Dobson	<b>Name of Agent</b> -	
<b>Decision Target Date</b> 21 October 2015	<b>Reason For Delay</b> N/A	
<b>Case Officer</b>	Mrs Petra Williams	
<b>Departure</b>	No	
<b>Summary of Recommendation</b>	Approval	

**(i) Procedural Matters**

This form of development would normally be dealt with under the Scheme of Delegation. However, the property is in the ownership of a Council employee, and as such the application must be determined by the Planning Committee.

**1.0 The Site and its Surroundings**

- 1.1 The site which forms the subject of this application is an end terraced property, which is one of a row of ten properties situated in an elevated position near the end of a cul-de-sac leading from Warton Road to the south in the Millhead area of Carnforth. The property's exterior has a painted finish and upvc windows under a slate roof. There is an existing flat roof porch with a 0.8m projection to the front elevation which comprises rendered brick and timber framed glazing.
- 1.2 Jackson Terrace is an unmade road with a row of garages located in the south-west side at a slightly lower level. The majority of other properties along the cul-de-sac have front porches which take varying forms including pitched and lean-to roof designs. Although all properties within the terrace display a painted render finish, the use of a variety of materials is evident within the street scene in respect of the front porches including timber frames and more solid lean-to structures.
- 1.3 Jackson Terrace is located at a higher level than Warton Road to the south-west. The boundary of the Arnside and Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty lies 40m to the north-east of the site but the subject site itself is unallocated within the Lancaster District Local Plan.

**2.0 The Proposal**

- 2.1 The application proposes a replacement porch to the front elevation of the property. The new porch will have a lean-to roof with a maximum height of 3m and a footprint of 1.7m by 2.3m. The porch will contain a single window within the front elevation and the main access door to the property will be sited within the side (north-western) elevation. It is worth noting that the proposal is only slightly over the limits of what could normally be constructed under permitted development rights.

**3.0 Site History**

3.1 There are a number of historic applications relating to this property although none are directly related to the current scheme.

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
06/00534/FUL	Erection of a detached garage to the rear	Permitted
04/01596/FUL	Erection of a two-storey rear extension to form dining room with bedroom over	Permitted
04/01343/FUL	Erection of a two storey rear extension to form dining room with bedroom and balcony over	Refused

**4.0 Consultation Responses**

Consultee	Response
Parish Council	No comments received at the time of compiling this report. Any observations received will be reported verbally to Members at Committee.

**5.0 Neighbour Representations**

5.1 No comments received at the time of compiling this report. Any comments received will be reported to Members verbally at Committee.

**6.0 Principal National and Development Plan Policies**

6.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Paragraph 17 – Core planning principles  
Section 7 - Requiring Good Design

6.2 Lancaster District Core Strategy (adopted July 2008)

Policy SC5 (Achieving Quality in design)

6.3 Development Management DPD (adopted December 2014)

DM35 – Key Design Principles

**7.0 Comment and Analysis**

- 7.1
- General Design and Street Scene Impacts
  - Impacts on Residential Amenity

7.2 General Design and Street Scene Impacts

The proposed porch will take the form of a lean-to structure and will be of a design and scale which reflects others within Jackson Terrace. The porch will contain a upvc window and door within solid rendered elevations. The lean-to roof will have a slate finish to match the existing dwelling. As such it is considered that the application puts forward an acceptable scheme in terms of general design and street scene impacts and will be an improvement on existing.

7.3 Impacts on Residential Amenity

The porch will reflect the approximate dimensions of the porch at the adjoining dwelling (no.9). It is considered that with a 1.7m projection the porch will not impact the front window of no.9. Furthermore the replacement of the existing glazed structure with a solid wall will remove the opportunity for overlooking towards the adjoining dwelling. It is therefore considered that the

development will not result in detrimental impacts upon neighbouring residential amenity and will improve the residential amenity of the occupants.

### **8.0 Planning Obligations**

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

### **9.0 Conclusions**

9.1 It is considered that the development provides an opportunity to enhance the visual appearance of this end terrace property and it is concluded that the proposed replacement porch is acceptable in terms of design and residential amenity. In respect of these matters, the development is in compliance with the relevant Development Plan policies and guidance provided in the NPPF.

### **Recommendation**

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

1. Standard time limit
2. Development in accordance with approved plans

### **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"><b>Agenda Item</b></p> <p align="center">A14</p>	<p align="center"><b>Committee Date</b></p> <p align="center">19th October 2015</p>	<p align="center"><b>Application Number</b></p> <p align="center">15/01168/FUL</p>
<p align="center"><b>Application Site</b></p> <p align="center">Storey Institute Meeting House Lane Lancaster Lancashire</p>	<p align="center"><b>Proposal</b></p> <p align="center">Installation of 3 replacement gates</p>	
<p align="center"><b>Name of Applicant</b></p> <p align="center">Miss Helen Ryan</p>	<p align="center"><b>Name of Agent</b></p>	
<p align="center"><b>Decision Target Date</b></p> <p align="center">11 November 2015</p>	<p align="center"><b>Reason For Delay</b></p> <p align="center">N/A</p>	
<p><b>Case Officer</b></p>	<p>Mrs Petra Williams</p>	
<p><b>Departure</b></p>	<p>No</p>	
<p><b>Summary of Recommendation</b></p>	<p>Approval</p>	

**(i) Procedural Matters**

The application is one which would normally be dealt with under delegated powers but has been placed on Committee as the application is being submitted by Lancaster City Council.

**1.0 The Site and its Surroundings**

1.1 The application relates to Storey Gardens to the west of the Storey Institute building which was constructed sometime between 1887 and 1891 and designed by Paley and Austin. The Institute, which is of significant architectural and historic merit, occupies a prominent corner position at the junction of Meeting House Lane and Castle Hill. The building, which dominates the approach to the Castle Hill Precinct and contributes significantly to the City's townscape, is a centre for creative industries and also contains a café as well as the Tourist Information Centre.

1.2 The Storey Gardens are screened from Meeting House Lane by a substantial stone wall along the site's southern boundary. There is a stepped gated entrance within the garden wall which historically allowed access from Meeting House Lane. The garden is divided into east and west sections by a brick wall which runs north/south across the site with two openings (which were historically gated) providing access between the two halves.

1.3 The walls are Grade II listed as is the Storey Institute. The site is within the Lancaster Conservation Area and the gardens are designated as Urban Greenspace in the Lancaster District Local Plan.

**2.0 The Proposal**

2.1 The application proposes the installation of two single metal gates, which will be have a maximum height of 2.03 metres and width of 0.87m, to be installed to the existing openings within the brick wall. It is also proposed to install a double metal gate mid-way up the steps within the opening in the stone boundary wall bounding Meeting House Lane. This gate will have an overall width of approximately 2 metres and a maximum height of 2.5 metres. The gates will be wrought iron and designed to reflect existing railings within the grounds of the Storey Institute. The scheme has been



submitted following liaison with the Council's Senior Conservation Officer who has provided advice regarding the design.

**3.0 Site History**

3.1 There is a considerable amount of planning history which relates to the Storey Institute, most of which seeks Listed Building Consent for minor internal and external alterations. The most recent and relevant is as follows:

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
15/01169/LB	Listed building application for the fitting of 3 replacement gates	Pending
14/00902/LB	Listed Building application for the installation of three gates	Withdrawn
14/00686/FUL	Erection of three gates	Withdrawn

**4.0 Consultation Responses**

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

Consultee	Response
Conservation Team	No comments received at the time of compiling this report. Any observations received will be reported verbally to Members at Committee.
County Highways	No objections.

**5.0 Neighbour Representations**

5.1 No correspondence has been received in response to the site notice at the time of compiling this report. Any comments subsequently received will be reported verbally.

**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 56, 58 and 60 – Requiring Good Design  
 Paragraphs 131 to 134 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

6.2 Development Management DPD

Policy DM30 – Development Affecting Listed Buildings  
 Policy DM31 – Development Affecting Conservation Areas  
 Policy DM35 – Key Design Principles

**7.0 Comment and Analysis**

7.1 The key issues to consider in determining this application is whether the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of design and visual amenity in addition to heritage impacts.

7.2 The design for the gates has come forward following advice from Council's Conservation Team and is based on other metalwork within the curtilage of the Storey Institute. It is considered that all three gates will fill the openings appropriately and will add to the character and significance of the existing walls and surrounding gardens. Furthermore the gates will have the added benefit of improving the general security of the site.

7.3 Members may be aware of the ongoing wider renovation and improvements taking place within the gardens, with the walls having recently been repointed. It is considered that the replacement gates will make a positive contribution to these efforts while enhancing the visual amenity of the Conservation Area as well as the Listed building and its curtilage.

## **8.0 Planning Obligations**

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

## **9.0 Conclusions**

9.1 It is concluded that the scale and design is appropriate and that the historic fabric and architectural features of the Storey Gardens and surrounding Conservation Area will be preserved and enhanced by the scheme. The proposal is therefore considered to accord fully with the provisions of policies DM30, DM31 and DM35 of the Development Management DPD. Members are therefore advised that this application can be supported.

## **Recommendation**

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

1. Standard time limit
2. Development in accordance with approved plans

## **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

Agenda Item A15	Committee Date 19 <sup>th</sup> October 2015	Application Number 15/01169/LB
<b>Application Site</b>  Storey Institute Meeting House Lane Lancaster Lancashire	<b>Proposal</b>  Listed building application for the fitting of 3 replacement gates	
<b>Name of Applicant</b>  Miss Helen Ryan	<b>Name of Agent</b>	
<b>Decision Target Date</b>  11 November 2015	<b>Reason For Delay</b>  N/A	
<b>Case Officer</b>	Mrs Petra Williams	
<b>Departure</b>	No	
<b>Summary of Recommendation</b>	Approve subject to referral to the National Planning Casework Unit	

**(i) Procedural Matters**

The application is one which would normally be dealt with under delegated powers but has been placed on Committee as the application is being submitted by Lancaster City Council.

**1.0 The Site and its Surroundings**

- 1.1 The application relates to Storey Gardens to the west of the Storey Institute building which was constructed sometime between 1887 and 1891 and designed by Paley and Austin. The Institute, which is of significant architectural and historic merit, occupies a prominent corner position at the junction of Meeting House Lane and Castle Hill. The building, which dominates the approach to the Castle Hill Precinct and contributes significantly to the City's townscape, is a centre for creative industries and also contains a café as well as the Tourist Information Centre.
- 1.2 The Storey Gardens are screened from Meeting House Lane by a substantial stone wall along the site's southern boundary. There is a stepped gated entrance within the garden wall which historically allowed access from Meeting House Lane. The garden is divided into east and west sections by a brick wall which runs north/south across the site with two openings (which were historically gated) providing access between the two halves.
- 1.3 The walls are Grade II listed as is the Storey Institute. The site is within the Lancaster Conservation Area and the gardens are designated as Urban Greenspace in the Lancaster District Local Plan.

**2.0 The Proposal**

- 2.1 The application seeks Listed Building Consent to install two single metal gates, which will be have a maximum height of 2.03 metres and width of 0.87m, to be installed to the existing openings within the brick wall. It is also proposed to install a double metal gate mid-way up the steps within the opening in the stone boundary wall bounding Meeting House Lane. This gate will have an overall width of approximately 2 metres and a maximum height of 2.5 metres. The gates will be wrought iron and designed to reflect existing railings within the grounds of the Storey Institute. The scheme

has been submitted following liaison with the Council's Senior Conservation Officer who has provided advice regarding the design.

**3.0 Site History**

3.1 There is a considerable amount of planning history which relates to the Storey Institute, most of which seeks Listed Building Consent for minor internal and external alterations. The most recent and relevant is as follows:

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
15/01168/FUL	Installation of 3 replacement gates	Pending
14/00902/LB	Listed Building application for the installation of three gates	Withdrawn
14/00686/FUL	Erection of three gates	Withdrawn

**4.0 Consultation Responses**

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

Consultee	Response
Conservation Team	No comments received at the time of compiling this report, any observations received will be reported verbally to Members at Committee.

**5.0 Neighbour Representations**

5.1 No correspondence has been received in response to the site notice at the time of compiling this report. Any comments subsequently received will be reported verbally.

**6.0 Principal National and Development Plan Policies**

6.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Paragraphs 131 to 134 - Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

6.2 Development Management DPD

Policy DM30 – Development Affecting Listed Buildings  
 Policy DM31 – Development Affecting Conservation Areas  
 Policy DM35 – Key Design Principles

**7.0 Comment and Analysis**

7.1 The key issues to consider in determining this Listed Building application is whether the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of its impacts upon the historic fabric of the Grade II Listed wall and the setting of the associated Listed building.

7.2 The design for the gates has come forward following advice from Council's Conservation Team and is based on other metalwork within the curtilage of the Storey Institute. It is considered that all three gates will fill the openings appropriately and will add to the character and significance of the existing walls and surrounding gardens. Furthermore the gates will have the added benefit of improving the general security of the site.

7.3 Members may be aware of the ongoing wider renovation and improvements taking place within the gardens, with the walls having recently been repointed. It is considered that the replacement gates will make a positive contribution to these efforts while enhancing the heritage asset.

**8.0 Planning Obligations**

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

**9.0 Conclusions**

9.1 It is concluded that the historic fabric and architectural features of the Storey Gardens and surrounding Conservation Area will be preserved and enhanced by the scheme. The proposal is therefore considered to accord fully with the provisions of policies DM30 and DM31 of the Development Management DPD. Members are therefore advised that this application can be supported and would then be referred to the National Planning Casework Unit as this is a Listed Building application submitted by the City Council.

**Recommendation**

That Listed Building Consent **BE GRANTED** subject to the following conditions and referral to the national Planning Casework Unit:

1. Standard Listed Building time limit
2. Development in accordance with approved plans

**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

## Quarterly Reports

(a) Planning Application Determination Timescales

*The table provides performance figures for the determination of Major Applications, Minor Applications and Other Applications in accordance with national timescales.*

(b) Number of Planning Applications and Related Cases

*The table lists the number of planning applications and other planning application-related cases that are received by the Development Management Service per quarter.*

(c) New Tree Preservation Orders Made

*The table lists the location of new Tree Preservation Orders (TPOs) made during the last quarter.*

(d) Number of Applications for Works to Trees

*The table lists the number of Tree Works applications received in respect of protected trees (protected by TPO or by Conservation Area status)*

(e) Planning Appeal Decisions

*The table lists the planning appeal decisions issued by the Planning Inspectorate during the last quarter.*

(a) Planning Application Determination Timescales

*NB: The figures below do not include applications where mutual agreement has been reached to extend the determination period.*

<b>Period</b>	<b>Major Applications Determined In Under 13 Weeks</b>	<b>Minor Applications Determined In Under 8 Weeks</b>	<b>Other Applications Determined Under 8 weeks</b>
January-March 2014	75%	69%	78%
April-June 2014	72%	57%	70%
July-September 2014	83%	67%	67%
October-December 2014	71%	37%	58%
January-March 2015	65%	48%	66%
April-June 2015	56%	42%	63%
July-September 2015	<b>72%</b>	<b>30%</b>	<b>53%</b>

<b>Year</b>	<b>Major Applications Determined In Under 13 Weeks</b>	<b>Minor Applications Determined In Under 8 Weeks</b>	<b>Other Applications Determined Under 8 weeks</b>
2011 Average	30%	50%	60%
2012 Average	39%	55%	66%
2013 Average	62%	64.5%	81%
2014 Average	75%	57.5%	68%
2015 (To Date) Average	<b>64%</b>	<b>40%</b>	<b>61%</b>

(b) Number of Planning Applications and Related Cases

	Jan-Mar 2014	Apr-Jun 2014	Jul-Sep 2014	Oct-Dec 2014	2014 TOTAL	Jan-Mar 2015	Apr-Jun 2015	Jul-Sep 2015	Oct-Dec 2015	2015 TOTAL
Major Applications	17	14	16	23	<b>70</b>	10	15	21		
Minor Applications	57	73	70	51	<b>251</b>	71	49	60		
Other Applications	202	179	181	165	<b>727</b>	179	226	165		
Discharge of Planning Condition Applications	49	46	42	39	<b>176</b>	48	56	42		
Non-Material Amendment Applications	7	10	12	10	<b>39</b>	11	11	9		
Variation of Legal Agreement/Condition Applications	3	0	1	0	<b>4</b>	2	2	1		
Prior Approval (Commercial/ Householder PA, Flexible Use etc) Applications	5	10	17	4	<b>36</b>	16	19	14		
<b>TOTAL NUMBER OF APPLICATIONS</b>	<b>340</b>	<b>332</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>292</b>	<b>1303</b>	<b>321</b>	<b>378</b>	<b>312</b>		
Environmental Screening and/or Scoping Opinions	6	8	9	16	<b>39</b>	4	7	2		
Infrastructure Planning Commission Consultations	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>	0	0	0		
Pre-Application Advice Submissions or Charged Meetings	-	-	-	4	<b>4</b>	24	47	38		



(c) New Tree Preservation Orders Made

<b>Tree Preservation Order Number</b>	<b>Date Made</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Extent of Protection</b>
553 (2015)	31 July 2015	Land at Caton Road, Lancaster	1 Individual Tree, 3 Groups
554 (2015)	14 August 2015	10 Regent Street, Lancaster	1 Tree
555 (2015)	3 September 2015	Shenstone, The Green, Over Kellet	2 Trees
556 (2015)	3 September 2015	Cragg House, Kirkby Lonsdale Road, Over Kellet	1 Area of Trees
557 (2015)	9 September 2015	Land at Sylvester Street, Lancaster	1 Group
558 (2015)	15 September 2015	School House, Main Street, Arkholme	3 Trees
559 (2015)	18 September 2015	Riverside Caravan Park, Lancaster Road, Heaton with Oxcliffe	1 Area
560 (2015)	21 September 2015	Land at Escowbeck, Crook o Lune, Lancaster	4 Woodland Compartments, 1 Group
561 (2015)	22 September 2015	Black Wood, off A683, Claughton	1 Woodland

(d) Number of Applications for Works to Trees

	Applications for Works to Trees Protected by Tree Preservation Orders	Applications for Works to Trees Protected by Conservation Area Status
January-March 2014	26	23
April-June 2014	10	14
July-September 2014	14	20
October-December 2014	19	25
<b>TOTAL APPLICATIONS 2014</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>82</b>
January-March 2015	21	18
April-June 2015	19	16
July-September 2015	20	24
October-December 2015		
<b>TOTAL APPLICATIONS 2015</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>

(e) Planning Appeal Decisions

Application Number	Application Site	Proposal	Appeal Decision
14/00013/ENF	Golden Ball, Lancaster Road, Heaton with Oxcliffe	Enforcement Appeal -Retrospective application for the retention of replacement timber fence with wrought iron balustrading and installation of four upvc windows to the first floor	Appeal Dismissed ( <i>period of compliance on Enforcement Notice extended</i> )
13/01214/FUL and 13/01215/LB	St Michael's Church, Parkgate Drive, Lancaster	Change of use of former offices and workspace to 5 self-contained apartments with associated car parking	Both Appeals Dismissed
14/00668/FUL	Quernmore Brow, Quernmore	Erection of 4-bedroom dwelling with car parking, access and earthworks	Appeal Dismissed
14/00647/OUT	Brookside, Whams Lane, Bay Horse	Outline application for the demolition of existing building and erection of one residential detached dwelling and detached garage	Appeal Dismissed
14/01058/RCN	Swallow Cottage, Moorhead Barn, Russell Lane, Tatham	Change of use of business use and residential unit to holiday cottage (pursuant to removal of conditions 3 and 4 on 2003 application to allow permanent residential use)	Appeal Dismissed
14/00114/FUL	Sunny Bank Farm, Kirkby Lonsdale Road, Arkholme	Erection of 80m high wind turbine with ancillary infrastructure and track	Appeal Dismissed

<b>14/01137/ADV</b>	D Stoker Group, Fellgate, White Lund, Morecambe	Advertisement application for the display of various signage and flagpoles	Split Decision – Appeal Dismissed for 5 6m-high flags; Appeal allowed for remainder of adverts
<b>14/01201/FUL</b>	9 Haverthwaite Avenue, Heysham	Proposed dormer window alteration	Split Decision – Appeal Dismissed for clear glazing of side-facing dormer window; Appeal Allowed for remaining alterations

## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

## LANCASTER CITY COUNCIL

APPLICATION NO.	DETAILS	DECISION
14/01322/FUL	75 Church Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Change of use of vacant former stable block to form 4 no. student apartments for Mr Zubeir Mister (Dukes Ward)	Application Permitted
14/01323/LB	75 Church Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Listed Building consent for works to facilitate the change of use of former stable block, within site curtilage of vacant public house (A4) to form 4 no. student apartments (C3) for Mr Zubeir Mister (Dukes Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00123/DIS	Islay, The Shore, Hest Bank Discharge of conditions 7 and 10 on previously approved application 14/01196/FUL for Mr T Johnson (Slyne With Hest Ward)	Initial Response Sent
15/00124/DIS	Seaways, The Shore, Hest Bank Discharge of conditions 3 and 4 on previously approved application 14/01195/FUL for Mr Hiten Mehta (Slyne With Hest Ward)	Initial Response Sent
15/00125/DIS	Ripley St Thomas Church Of England Academy , Ashton Road, Lancaster Discharge of conditions 1,2,4,5,6 and part discharge of condition 3 on approved application 15/00233/FUL for Ripley St Thomas Church of England Academy (Dukes Ward)	Request Completed
15/00126/DIS	Ripley St Thomas Church Of England Academy , Ashton Road, Lancaster Discharge of conditions 1,2,4, 5 and part discharge of condition 3 on approved application 15/00234/LB for Ripley St Thomas Church of England Academy (Dukes Ward)	Request Completed
15/00143/DIS	Visitor Newspaper Offices And Print Works, 12 Victoria Street, Morecambe Discharge of conditions 9, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16 on planning permission 14/00770/FUL for Mr S Clayton (Poulton Ward)	Initial Response Sent
15/00146/DIS	39 - 41 Moor Gate, Lancaster, Lancashire Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 13/00037/FUL for Mr S Hothi (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Request Completed
15/00147/FUL	2 Bronte Cottages, Long Level, Cowan Bridge Erection of a single storey extension to the existing detached outbuilding to form an ancillary office to the main dwelling, erection of car port, erection of a third storey rear extension, construction of a rear dormer, replacement window to staircase and installation of gate to driveway for Professor Malik Salameh (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Split Decision

## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

15/00148/LB	2 Bronte Cottages, Long Level, Cowan Bridge Listed building application for the erection of a single storey extension to the existing detached outbuilding, erection of car port, erection of a third storey rear extension, installation of vehicular and pedestrian gates to boundary wall, creation of opening between dining room and kitchen, conversion of roofspace to form additional bedroom and shower room, installation of staircase to new second floor, construction of rear dormer window, replacement window to staircase and replacement slate roof to shed for Professor Malik Salameh (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Split Decision
15/00154/DIS	22 Storey Avenue, Lancaster, Lancashire Discharge of conditions 5 and 6 on approved application 15/00246/FUL for Mr & Mrs I Myles (Marsh Ward 2015 Ward)	Request Completed
15/00155/DIS	The Stores, Corless Cottages, Dolphinholme Discharge of conditions 3, 4 and 5 on approved application 11/01041/LB for Mr Michael Desmond (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Request Completed
15/00241/FUL	Lunecliffe Barn, Lunecliffe Road, Lancaster Change of use of land for the siting of two holiday lodges with associated access track and parking for Mr & Mrs David and Sarah Watson (Scotforth West Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00389/ELDC	Sellerley Farm, Conder Green Road, Galgate Existing Lawful Development Application for the use of 9 holiday cottages to be used as unfettered residential dwellings for Mr Paul Newsham (Ellel Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Refused
15/00396/FUL	47 Wharfedale Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a single storey front and rear extension for Mr Joseph Wilcock (Castle Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00505/FUL	1 Well Lane, Yealand Redmayne, Carnforth Erection of car port to the side elevation for Mrs Caroline Higgens (Silverdale Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00539/RCN	3 St Johns Avenue, Heysham, Morecambe Erection of a 2 storey, 4 bedroom detached dwelling (pursuant to the removal of condition 5, 6 and 8 on planning permission 04/01267/FUL in order to drop the existing kerb) for Mr Terry Lewis (Heysham Central Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00545/CU	Warren House, Burrow Road, Burrow Change of use of two dwelling houses into one (C3) for Mr John Handley (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00552/VCN	Land South Of Orchard House, Lodge Lane, Wennington Erection of one dwelling with associated parking and creation of a new access (pursuant to the variation of condition 2 on planning permission 14/00006/FUL to include a garage/utility room extension on previously proposed plans) for Mr Paul Wood (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00556/REM	Land Rear Of 1, St Michaels Grove, Bolton Le Sands Reserved matters application for the erection of a detached dwelling for Mr James Dant (Bolton Le Sands Ward)	Application Permitted

## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

15/00558/CU	Unit 2B And 3, 1 Southgate, White Lund Estate Change of use of business use (B1) to general industrial (B2) for the installation of a small scale standby electricity generation plant for Mr Gareth Woodberry (Westgate Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00640/CU	Unit 1, 3 1 5 Health Club, Mannin Way Change of use of part gymnasium (D2) to a nursery (D1) and erection of a single storey front extension for Total Tots (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00655/FUL	7 Pierce Close, Lancaster, Lancashire Demolition of the existing conservatory, erection of a two storey rear extension and erection of a first floor side extension for Mr & Mrs M. Maxwell (Castle Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00665/ADV	Slyne Lodge, 92 Main Road, Slyne Advertisement application for the display of 5 illuminated fascia signs and 2 illuminated free standing signs for Mr Martin Horner (Slyne With Hest Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00666/FUL	6 Arran Close, Heysham, Morecambe Erection of two storey extensions to side and rear, single storey rear extension with roof terrace above and first floor extension to front and side over existing garage for Mr Steve Hemingway (Heysham South Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00684/FUL	Railway Cottage, Corricks Lane, Conder Green Conversion of part of existing garage to form ancillary living accommodation and creation of a new hardstanding for Mr D Sharratt (Ellel Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00690/FUL	Old Crow Trees, Lodge Lane, Melling Demolition of existing lean-to structure, erection of single storey rear extension, and conversion and refurbishment of existing attached barn to form garaging and ancillary accommodation. for Mr Andrew Hodgson (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00691/LB	Old Crow Trees, Lodge Lane, Melling Listed building application for the demolition of lean-to structure, erection of single storey rear extension, installation of 3 sets of triple doors and 1 single door to attached outbuilding, replacement windows to east and west elevation, installation of 2 rooflights to dwelling and 4 rooflights to replacement roof over outbuilding, replacement staircase to dwelling, and relocation and removal of internal doors and partitions to dwelling for Mr Andrew Hodgson (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00733/EE	St Marys, Main Road, Bolton Le Sands Ecclesiastical Exemption for the replacement of the existing heating system for John Cowdall (Bolton Le Sands Ward)	No Objections
15/00734/EE	St Josephs Rc Church, Slyne Road, Lancaster Ecclesiastical Exemption for the replacement of the existing heating system for John Cowdall (Skerton East Ward)	No Objections
15/00739/FUL	Silverdale Village Institute, Spring Bank, Silverdale Construction of a skate park, multi-use games area and running track for Silverdale Village Institute (Silverdale Ward)	Application Withdrawn

## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

15/00754/CU	Lune Valley Lawnmowers, Sylvester Street, Lancaster Demolition of existing industrial building and erection of 6 residential dwellings (C3) with associated car parking for Mr Colin Stephens (Castle Ward)	Application Refused
15/00799/FUL	A1 Supa Skips, Paragon Way, Lune Business Park Retrospective application for the installation of a flue to serve existing biomass boiler for Mr Mel Welsh (Castle Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00808/FUL	43 Albert Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Conversion of existing 3-bed maisonette over first and second floors into two 1-bed flats and installation of a new shop front at ground level for Mr Andy Collins (Harbour Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00849/FUL	Coach And Travel Centre , Scotland Road, Carnforth Erection of a single storey side extension for Mr John Shaw (Carnforth Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00871/FUL	3 Wordsworth Avenue, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Demolition of existing garage and erection of a part single part two storey side and rear extension and a single storey front extension for Mr C. Dixon (Bolton Le Sands Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00883/FUL	73 Willow Lane, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of single storey rear extension for Mr Paul Morphet (Castle Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00885/FUL	1 - 4 Mill Waters , Main Street, Lancaster Replacement of wooden windows with new UPVC windows for Mr Alan Thomas (Skerton East Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00886/PLDC	Atlantic House, 57 Sandylands Promenade, Heysham Proposed lawful development certificate for the excavation of front yard and installation replacement of windows and doors for Mr A. Rodgers (Heysham North Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Refused
15/00889/FUL	73 Twemlow Parade, Heysham, Morecambe Construction of a balcony with glazed side screens within the West roof slope and installation of double doors to replace existing windows for Mrs C. Wawoczny (Heysham Central Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00900/FUL	3 Old Hall Cottages, Cove Road, Silverdale Erection of a single storey side extension and construction of a dormer window to the side elevation for Ms S Caddy (Silverdale Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00902/FUL	St Johns Church, Church Lane, Yealand Conyers Installation of two air source heat pumps for St John's Church PCC (Silverdale Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00903/LB	St Johns Church, Church Lane, Yealand Conyers Listed building application for the installation of two air source heat pumps for St John's Church PCC (Silverdale Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00905/ADV	32 Market Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Advertisement application for the display of one externally illuminated fascia sign and one internally illuminated window sign for Mr Aaron Morgan (Dukes Ward)	Application Permitted



## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

15/00906/FUL	41 Regent Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Demolition of existing two storey rear projection and erection of a partial single storey and partial two storey rear extension for Mr John Childs (Dukes Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00908/FUL	Lancaster University, Bailrigg Lane, Lancaster Installation of a strobic extract fan to the roof of the Faraday building for Lancaster University (University Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00917/LB	6 Hill Side, Lancaster, Lancashire Listed building application to facilitate the removal of an asbestos garage roof and construction of a replacement corrugated iron roof for Mr R Frankland (Castle Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00918/PLDC	3 1 5 Health Club, Mannin Way, Lancaster Proposed lawful development certificate for the installation of solar PV system to south facing roof slope for 315 Health Club (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
15/00921/FUL	43 Hest Bank Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Demolition of existing side conservatory and erection of a replacement single storey side extension for Mr A Bleasedale (Bare Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00923/ADV	Site For Fast Food Takeaway Unit, Caton Road, Lancaster Advertisement application for the display of an internally illuminated totem sign for McDonalds Restaurant Ltd (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Application Refused
15/00939/FUL	4 Portland Place, Aldcliffe Road, Lancaster Retrospective application for the excavation of land to front to provide light wells to basement for Mr J Park (Dukes Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00940/LB	Castle Station , Westbourne Road, Lancaster Listed building application for refurbishment of information point room, platform 4 waiting room and toilets located on platform 3, including the installation of new windows and doors, replacement of partition walls and installation of new seating and desks for Virgin Trains (Castle Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00944/FUL	6 Barnacre Close, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension for Mr Michael Leack (Scotforth East Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00947/FUL	1 Barley Cop Lane, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of conservatory to the side elevation for Mr & Mrs David Deakins (Skerton West Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00956/FUL	Riversway , Main Street, Lancaster Installation of uPVC windows to all elevations to replace timber windows for Mr Alan Thomas (Skerton East Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00958/FUL	14 Hawksworth Grove, Heysham, Morecambe Erection of a single storey rear extension and construction of a pitched roof to the existing rear extension for Mr Patryk Dabrowski (Heysham Central Ward)	Application Permitted

## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

15/00959/ADV	Land North Of 1 To 23, Stoney Lane, Galgate Advertisement application for the display of 2 non-illuminated single panel boards and 2 flagpoles and flags for Mr Martin Nugent (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00961/FUL	146 Brookhouse Road, Brookhouse, Lancaster Construction of a dormer window to the rear elevation for Mr And Mrs Quinn (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00970/LB	Derby Home, Pathfinders Drive, Lancaster Listed building application for the demolition of the existing side extension for Mr (Scotforth West Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00974/FUL	55 Anstable Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Demolition of existing rear conservatory and erection of a replacement single storey rear extension for Mr And Mrs Cragg (Torrisholme Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00975/FUL	7 Well Lane, Warton, Carnforth Erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr R Partington (Warton Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00983/FUL	66 Marine Drive, Hest Bank, Lancaster Erection of a single storey side and rear extension, first floor side extension and a pitched roof over existing and proposed first floor side projection for Mr Terry Atkiss (Slyne With Hest Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00986/VCN	Stables Opposite Unit 19, Galgate Mill, Chapel Lane Change of use of waste land to menage, erection of stable building with fence and gate as enclosure (pursuant to the variation of condition 2 on planning permission 95/00301/CU to amend the personal use restriction) for Mr Martin Yates (Ellel Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00988/CU	Land At Bay Horse Road, Quernmore, Lancashire Change of use of agricultural land to equine use including erection of stable block, creation of a sand paddock and erection of poultry shed for Mr Dilaver Patel (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Application Refused
15/00989/LB	Castle Station, Westbourne Road, Lancaster Listed building application for the removal of two ticket vending machines and two phone boxes and replacement of three ticket vending machines for Mr Andy Donelan (Castle Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00990/CU	24 Cheapside, Lancaster, Lancashire Change of use of cafe (A3) to betting shop (sui generis) and erection of new shop front for Done Brothers (Cash Betting) Ltd (Dukes Ward)	Application Refused
15/00994/VCN	Olivet Baptist Church, Stanley Road, Heysham Erection of temporary ramp to provide DDA access to Church entrance (pursuant to the variation of condition 3 on planning permission 12/00462/FUL to extend the temporary permission for a further 3 years until August 2018) for Mr Steven Hewitt (Heysham North Ward)	Application Permitted
15/00998/FUL	1 Edenbrook Cottages, Crag Bank Road, Carnforth Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of a single storey rear sun room, a porch to side and construction of a detached garage for Mr R Loxam (Carnforth Ward)	Application Permitted

## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

15/01002/FUL	405 Heysham Road, Heysham, Morecambe emolition of existing single storey side extension and erection of a replacement two storey side extension for Mr D Babij And Miss L Pinington (Heysham South Ward)	Application Permitted
15/01013/FUL	3 St Margarets Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of a two storey side extension, single storey rear extension and construction of a dormer window to the front and the rear elevations for Mr & Mrs John Cross (Bare Ward)	Application Refused
15/01015/PLDC	55 Redruth Drive, Carnforth, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr N Downham (Carnforth Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
15/01027/CU	4 Portland Place, Aldcliffe Road, Lancaster Change of use of dwellinghouse (C3) to 8-bed shared student accommodation house (Sui Generis) for Mr J Park (Dukes Ward)	Application Refused
15/01037/LB	Slyne Lodge, 92 Main Road, Slyne Listed building application for the fitting of 5 illuminated fascia signs, 2 illuminated free standing signs and removal of 1 fascia sign for Mr Martin Horner (Slyne With Hest Ward)	Application Permitted
15/01039/ELDC	2 Launds Farm Cottage, Lancaster Road, Cockerham Existing lawful development certificate for the use of the building as a dwelling for Mr & Mrs Walmsley (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
15/01049/FUL	19 Daisy Bank, Quernmore Road, Quernmore Erection of a two storey rear and side extension for Mr & Mrs J Lingard (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
15/01052/FUL	10 Hexham Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of a single storey rear extension and alterations to existing roofs for Mrs Spencer (Torrisholme Ward)	Application Permitted
15/01061/CCC	Land At Midland Terrace, Warton Road, Carnforth Installation of a control kiosk, pressure balancing stack, access road and removal of trees and vegetation, development to include landscaping scheme and remote temporary compound for United Utilities (Carnforth And Millhead Ward 2015 Ward)	No Objections
15/01073/FUL	56 Twemlow Parade, Heysham, Morecambe Demolition of existing rear conservatory and erection of a replacement single storey rear extension for Mr D Bailey (Heysham Central Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
15/01076/CCC	Morecambe Bay Primary School, Station Road, Morecambe Installation of a 6m high external lighting column for The Governors Of Morecambe Bay PS (Poulton Ward 2015 Ward)	No Objections
15/01077/AD	Westfield Farm, 1 Westfield Hamlet, Nether Kellet Agricultural determination for the erection of an open fronted portal frame machinery storage building for Mr Alan Riley (Kellett Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Not Required
15/01093/PLDC	11 Coolidge Avenue, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed Lawful Development certificate for the erection of a single storey rear extension for Dr M Pickles (Marsh Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted

## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

15/01110/FUL	20 Victor Avenue, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of a two storey side and rear extension for Mr N Parker (Bare Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
--------------	--	-----------------------