



**Committee:** PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS REGULATORY COMMITTEE

**Date:** MONDAY, 22<sup>ND</sup> AUGUST 2016

**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 25<sup>th</sup> July, 2016 (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 9 and in the interests of clarity and transparency, Members should declare any disclosable pecuniary interests which they have already declared in the Register, at this point in the meeting.

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

### **Planning Applications for Decision**

#### Community Safety Implications

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

## Category A Applications

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

- |   |                        |   |                                    |                        |
|---|------------------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------|
| 5 | <b>A5 16/00665/FUL</b> | <b>Ashton Golf Centre, Ashton Road, Ashton With Stodday</b>   | <b>Ellel Ward</b>                  | <b>(Pages 1 - 6)</b>   |
|   |                        | Change of use of golf driving range (D2) for the siting of 14 holiday chalets (C1) and creation of a new access point for Mr & Mrs Lake   |                                    |                        |
| 6 | <b>A6 16/00722/FUL</b> | <b>Hest Bank Lane Garage, Hest Bank Lane, Slyne</b>   | <b>Bolton and Slyne Ward</b>       | <b>(Pages 7 - 12)</b>  |
|   |                        | Erection of detached storage building for Mr C. Bradley   |                                    |                        |
| 7 | <b>A7 16/00578/FUL</b> | <b>Rear Of Pleasureland , Marine Road Central, Morecambe</b>  | <b>Poulton Ward</b>                | <b>(Pages 13 - 20)</b> |
|   |                        | Erection of a two storey indoor trampoline park with associated landscaping and parking and extension of terrace to rear of Pleasureland for Mr Solomon Reader  |                                    |                        |
| 8 | <b>A8 16/00569/FUL</b> | <b>Red Court Caravan Park, Lancaster Road, Carnforth</b>  | <b>Carnforth and Millhead Ward</b> | <b>(Pages 21 - 27)</b> |
|   |                        | Demolition of existing Working Men's Club, erection of a 3 storey retirement home comprising 40 apartments and communal facilities, alterations to the roadside wall, and associated landscaping works to provide car park and garden spaces for McCarthy & Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd |                                    |                        |
| 9 | <b>A9 16/00570/FUL</b> | <b>Brookside, Whams Lane, Bay Horse</b>   | <b>Ellel Ward</b>                  | <b>(Pages 28 - 39)</b> |
|   |                        | Demolition of agricultural building, erection of a detached residential dwelling, a garage/workshop, installation of solar array panel and erection of two polytunnels for Mr Ken Parker  |                                    |                        |

- |           |                         |   |                                   |                        |
|-----------|-------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|------------------------|
| <b>10</b> | <b>A10 16/00806/VCN</b> | <b>Moss Wood Caravan Park,<br/>Crimbles Lane, Cockerham</b>   | <b>Ellel Ward</b>                 | <b>(Pages 40 - 43)</b> |
|           |                         | Change of use of land for the siting of 25 static caravans (pursuant to the variation of condition 4 on planning permission 16/00201/FUL relating to the use of colours of the static caravans) for Mr Henry Wild |                                   |                        |
| <b>11</b> | <b>A11 16/00692/FUL</b> | <b>8 Fell View, Caton, Lancaster</b>  | <b>Lower Lune<br/>Valley Ward</b> | <b>(Pages 44 - 46)</b> |
|           |                         | Erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr Tom Greenwood   |                                   |                        |

### Category D Applications

Applications for development by the City Council

- |           |   |  |                                  |                        |
|-----------|---|--|----------------------------------|------------------------|
| <b>12</b> | <b>A12 16/00828/ADV</b>                             | <b>Salt Ayre Sports Centre, Doris<br/>Henderson Way, Heaton With<br/>Oxcliffe</b>                                | <b>Skerton<br/>West Ward</b>     | <b>(Pages 47 - 49)</b> |
|           |   | Advertisement application for the display of one internally illuminated individual letter sign for Suzanne Lodge |                                  |                        |
| <b>13</b> | <b>A13 16/00824/LB</b>                              | <b>Ashton Memorial, Williamson<br/>Park, Wyresdale Road</b>  | <b>John<br/>O'Gaunt<br/>Ward</b> | <b>(Pages 50 - 53)</b> |
|           |   | Listed building application for internal repair works to dome for Ms Sarah Price                                 |                                  |                        |
| <b>14</b> | <b>Delegated Planning Decisions (Pages 54 - 64)</b> |  |                                  |                        |

### ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

#### (i) Membership

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

#### (ii) Substitute Membership

Councillors Jon Barry, Susie Charles, Sheila Denwood, Mel Guilding, Tim Hamilton-Cox, Janice Hanson and Geoff Knight

**(iii) Queries regarding this Agenda**

Please contact Tessa Mott, Democratic Services: telephone (01524) 582074 or email [tmott@lancaster.gov.uk](mailto:tmott@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).

SUSAN PARSONAGE,  
CHIEF EXECUTIVE,  
TOWN HALL,  
DALTON SQUARE,  
LANCASTER, LA1 1PJ

Published on Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> August, 2016.

Agenda Item A5	Committee Date 22 August 2016	Application Number 16/00665/FUL
<b>Application Site</b> Ashton Golf Centre Ashton Road Ashton With Stodday Lancaster	<b>Proposal</b> Change of use of golf driving range (D2) for the siting of 14 holiday chalets (C1) and creation of a new access point	
<b>Name of Applicant</b> Mr & Mrs Lake	<b>Name of Agent</b> Mr Avnish Panchal	
<b>Decision Target Date</b> 26 August 2016	<b>Reason For Delay</b> N/A	
<b>Case Officer</b>	Mr Mark Potts	
<b>Departure</b>	No	
<b>Summary of Recommendation</b>	Refusal	

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

- 1.1 The proposed development is located at Ashton Golf Centre, located approximately 4.75 km to the south of Lancaster City Centre with the driving range being located on the south side of the golf centre. The application site covers an area of roughly 1.25 hectares and is currently used as a golf driving range with a defined stone wall marking the boundaries together with tree planting along the boundaries. The ground is quite level. Access to the site would be afforded off the A588 (Ashton Road) then via a private road which serves Ashton Road garden centre, the golf centre, a touring caravan site (approved under 12/00212/CU and currently being implemented) and a number of residential properties, including Ashton Barns.
- 1.2 The application site is adjacent to a significant copse of woodland to the west, with the golf course located beyond this. To the north and east lies further tree planting and the golf club's greens beyond this. To the south is further tree planting leading to an unclassified road with Seafield Plantation beyond this. The nearest residential dwelling to the proposal is approximately 100 metres to the east of the site.
- 1.3 The site is not within a protected landscape, although it is located approximately 200 metres from the Morecambe Bay Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Special Protection Area (SPA), Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and a RAMSAR site. There are no listed buildings on the site, although Ashton Hall is a Grade I listed building and is located some 300 metres to the east of the proposal. The wider golf centre complex is allocated as 'PPG17 Open Space' land, however, only the golf driving range shelter falls within this designation. The land is allocated as Countryside Area as part of the adopted Local Plan.

## **2.0 The Proposal**

- 2.1 The proposed development consists of the siting of 14 holiday chalets on the current golf driving range of Ashton Golf Centre. The scheme proposes three different types of units being the Cresta (4.73m x 12.23m), the Tirol Annexe (6.84m x 10.65m) and the Sherwood (6.9m x 10.97m) - all single storey and of timber construction. New planting is also proposed as part of the scheme, with provision for an emergency vehicle access point located on the south west corner of the proposed

development site. Access to the site would be afforded via the existing site entrance to the golf course with an internal track to access each of the chalets.

### **3.0 Site History**

3.1 There is no relevant site history affecting this proposal.

### **4.0 Consultation Responses**

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

Consultee	Response
<b>Natural England</b>	<b>No objection</b>
<b>Thurnham Parish Council</b>	<b>Objection</b> , on the basis: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Over provision of holiday accommodation in the area</li> <li>2. Local objections voiced to the Parish Council</li> <li>3. Previous objections to similar developments in the vicinity.</li> </ol>
<b>County Highways</b>	<b>No objection.</b> Recommends conditions associated with covered and secure cycle storage and off site highway works including stop and give way lines.
<b>Environmental Health</b>	No observations received
<b>Lead Local Flood Authority</b>	<b>Objection</b> to the development. A Flood Risk Assessment is required in support of the application.
<b>Tree Protection Officer</b>	<b>No objection</b> , subject to the submission of a tree survey, tree constraints plan and tree protection plan to be submitted before the application is determined.
<b>Sport England</b>	Given the scale of the development has no comments to make.
<b>Public Realm Officer</b>	<b>No objection</b> however requests that an open space assessment is provided for consideration.
<b>Lancashire Police</b>	<b>No objection</b>

### **5.0 Neighbour Representations**

5.1 To date there has been **6** letters of representation received in response to the scheme all of which raise objection with the proposal based on the following concerns:

- Issues of ownership (not a planning consideration);
- Concerns with respect to foul and surface water;
- No evidence of need;
- Harm to Ashton Hall;
- Detrimental impact on landscape and ecology;
- Highway Safety concerns; and
- Unsustainable location.

### **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  
 Section 3 – Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
 Section 4 – Promoting Sustainable Transport  
 Section 8 – Promoting Healthy Communities  
 Section 11 – Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment

#### **6.2 Lancaster District Core Strategy Policies**

SC5 – Achieving Quality in Design  
 ER6 – Developing Tourism

6.3 Development Management DPD

DM7 – Economic Development in Rural Areas  
DM9 – Diversification of the Rural Economy  
DM14 – Caravan Sites, Chalets and Log Cabins  
DM20 – Enhancing Accessibility and Transport Linkages  
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  
DM35 – Key Design Principles  
DM38 – Development and Flood Risk  
DM39 – Surface Water Run-Off and Sustainable Drainage  
DM40 – Protecting Water Resources

6.4 Lancaster District Local Plan Saved Policies

E4 – Development within the Countryside

**7.0 Comment and Analysis**

7.1 The application raises the following main issues:

- Principle of development;
- Flooding and drainage;
- Open space;
- Ecology; and
- Highways.

7.2 Principle of Development

7.2.1 The proposed development involves the siting of wooden chalets on a golf driving range associated with the Ashton Golf Centre. Policy DM14 of the Development Management DPD is therefore relevant which concerns the siting of caravans, chalets and log cabins, and generally proposals should seek to utilise brownfield land first and the local highway network should be capable of accommodating the development. In addition, the points below require special consideration:

- (Development should) Be of a scale and design appropriate to the locality and does not have any detrimental impacts on the local landscape;
- (Development) should Make use of appropriate materials which are sympathetic to its locality.

Priority will generally be given to utilising previously developed sites and when greenfield sites are considered it should be demonstrated that no alternative suitable brownfield sites exist locally. The site has a historic use as a golf driving range and therefore whilst it is greenfield (with manicured greens) it is considered to be potentially capable of accommodating this form of development, assuming issues of the loss of recreational open space can be fully addressed (see section 7.4). It is the applicant's intention that the chalets would likely be used by people wishing to take a golfing holiday and that the provision of the chalets would enhance the attraction to users and boost the income of the business. The Highway Authority raises no objection in highway terms.

7.2.2 The application seeks to utilise wooden chalets of single storey build and the site is enclosed, so views into the site would be limited and only really be gained by golfers and perhaps those using the private lane to the south of the site in the winter time when the trees are not in leaf. It is therefore considered to be of a scale and design that is appropriate to its surroundings and the wooden chalets would be sympathetic to the rural location. There are concerns with respect to accessing the development via the existing golf course and this requires further thought, as is noted in paragraph 7.6.2, but overall the principle of this development could be found acceptable (assuming other issues such as the loss of recreational open space, access and drainage can be overcome).

## 7.3 Flooding and Drainage

7.3.1 The site area is over 1 hectare, and whilst in Flood Zone 1, the Lead Local Flood Authority has objected to the development as a Flood Risk Assessment has not accompanied the proposed development, and the scale of development may present risks of flooding on or off site if surface water is not effectively managed. The need for this assessment was relayed to the applicant's agent early in the determination process (June 2016). However, despite several requests this has not been received. It is also unclear how foul water will be dealt with (i.e. mains or a package treatment plant) and therefore it is unclear whether the development would have an adverse impact on the groundwater in the locality. The Local Authority has sought to work proactively with the applicant, however, despite requests the required information has not been forthcoming. In the absence of an assessment to determine whether the site can be drained appropriately the scheme fails to comply with Policies DM38 and DM39 of the Development Management DPD.

## 7.4 Open Space

7.4.1 The Ashton Golf Centre is identified in the Council's PPG17 study on open spaces (however the allocation only covers the driving range shelter and not the area where the chalets are proposed to be sited, even though these are on the driving range greens). Notwithstanding this it is clear in the specification of the PPG17 study that the driving range is part of the make-up of the allocation. Sports facilities such as the golf driving range are a source of recreation and amenity and therefore in line with Policy DM26 of the Development Management DPD the applicant has submitted an Open Space Assessment for consideration. This concludes that the Lancaster Golf Club (located less than 500m away) has recently developed their own driving range and this has had a detrimental effect on the existing facility. However, whilst full consent was granted under 13/01295/HYB for the change of use of land to a driving range further north along Ashton Road and outline consent for the associated building, this has not been implemented, so it would appear that the Open Space Assessment is flawed. It is also claimed since the approval of 12/00212/CU which was for the change of use of land for the siting of 26 pitches for touring caravans, immediately to the south of this site that golf balls do stray out of the application site onto the adjacent touring caravan site and it is considered a risk in future once the adjacent site is fully occupied. However the Assessment fails to consider that the driving range is still in use (see 7.4.2. below), albeit there is signage preventing golfers from using longer clubs on the driving range due to the possibility of golf balls entering neighbouring land. The Golf Centre could theoretically erect new netting preventing balls from entering neighbouring land. Other golf centres (and driving ranges) exist in places where stray golf balls could be problematic, such as adjacent to motorways, and thus with appropriate netting/screening, the golf use can continue without detriment.

7.4.2 The supporting information does state that the use of the main 9-hole course golf would not be affected by the proposed development. The open space statement submitted with the scheme is relatively brief (at 1 page long) and there has been no consultation with key stakeholders and the local community as to whether the driving range has a value. The case officer understands that the driving range is still available for use open 7 days a week between the hours of 09.00 and 20.30 during the summer months. No compensation for the loss is provided as part of the scheme, however, in general it is not considered that the applicant has justified the loss of the driving range to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority to allow for an informed decision to be made. The open space assessment was only submitted in late July and therefore at the time of writing this report the views of the Public Realm Officer have not been received in response to the application. Overall it is considered that a lack of justification has been put forward to allow the loss of the driving range and therefore the scheme fails to comply with Policy DM26 of the Development Management DPD and Paragraph 74 of the NPPF.

## 7.5 Ecology

7.5.1 The scheme is supported by an ecological appraisal of the site. Whilst the site itself is not deemed to be of high value the surrounding woodland is deemed as high value woodland and there are a number of ponds in close proximity to the application site. Given the age of trees bats are known to forage locally, but the trees in question would remain as part of this development proposal, and therefore there would be no loss of habitat. The ponds in close proximity to the site have been assessed as not being suitable for Great Crested Newts. Notwithstanding the above, a condition is



## Page 5

recommended for ecological enhancement of the site (including a control on external lighting) should Members determine to approve the scheme. Officers are satisfied that the proposed development could, through the use of planning conditions, be beneficial to the natural environment.

7.5.2 The Tree Protection Officer has no objections subject to the provision of a detailed tree survey, tree constraints plan and tree protection plan before the application is determined. These details have not been submitted. At present it is unclear whether the concrete slabs to site the chalets on would encroach within the root protection zones and therefore in the absence of such detail the case officer cannot be certain that trees on the boundary of the site would not be affected by the development proposals. Therefore in the absence of a tree survey, constraints and protection plan it is unclear if the proposed layout would be harmful to any trees.

### 7.6 Highways

7.6.1 The site is accessed off Ashton Road, and via a private road that also serves a number of dwellings, the garden centre, golf centre, touring caravan site (currently under construction) and the application site. The Highway Authority raises no objection to the scheme on the understanding that the scheme is for holiday accommodation only and that cycle parking is provided on the site. Conditions are recommended requiring white-lining at the junction of Ashton Road and private road. These are all considered acceptable.

7.6.2 Whilst the Highway Authority does not object to the proposals there is concern as to how the site would be accessed as there would be a need to cross the existing golf club. However, no detail is provided for this within the scheme. Additional information was requested in this regard but no details have been forthcoming. It is unclear whether users would use the existing car park at the front of the site and walk or take a golf buggy with luggage to access the holiday chalets, or whether a road would be needed (which would require the benefit of planning permission).

### 7.7 Other Considerations

7.7.1 The proposed development is close to a Grade I listed building in the form of Ashton Hall which is a 14<sup>th</sup> century mansion now owned by Lancaster Golf Club. Given the screening between the listed building and the proposed development it is not considered that the setting would be unduly harmed due to this development.

7.7.2 Many of those who have objected to the scheme have raised land ownership as an issue. However, the agent has signed the necessary certificate to state that they are the owner of the site. This is a legal declaration and has to be relied upon. Notwithstanding this, the concern has been relayed back to the applicant, but the Local Authority has not been informed of any changes to their previous declaration.

7.7.3 Concern has also been raised regarding the sustainability credentials of the scheme. However, the Ashton Golf Centre has a small club house serving food and drink. The nearby garden centre provides a similar service. Overall it is considered that a use such as that proposed could indeed be complementary to the offer already present and assist with maintaining rural businesses.

## **8.0 Planning Obligations**

8.1 Should Members support the scheme against the advice of officers then the applicant should enter into a section 106 legal agreement to limit the site solely to chalets and to prevent the residential occupancy of the chalets.

## **9.0 Conclusions**

9.1 The proposal contains insufficient information, notably with regard to the loss of recreational open space, drainage, trees and how users would access the site. Members are therefore advised that the scheme should be refused.

## **Recommendation**

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

1. The applicant has failed to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Local Planning Authority that the golf driving range no longer has an economic, recreational and community value. Therefore the proposed development is contrary to Policy DM26 of the Development Management Development Plan Document and Paragraph 74 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The applicant has failed to fully demonstrate how the proposal will be accessed as the point of access on the north boundary does not currently connect to any off site infrastructure, and the red edged application site excludes land to the north, so no off-site development of tracks or roads are proposed. Furthermore, the provision of an access across the existing outdoor recreational facility (the golf course) could potentially adversely affect its recreational and environmental value, and therefore the proposed development is contrary to Policies DM26, DM27 and DM35 of the Development Management Development Plan Document.
3. The application is not accompanied by a Flood Risk Assessment and insufficient detail is contained within the application as to how surface and foul water drainage will be appropriately managed. The application therefore fails to comply with Policies DM38, DM39 and DM40 of the Development Management DPD.
4. There is a lack of consideration of the development's impact on trees given the insufficient supporting documentation submitted as part of the application. In the absence of adequate tree information it can only be concluded that the scheme has the potential to adversely impact the health of the trees in the vicinity of the application site and therefore the scheme fails to accord to Policy DM29 of the Development Management DPD.

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

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

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

Agenda Item A6	Committee Date 22 August 2016	Application Number 16/00722/FUL
<b>Application Site</b> Hest Bank Lane Garage Hest Bank Lane Slyne Lancaster	<b>Proposal</b> Erection of detached storage building	
<b>Name of Applicant</b> Mr C. Bradley	<b>Name of Agent</b> Building Plan Services	
<b>Decision Target Date</b> 30 August 2016	<b>Reason For Delay</b> N/A	
<b>Case Officer</b>	Mrs Kim Ireland	
<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, given the contentiousness surrounding the previous uses at this site and the high public interest in the application, the Chief Officer (Regeneration and Planning) has confirmed that the application should 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 two single storey buildings located on Hest Bank Lane in Hest Bank. The property is used as a car garage with ancillary car sales. The surrounding area mainly consists of semi-detached and detached residential properties.

1.2 The site is allocated as a countryside area and is located within the North Lancashire Green Belt in the Lancashire District Local proposals map.

**2.0 The Proposal**

2.1 The application proposes the erection of a detached storage building to the rear of the site. The proposed storage building will be sited to the west of the existing buildings, with a length of 14.5m and a width of 6.3m. The mono-pitched roof would have a ridge height of 2.9m. The walls would be smooth rendered under coated-galvanised steel sheets with one light alloy garage door and two sets of white upvc windows and doors. The proposed detached outbuilding will provide storage for car parts for the business.

**3.0 Site History**

3.1 The former garage premises appears to have become established in the 1950s. The use at that time was a traditional garage and repair workshop with petrol filling facilities.

3.2 The site has previously been investigated (1999/2000) by the City Council's Planning Enforcement Team in relation to the use of the site for car sales. At the time it was concluded that the sales were

of such a lesser scale that they were ancillary to the primary planning unit, which remained the garage and workshop.

- 3.3 Enforcement investigations also occurred more recently (2015), in relation to the use of the site for business purposes and the siting of a large container. During those investigations it transpired that a small area at the front of the building had been sectioned off for the production of candles for sale at Christmas Markets. This use has since ceased. Car sales were occurring at the site, although at the time of the enforcement investigation this element remained ancillary to the vehicle repair use. This element continues to be monitored. Additionally, the Coastal Racing Team were reported to be meeting up at the premises and parking cars at the site over the weekend, whilst they travel to competitions.
- 3.4 The most recent planning application was in 2010 for the demolition of the existing garage building and the erection of 2 detached residential units, which has not been implemented (see below).

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
10/00450/OUT	Demolition of existing garage building and erection of 2 detached residential units	Permitted

#### 4.0 Consultation Responses

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

Consultee	Response
Parish Council	<b>No objections.</b> However, the Parish Council notes that this area of Slyne has been liable to flooding
County Highways	A holding response was initially raised as a site plan was required to show onsite parking facilities. A site plan was received and <b>no objections</b> were raised, subject to a number of conditions to be applied to the decision.
Environmental Health	<b>No objections</b> subject to a number of conditions to be applied to the decision.
Lancaster Civic Society	<b>Objection</b> , on the grounds that incorrect information has been submitted on the form, as this area of Hest Bank has recently flooded and the site has an ongoing issue of parking on the road and obstructing the bus stop, is no parking were allowed in this area, then there would be no objections to the garage expansion.

#### 5.0 Neighbour Representations

5.1 Fourteen pieces of correspondence (from 11 different local residents) have been received objecting to the proposed scheme. The reasons for opposition include the following:

- No information has been provided as to what is to be stored in the outbuilding;
- There is an existing problem with on street parking as there is not enough on-site parking for the business - the proposed storage building could result in less parking space available;
- Due to the existing on street parking problems there is a lack of visibility and traffic often builds up Hest Bank Lane. Vehicles visiting the business often park on the bus stop and across resident's driveways;
- The proposed site is in an area of flooding (the garage and land flooded on 26 December 2015), though the application form states that it is not. Details of how the surface water is to be dealt with has not been included on the proposed plan; and
- There is no room for expansion on the small garage site.

#### 6.0 Principal National and Development Plan Policies

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

## National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Paragraph **17** - 12 Core principles  
Paragraph **19** – Economic growth  
Paragraph **28** – Rural economy  
Paragraphs **67 and 68** – Requiring good design  
Paragraph **89** – Protecting Green Belt land

### 6.2 Development Management DPD

**DM7** – Economic development in rural areas  
**DM11** – Green Belt  
**DM15** – Employment land and premises  
**DM35** – Key design principles

### 6.3 Lancaster District Core Strategy

**SC1** – Sustainable development  
**SC5** – Design

### 6.4 Lancaster District Local Plan (saved policies)

**E1** – Green Belt  
**E4** – Countryside area

## **7.0 Comment and Analysis**

7.1 The key considerations arising from the proposal are:

- General principle of expanding an existing rural business;
- Design, including impact on the Green Belt;
- Impacts upon residential amenity;
- Impacts upon highways;
- Other matters

### 7.2 General Principle

7.2.1 The site is located within the village of Slyne-with-Hest. It is currently used as a car garage that specialises in service and repairs on BMW Mini's, including MOT services on all cars and the sale of a limited number of cars. The proposed outbuilding to the rear of the property is to be used for the storage of car parts, which are currently located within the site.

7.2.2 Policy DM7 states that employment proposals in rural areas will be supported in principle if the proposal is for the alteration, replacement, extension or change of use of existing buildings in accordance with other local plan policies.

7.2.3 Policy DM11 explains that development in the Green Belt will be considered appropriate if it does not materially have a greater impact upon the present use on the openness of the Green Belt, strict control is exercised over the extension of re-used buildings, which might conflict with the openness of the Green Belt, and the form, bulk and general design of the buildings are in keeping with their surroundings. This is reiterated within Paragraph 89 of the NPPF that states that an exception to the construction of new buildings within the Green Belt is the extension, or alteration of a building provided that it does not result in disproportionate additions over and above the size of the original building.

7.2.4 Policy DM15 states that proposals for employment generating uses of B1, B2, B8 and appropriate sui generis uses which seek to utilise previously developed land will be supported if there is sufficient access and capacity in the local highway network to accommodate the proposed use, that there is no significant detrimental impact on local residential amenity or natural environment, and the proposal is in accordance with the design guidance set out in policy DM35 of the Development Management DPD.

7.2.5 The principle of the outbuilding is looked upon favourably as the proposal is for the extension to existing premises within the rural area; it is not thought to have a materially greater impact upon the present use on the openness of the Green Belt (due to the presence and orientation of other buildings); and the form, bulk and general design of the outbuilding is in keeping with the existing building. There is sufficient access and capacity in the local highway network to accommodate the proposed use and there is not thought to be a significant detrimental impact on the local residential amenity or natural environment. These points are expanded upon below.

### 7.3 Design

7.3.1 Though the proposal would be screened by the existing buildings so as to effectively screen it from the streetscene, it has been designed to reflect the appearance of the existing buildings, including the proposed materials. It will therefore not be out of character and is deemed to be acceptable. The amended plan indicates a smooth render finish, but the precise colour would be a matter controlled by planning condition (as would the colour of the roof and doors. As the proposal is surrounded on all four sides by other properties and is only single storey in height, it is considered that there would be no adverse impact upon the openness of the Green Belt.

### 7.4 Impacts upon Residential Amenity

7.4.1 The proposed outbuilding is not seen to have an adverse and detrimental impact upon the residential amenities (through overbearing, overlooking and overshadowing), given the height and siting of the proposed outbuilding in relation to the neighbouring properties. To the south of the site is the neighbouring property of Grey Walls, 110A Hest Bank Lane. The rear elevation of the proposed development is sited 11m away from side elevation of the neighbouring property of Grey Walls. The boundary treatment is a 2m high timber fencing. The proposed outbuilding is not thought to have a detrimental impact upon the neighbouring property as the proposed eaves height to the southern elevation is 2.3m in height, which is only an additional 0.3m above the existing boundary treatment and there are no windows proposed to the south elevation. To the west of the site is the neighbouring property of 5 Beech Grove. The side elevation of the proposed development is sited 14m away from side elevation of the neighbouring property of 5 Beech Grove. Again the boundary treatment is a 2m high timber fencing. The proposed outbuilding is not thought to have a detrimental impact upon the neighbouring property as there are no windows or doors overlooking the property as they are all located to the northern elevation.

7.4.2 Environmental Health has raised no objections to the proposal, subject to conditions being applied to any consent granted relating to the hours of construction and site investigation into land contamination. As the building is to be used for the storage of car parts, it is not thought to create additional noise to the existing business use and therefore the proposal is found acceptable with Environmental Health. A condition should be applied to control the outbuilding's use.

### 7.5 Impacts upon Highways

7.5.1 14 letters of objections have been received from 11 local residents. One of the grounds of objection relates to there being an existing problem with on-street parking. Concerns have been expressed that if there is insufficient space within the site to accommodate vehicles now then the construction of a 91sq.m building on the site will exacerbate the current situation. Paragraph 17 of the NPPF states that one of the twelve principles of planning should be to always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. The proposed outbuilding is to be used for the storage of car parts, which are currently located all over the site, which in turn will tidy up the site and allow for adequate off street parking within the site.

7.5.2 Through negotiations with the agent, a revised plan indicating on-site parking has been provided. This shows the front forecourt to be used for sales vehicles, four spaces to the north of the site that are to be allocated as visitor/customer parking (with a further 3 spaces shown in an area currently occupied by a large vehicle transporter) and another 10 spaces to the west for overflow parking/ long term parking. This area also provides a turning head. This plan initially showed 4 spaces to the rear of the existing building blocking the garage door to the proposed outbuilding. A further amendment was sought (and received) that rectifies this error by replacing a previously proposed vehicular door with a pedestrian door and window. All of the parking spaces shown measure the

standard 2.4m by 4.8m and there is 7.8m between the facing rows of parking spaces to the rear of the site, which allows for an adequate turning area for vehicles. This shall remain unobstructed.

7.5.3 Having viewed this amended site plan, the County Council as Highway Authority has removed their holding response. County now raises no objection to the proposal subject to three conditions being applied to the decision, relating to details of the car park surface treatment, and the parking spaces and manoeuvring spaces shown on the amended site plan being provided and available for use prior to the development being brought into use/first occupied.

### 7.6 Other Matters

7.6.1 Whilst it is acknowledged that concerns have been raised that Hest Bank Lane experienced some considerable flooding problems, the site is not within Flood Zone 2 or 3, though parts of the site do fall within an area identified as having a surface water flooding issue of 1 in 1000. Therefore, it is at low risk of flooding. Furthermore the proposal is not introducing any additional non-permeable surfaces compared to the existing situation as the proposed building is to be situated on an area of existing hardstanding. Hence the proposal is not thought to have a detrimental impact upon flood risk within the area.

7.6.2 Given the nature of the uses on the site and the sensitivity of the surrounding uses, it is appropriate to impose a contamination condition to protect users of the application site and its environs.

### 8.0 Planning Obligations

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

### 9.0 Conclusions

9.1 The expansion of an existing rural business is acceptable in principle. However the issues for Members is whether this proposal is acceptable in form and siting; whether it is acceptable in terms of its impact on the Green Belt, and whether the building leaves sufficient space for satisfactory car parking. The building is considered appropriate in terms of use and form, and for the reasons contained in this report is not considered to have a detrimental impact upon the Green Belt designation. In terms of satisfactory car parking, the agent has produced an amended plan showing how vehicle can be accommodated across the site and still leave room for on-site turning. County Highways have no objection to this arrangement. However a planning condition will require the spaces to be marked out to ensure that the spaces are as deliverable as the agent indicates. Further safeguards include a condition preventing outdoor storage (i.e. all storage to take place within the new building). Finally, a condition is also imposed restricting the use of the building to storage only, to prevent any excessively noisy activity occurring.

### Recommendation

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

1. Standard 3 year timescale
2. Development to be carried out in accordance to the amended plans
3. Standard contamination condition
4. Materials (including colours and finishes) to match existing buildings
5. On site parking shall be carried out in accordance with the amended proposed site plan, and kept available for such use at all times
6. Details of the surface or paved car park to be submitted, including marking out of car spaces as per the approved plan
7. The building shall not be brought into use before condition 6 has been carried out
8. Hours of construction (Mon to Fri 0800-1800 and Sat 0800-1400 only)
9. The outbuilding to be used for the storage of car parts only. In particular no other operations (oither than storage) shall take place within the outbuilding
10. No outdoor storage

### 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 decision 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 decision has been taken having had regard to the impact of development, and in particular to the relevant policies contained in the Development Plan, as presented in full in the officer report, and to all relevant material planning considerations, including the National Planning Policy Framework, National Planning Practice Guidance and relevant Supplementary Planning Documents/ Guidance.

### **Human Rights Act**

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

### **Background Papers**

None



Agenda Item	Committee Date	Application Number
A7	22 August 2016	16/00578/FUL
<b>Application Site</b> Rear Of Pleasureland Marine Road Central Morecambe Lancashire	<b>Proposal</b> Erection of a two storey indoor trampoline park with associated landscaping and parking and extension of terrace to rear of Pleasureland	
<b>Name of Applicant</b> Mr Solomon Reader	<b>Name of Agent</b> Mr Seb Salisbury	
<b>Decision Target Date</b> Extension of time agreed until 26 August 2016	<b>Reason For Delay</b> Awaiting amended plans	
<b>Case Officer</b>	Mrs Eleanor Fawcett	
<b>Departure</b>	No	
<b>Summary of Recommendation</b>	Approval	

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

- 1.1 The site comprises a large private car park located to the rear of properties which front onto Marine Road Central, approximately 200 metres to the west of the main town centre area of Morecambe, and part of the Pleasureland building, which is an amusement arcade. The car park is accessed from Northumberland Street to the east and is located adjacent to the Morecambe Conservation Area, which covers the buildings fronting onto both Marine Road Central and Northumberland Street.
- 1.2 A number of large buildings, which face towards the seafront, back onto the site, including Winter Gardens (a Grade II\* Listed building), which adjoins Pleasureland. These buildings are mainly two and three storey, although part of the rear of the Winter Gardens is approximately twice the height of the Pleasureland building. To the east of the site is a terrace of three storey properties, which front onto Northumberland Street. These contain a mix of uses including residential, offices and a public house. To the south and south east are Council-owned car parks which are adjacent to the Festival Market and accessed from Central Drive.
- 1.3 The site lies within Morecambe Town Centre boundary, is a Regeneration Priority Area and is within the Morecambe Area Action Plan area.

## **2.0 The Proposal**

- 2.1 The main part of the proposal relates to the erection of a large building, to the north east of the car park, to be used as a trampoline park. It is proposed to be sited approximately 11 metres from the rear of the Winter Gardens and 6.5 metres from the boundary with the properties fronting onto Northumberland Street. The building would measure approximately 48 metres by 50 metres and have an eaves height of 5.9 metres and a ridge height of 8.9 metres. It is proposed to be finished with a cladding system in varying colours of blue, and possibly grey, and would have a hipped dark grey profiled metal sheet roof. Improved pedestrian links through the car park are also proposed, in addition to an area to the west of the building to include seating and bike stands. The land between the building and the boundary with the properties on Northumberland Street would be used as an external storage area and would have a three metre wide access at both the northern and southern ends.

2.2 An extension to the existing terrace at the rear of Pleasureland is also proposed and would include a ramp to allow for disabled access. The usable area of terrace is proposed to be extended from 1.9 metres to a depth of 5.9 metres. Clarification has been sought with regards to the proposed materials and elevation plans showing any proposed balustrade.

**3.0 Site History**

3.1 The only relevant history, on the car park element of the site, relates to a planning application for the change of use of part of this for car boot sales on Saturdays (14/00262/CU), which was approved in 2014, and the erection of a foodstore in 1995 (95/00058/FUL). The latter was proposed in a similar location to the building on the current application, but had a smaller footprint. It was refused for the following reasons:

- The development would be contrary to the Morecambe and Heysham Local Plan and the associated Development Brief covering the area. The proposal would undermine the comprehensive development scheme for the Central Promenade Area by bringing in a significant food retailing element into part of the site earmarked for supporting visitor attractions and result in an overall reduction in the amount of public off-street parking potentially available in the site.
- The development would prejudice restoration proposals for the Winter Gardens, a Grade II\* Listed Building, which occupies land immediately north of the site.
- The increased supply of convenience retail floorspace would be likely to affect adversely the vitality and viability of the older part of the town centre of Morecambe.

3.2 There have been a number of applications on the Pleasureland building which are listed below:

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
16/00638/FUL	Alterations and remodelling of existing front elevation including new structural elements, new cladding and replacement windows to first floor	Approved
12/00706/FUL	Retrospective application for the creation of a disabled access and decked area with revised balustrade to the rear of Pleasureland	Application returned (as no application fee was paid)
10/00875/FUL	Retrospective application for the creation of a decked area to the rear of Pleasureland	Refused and appeal dismissed (Enforcement notice also served for the removal of the decked area and upheld at appeal, subject to increase in timescale for compliance)

**4.0 Consultation Responses**

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

Consultee	Response
Morecambe Town Council	No comments received
County Highway	<b>No objection</b> subject to conditions requiring: details of covered and secure cycle storage facilities; details of surfacing and marking of parking and turning; and offsite highway works, to include laying / refreshing of transverse Stop and Give Way thermoplastic lines.
County Strategic Planning	No comments received
Lead Local Flood Authority	No comments received

<b>Environmental Health</b>	<b>No objection</b> subject to conditions requiring: standard contamination conditions; hours of construction; scheme for dust control; noise mitigation; opening hours.
<b>Conservation Officer</b>	<b>Concerns</b> - overall from a conservation and heritage perspective, the proposed materials, massing and architectural design of the proposed indoor trampoline park are not desirable and would not make a positive contribution to the setting of surrounding heritage assets.
<b>Regeneration Team</b>	The proposal is consistent with MAAP Policy D05. Queries regarding the status of proposed pedestrian routes and maintenance of the existing arcade which provides a link to the seafront.
<b>Historic England</b>	<b>No comments to make.</b>
<b>Victorian Society</b>	<b>No comments to make.</b>
<b>Environment Agency</b>	Advised that the proposal does not fall within their consultation framework
<b>Natural England</b>	<b>No comments to make.</b>
<b>Fire Safety Officer</b>	It should be ensured that the scheme fully meets all the requirements of part B5 of the Building Regulations.
<b>Theatres Trust</b>	<b>No objection</b> in principle but seek assurances that full access to the rear of the Winter Gardens will be maintained.

**5.0 Neighbour Representations**

5.1 Five pieces of correspondence have been received raising objections, and set out the following concerns:

- Scale of the building not in keeping with existing development in the vicinity
- Poor design and appearance, similar to an industrial unit
- Loss of light to residential properties, overbearing and noise impacts (including from increased traffic), impact on view and privacy
- Adverse impacts on office working conditions and environments, including loss of light and increased noise
- Impact on the Grade II\* Listed building (Winter Gardens) and the Conservation Area
- Storage area will encourage pests/rodents
- Increase in traffic and impacts on Northumberland Street
- No proposals for landscaping
- Previous foodstore application was refused as it would prejudice the restoration of the Winter Gardens. The current proposal will impact on accessibility and parking.
- Loss of parking which support existing attractions

**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 **23** – Ensuring the vitality of town centres  
 Paragraph **32** – Access and transport  
 Paragraphs **56, 58 and 60** – Requiring good design  
 Paragraph **70** - Safeguarding cultural facilities  
 Paragraph **123** – Noise impacts  
 Paragraphs **131 – 134, 137 and 141** – Designated heritage assets

6.2 Lancaster District Core Strategy

**SC1** – Sustainable development  
**SC5** – Achieving quality in design  
**SC6** – Crime and community safety

6.3 Development Management Development Plan Document

**DM1** – Town centre development  
**DM3** – Public realm and civic space

- DM12** – Leisure facilities and attractions
- DM20** – Enhancing accessibility and transport linkages
- DM21** – Walking and cycling
- DM22** – Vehicle parking provision
- DM30** – Development affecting Listed buildings
- DM31** – Development affecting Conservation Areas
- DM32** – The setting of designated heritage assets
- DM35** – Key design principles
- DM39** – Surface water run-off and sustainable drainage

## 6.4 Morecambe Area Action Plan Development Plan Document

- SP1** – Key pedestrian routes and spaces
- DO5** – Festival Market and area

## 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;
- Access and highway implications;
- Impact on amenity of neighbouring properties; and
- Impact on cultural facilities.

## 7.2 Principle of development

7.2.1 The site is located within the Morecambe Town Centre boundary and is within land identified as 'Development Opportunity Site DO5' as set out in the Morecambe Area Action Plan (MAAP). As such, proposals for main town centre uses, of which leisure is one, are encouraged in principle subject to the specific details being acceptable. A trampoline park would be anticipated to be a significant generator of footfall in an area which is currently devoid of activity, particularly outside of the summer season. The proposal has the potential to help make for a more compact town centre, as envisaged by the MAAP.

## 7.3 Scale, design and impact on heritage assets

7.3.1 The site is on the boundary of Morecambe's Conservation Area and immediately behind the Grade II\* Listed Winter Gardens. The Conservation Area is designated for its historic linear development of seaside resort, its mixture of late-19th and early-20th terraced houses some with ground floor shopfronts and its eclectic mix of revival architectural styles. The Winter Gardens, formerly known as the Victorian Pavilion, is a landmark feature in Morecambe and is a particularly important example of a late-Victorian theatre. The significance of the building relates to its rarity as example of late-Victorian theatre, its retention of architectural merit and its historic association with the exponential development of Morecambe as a seaside resort in the late-19th century.

7.3.2 The proposed indoor trampoline park is sited immediately behind the Winter Gardens and along the boundary of the Conservation Area. The location and design of the proposal will have a direct impact on the setting of the Listed Building and Conservation Area. The building would measure 48 by 50 metres, with an external footprint of approximately 2,400sq.m, and be sited approximately 11 metres from the rear of the Listed Building. The original design proposed horizontal profiled metal cladding in a silver finish, with a grey brick plinth and a blue cladded panel marking the entrance. The plans also showed some large fabric panels containing images, spaced along the side of the building. It

was considered that the original design had an overly industrial appearance. Although some cladding had been proposed to add colour, overall it was not considered that the design related well to the proposed leisure use and was more akin to a building that you would expect to see on an industrial or retail estate, rather than within a town centre location.

7.3.3 Given the size of building required for the type of leisure use proposed, it would never be able to fully respect the scale of the surrounding buildings, in particular the adjacent terrace, and would be seen as a stand-alone building. As such, it is considered important to ensure that the proposal provides a high quality building, taking a contemporary approach, and possibly making it an attraction in its own right.

7.3.4 Amended plans have been received following the concerns being raised regarding the design. The footprint and position of the building have not been altered, but a different cladding system has been proposed to the external walls, in addition to a new glazed entrance at the southwest corner. Vertical cladding panels have been proposed in three tiers, with varying thicknesses. It is proposed to have one background colour with two tones of blue increasing in frequency towards the entrance to give an impression of movement. Concerns have been raised regarding the use of white as the main colour as it is considered that the finish could deteriorate quite rapidly. Grey has been proposed as an alternative, but it is considered that three tones of blue may be more appropriate. The effect proposed with the use of the cladding could significantly enhance the appearance of the building and help to break up its overall bulk and massing. However, at present it appears a little busy and confused. Whilst the cladding is acceptable in principle, the precise arrangement, size and colour of the cladding panels can be, and should be, controlled by condition. The glazed element for the entrance provides a clear focal point on the building, and subject to precise details, is considered to be acceptable.

7.3.5 There were also concerns raised regarding the low pitched hipped roof and it was suggested that alternative approaches were considered, such as a curved roof, so that it was clearly different from the surrounding development. No alterations have been made to the pitch and design of the roof, but it has been shown that it would be finished in a dark grey colour, and a stronger overhanging detail has been proposed to the eaves. Given the height of the building, when viewed in close proximity, the roof will not be discernible. As such, on balance, this element is considered to be acceptable.

7.3.6 In relation to the original proposal, the Conservation Officer raised concerns regarding the proposed materials, massing and architectural design and set out that they would not make a positive contribution to the setting of surrounding heritage assets. In addition to the design, it was advised that consideration be given to moving the facing elevation further from the heritage assets. The applicant did not want to reduce the footprint of the building as it was considered that this was the optimal size for the use proposed. Further comments from the Conservation Officer will be updated at the meeting. However, given the separation distance proposed and the scale and appearance of the rear of the Winter Gardens (which is markedly different in appearance than the more elegant front of the building), it is not considered that the proposal will unduly impact on its setting or that of the Conservation Area.

7.3.7 The scheme also includes the extension of the terrace area at the rear of Pleasureland. No elevations have been provided of this, but have been requested. A retrospective application for timber decking has been previously refused and an appeal dismissed as a result of its impact on the setting of the Listed Building and the Conservation Area. However, if designed sensitively, it is likely to be acceptable. Further details will be updated at the Committee meeting.

## 7.4 Access and Highway Implications

7.4.1 The site is currently used as a privately managed parking facility for 450 vehicles accessed off Northumberland Street. The proposal will reduce the overall number of available spaces to 280. However, there are significant areas of other town centre car parking in the immediate vicinity. The Highway Authority has advised that the reduction in car parking spaces will have a negligible impact on vehicle movements over surrounding lengths of the public highway network. The area is also served by both rail and bus services in close proximity to the site. A condition has been requested in relation to off-site highway works in order to influence vehicle speeds along Northumberland Street at the point of access with the car park.

7.4.2 The Highway Authority has also requested a condition requiring 12 covered and secure parking

spaces. Cycle parking would be required for staff as well as for users of the facility. These have been shown on the amended plan, with 8 public cycle stands to the west of the building and secure staff cycle lockers located adjacent to the gate to the rear storage area. It is not clear whether these are big enough for the proposed purpose, but there are concerns regarding the visual impact of such, as they are on the public side of the gate. It may be more appropriate to provide the facility within the storage area. However, it is considered that the precise details could be controlled by condition.

7.4.3 New footpath links have been identified across the car park on the submitted site plan. Policy SP1 of the MAPP identifies a Key Pedestrian Route between Northumberland Street and the Flock of Words 'Poem' Path and, connecting to this, one from the Path north to the seafront. At present these are no more than desire lines across a car park. The policy expectation is that development will deliver these routes. The site proposed for the building means that it should relate well to the routes sought. The pedestrian refuge besides the building's south elevation will provide an element of the east-west route sought. It has been advised by the Regeneration Team that this should be a minimum 3 metres in width and constructed in appropriate and durable materials. Away from the building, the key pedestrian routes are shown as extending through the parking areas to make the linkages necessary. To optimise the pedestrian use of these, and in the interests of pedestrian safety, it is important that they are clearly demarcated with appropriate and durable surfacing treatments.

7.4.4 The application does not address the status of the key pedestrian routes through the site. Given these are key routes it is important to ensure that the public use of these and the connectivity these will afford is retained. The application shows a route for pedestrians extending from the application site via the Arcade through to the seafront. This is consistent with the Policy, however, the physical condition of the Arcade is currently less than satisfactory and the application offers nothing towards improving it. The applicant is encouraged to address this with, as a minimum, proposals to improve the appearance of the Arcade and to sustain these with regular maintenance and cleansing. The Arcade is not within the red-edged site (but within the applicant's ownership), but should the application be approved then officers envisage that a scheme for the maintenance and management of this could be agreed.

### 7.5 Impact on amenity of neighbouring properties

7.5.1 There are a number of properties fronting onto Northumberland Street, adjacent to the site. These have a mix of uses including residential, offices and one public house. When considering the siting of new dwellings, it would normally be expected that a distance of 12 metres be maintained between a blank wall and a habitable room window. Although the proposal relates to a much larger building, the eaves and ridge height are not dissimilar to a standard dwelling and as such this approach is considered appropriate in this instance. The scheme proposes at least this separation distance, and for most of the properties it is greater than this. There are also no windows proposed in this elevation, and two doors at ground floor. Given the above, it is not considered that there will be a detrimental impact on privacy or daylight to these properties. There is an existing wall along this boundary which varies in height, but is around 1.4 metres. It is not clear who has ownership of this, but it may be appropriate for the height to be increased or an additional higher boundary treatment to be installed to prevent overlooking from the storage area and to help screen this. It is not clear what is proposed to be stored in this area, but a height limit on this could be conditioned.

7.5.2 An environmental noise impact assessment has been submitted with the application. It is considered that this satisfactorily demonstrates, with predictive modelling, that noise impacts associated with the structural elements of the development can be adequately mitigated so that lowest observed effect levels are likely to be achieved at the nearest noise sensitive receptors. Environmental Health have advised that a condition is required to ensure that the structural elements described within the table provided in the 'summary' section of the report are provided as a minimum standard.

7.5.3 The survey undertaken did not assess potential noise impacts associated with plant noise. A condition is required to ensure that an assessment is undertaken to determine these impacts so that appropriate mitigation measures can be put in place. Considering the existing use of the land and typical noise characteristics associated within this area, it has been recommended that a rating level of 3dBA above 'typical'  $L_{A90}$ , is achieved during daytime hours at the façade of the nearest noise sensitive receptors. If it is necessary for plant to be operational during 'night-time' periods the development should be designed to achieve a rating level of 5dB below the 'typical' night-time  $L_{A90}$ .

7.5.4 The assessment has not considered potential impacts associated with the potential increased vehicle use at this location or potential noise impacts associated with people noise. However, having regard to the existing uses associated with the development site and its location, it is considered that there will be negligible impacts. It has also been recommended that opening hours are restricted to those detailed within the application form (10.00 until 22.00) and delivery hours are also restricted.

### 7.6 Impact on Cultural Facility

7.6.1 The Theatres Trust have raised some concerns regarding the potential impacts on safe and efficient access by vehicles to make deliveries of sets and equipment at the rear of Winter Gardens and have highlighted that a standard articulated lorry is 16.5 metres in length. They have advised that any restrictions on access for vehicles of this nature would have a long term negative impact on the future operation and viability of the theatre. Paragraph 70 of the NPPF provides clear guidance on the importance of safeguarding cultural facilities and states that in 'promoting healthy communities', planning decisions should 'plan positively for cultural buildings' and 'guard against the loss of cultural facilities and services'.

7.6.2 A distance of 10.8 metres has been left between the rear of the Winter Gardens and the application site boundary, part of which is within the applicant's ownership. There is also a small area between this and the north elevation of the building. There is sufficient space for the parking and turning of smaller vehicles, although there may be issues with larger lorries. However, the car park is not within the ownership of the Winter Gardens, and there are currently bollards between this space and the car park. As such, the proposal would not have any additional implications than the current situation.

## 8.0 Planning Obligations

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

## 9.0 Conclusions

9.1 The proposal will provide a covered leisure facility within a sustainable town centre location and should also improve pedestrian links through this area. There were original concerns regarding the massing and design of the building, in particular its relationship to the Conservation Area and Grade II\* Listed building. However, the amendments have gone some way to addressing the concerns and overall it is considered that there will not be an adverse impact on the setting of either of these heritage assets. It is also considered that there will not be a detrimental impact on the amenities of neighbouring properties or on highway safety. Potential issues with contaminated land and surface water can be adequately controlled by condition.

## Recommendation

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

1. Standard time condition
2. Approved plans
3. Construction Management Plan
4. Investigation/ remediation of contaminated land
5. Surface water drainage scheme
6. Noise mitigation, including noise generated by the plant
7. Off-site highway improvement works namely: Implementation of a range of off-site highway improvement works relevant to influencing vehicle speeds along Northumberland Street at its point of access with "Winter Gardens" car park
8. Precise details of layout out of the car park and pedestrian links, including materials, lighting, benches, cycle stands, bollards, landscaping and maintenance
9. Materials/details including – cladding (material, colour and arrangement), roofing material, windows/ doors (including any effects to glazing), eaves and ridge details, rainwater goods, boundary treatments
10. Materials/ details of extended terrace
11. Secure staff cycle facilities (notwithstanding details shown on submitted plan)
12. Opening hours 10.00 – 22.00
13. Restriction of delivery hours
14. Height limit to external storage area

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

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

Lancaster City Council has made the recommendation in a positive and proactive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development, working proactively with the applicant to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. The recommendation has been taken having had regard to the impact of development, and in particular to the relevant policies contained in the Development Plan, as presented in full in the 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> A8	<b>Committee Date</b> 22 August 2016	<b>Application Number</b> 16/00569/FUL
<b>Application Site</b> Red Court Caravan Park Lancaster Road Carnforth Lancashire	<b>Proposal</b> Demolition of existing Working Men's Club, erection of a 3 storey retirement home comprising 40 apartments and communal facilities, alterations to the roadside wall, and associated landscaping works to provide car park and garden spaces	
<b>Name of Applicant</b> McCarthy & Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd	<b>Name of Agent</b> Mr Chris Butt	
<b>Decision Target Date</b> 22 August 2016	<b>Reason For Delay</b> N/A	
<b>Case Officer</b>	Mr Andrew Drummond	
<b>Departure</b>	No	
<b>Summary of Recommendation</b>	Approval	

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

- 1.1 The application site is located within the urban area of Carnforth to the west of Lancaster Road (A6). The site comprises a large 2 storey Victorian building with a significantly sized single storey extension and associated grounds. The property has been used as a working men's club, with land to the south and east utilised as its car park. The land to the north contains 6 static caravans, 3 enjoying residential consent and the other 3 holiday use. There is also a small outbuilding located in this part of the site, which appears to have historically been used in association with the Victorian building. Land to the rear of the site (to the west) benefits from consent for 9 static caravans but at the current time remains undeveloped. Both pedestrian and vehicular access is off Lancaster Road.
- 1.2 The site boundaries generally comprise a limestone wall to the north and east and close boarded timber fences to the south and west. The south and west boundaries in particular are lined by trees, with a secondary row of trees running north-south within the site to the west of the existing clubhouse (predominantly elm and sycamore). The eastern boundary benefits from a single, mature horse chestnut tree. The western (rear) part of the site sits at a lower level than the eastern (front) part of the site that currently accommodates the clubhouse and static caravans.
- 1.3 The site is undesignated on the Local Plan Proposal Map, but there are 2 Tree Preservation Orders nos. 13 (1975) and 43 (1978) in place.

## **2.0 The Proposal**

- 2.1 The application seeks planning permission for the demolition of the existing clubhouse and the erection of a 3 storey property comprising 20 1-bed and 20 2-bed apartments with communal spaces on the higher, eastern part of the site. The building would be constructed of smooth and rubble reconstituted stone and off-white rendered walls under a grey concrete tile with thin profile uPVC windows and doors and black uPVC rainwater goods. The lower section of the site would provide a 34 space car park and landscaped gardens. Further landscaped gardens would be provided to the front of the proposed building. The existing vehicular and pedestrian access points onto Lancaster Road would be retained and utilised, and the boundary wall to this frontage made good and lowered

to a consistent height. The trees within the site would be protected and retained with the exception of a row of Leyland Cypress within the north west corner of the site, which would be removed.

### **3.0 Site History**

3.1 Whilst the site is dominated by the large Victorian building, which has been used as a clubhouse, the site's planning history mainly relates to consents for static caravans, most for holiday use only, though some benefit from permanent residential status. Permissions stretch back to the 1970s:

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
77/900	Retention of land as caravan park for 3 residential and 14 static holiday caravans	Permitted
83/3	Continued use of land as caravan site with period of occupancy to include winter weekends and Christmas period	Permitted
11/00812/VCN	Continued use of land as caravan site with period of occupancy to include winter weekends and Christmas period (pursuant to the variation of condition 2 on planning permission 83/3 to enable the caravans to be used for a 12 month holiday season)	Permitted
15/00187/VCN	Retention of land as caravan park for 3 residential and 14 static holiday caravans (pursuant to the variation of conditions 2 and 3 on planning permission 77/900 to improve road layout and reduce caravan units from 11 to 9)	Permitted

### **4.0 Consultation Responses**

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

Consultee	Response
County Highways	<b>No objection.</b> Conditions requested regarding the submission of a Construction Method Statement prior to commencement, and the implementation of a scheme of off-site highway works and the access road, car parking spaces and turning space prior to occupation.
Tree Officer	<b>No objection.</b> Conditions requested regarding the implementation of the approved Tree Protection Plan, Arboriculture Implications Assessment and landscaping scheme, and the submission of an Arboricultural Method Statement
Environmental Health	No comments received during the statutory consultation period.
Canal and River Trust	<b>No objection.</b>
Local Lead Flood Authority	<b>No objection.</b> Conditions requested regarding the submission of a surface water drainage scheme and maintenance/management plan.
Carnforth Town Council	<b>No objection</b> – the Parish Council supports the proposal.
Police	<b>No objection.</b> Makes a number of security recommendations regarding external lighting, landscaping, glazing specification, boundary treatments, and access arrangements into the building.
Fire and Rescue	<b>No objection.</b> It should be ensured that the scheme fully meets all the requirements of part B5 of the Building Regulations.

### **5.0 Neighbour Representations**

5.1 5 objections have been received citing the following concerns:

- Design (height, appearance, scale, out of keeping with the character of the area)
- Loss of amenity (loss of light, overlooking, noise of construction, air quality associated with demolition)

- Highway impacts (access arrangements, parking demand, construction works, increased traffic, impact of additional traffic on air quality in the town)
- Lack of demand for this type of development
- Changes to the height of the boundary wall to the site's frontage

A reduction in property values was also raised but this is not a planning consideration.

2 pieces of correspondence have been received neither supporting the scheme nor objecting to it, but raising queries over the building's height, the site's ground levels and drainage (impact on properties abutting the site to the rear).

9 pieces of correspondence have been received supporting the scheme on the basis that it utilises a redundant site, the proposal's appearance matches and enhances its locality, would free up family houses as older couples downsize, and the application proposes an appropriate use for the site. However, a few concerns were also raised within the content of these responses, including the need to retain existing trees, to lower the wall to the site frontage and to consider traffic, access and parking.

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

### **6.1 National Planning Policy Framework**

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

Paragraph **49** and **50** - housing

Paragraphs **56**, **58** and **60** - good design

### **6.2 Development Management DPD**

Policy **DM20** Enhancing accessibility

Policy **DM22** Parking provision

Policy **DM27** Biodiversity

Policy **DM29** Protection of trees, hedgerows and woodland

Policy **DM35** Key design principles

Policy **DM41** New residential dwellings

Policy **DM45** Accommodation for older people

Policy **DM49** Local services

### **6.3 Lancaster District Core Strategy**

Policy **SC1** Sustainable development

Policy **SC2** Urban concentration

Policy **SC4** Meeting the District's Housing Requirements

Policy **SC5** Achieving quality in design

## **7.0 Comment and Analysis**

7.1 There are 6 principal planning considerations arising from the proposal:

- Principle of development, including loss of a community facility and the need for housing for older people
- Affordable housing provision
- Impact on the local highway network, including access and parking
- Impact on protected trees
- Impact on residential amenity
- Design, scale, massing and streetscene considerations

### **7.2 Principle of Development**

7.2.1 The working men's club is classified as a community facility, and therefore its loss must be considered in light of policy DM49. The preamble to this policy states that the Council will resist the

loss of local services where it is demonstrated that they are valued by the community they serve. The facility closed about 10 years ago and it is understood that it has only been in occasional use since. It is also noted from the submitted Statement of Community Involvement that 79% of the 45 attendees of the consultation event that was arranged by the applicant prior to the application's submission were in general support of the proposal. In light of this evidence, it would be appropriate to conclude that the value associated with the facility is limited. Furthermore there are similar facilities available within Carnforth which are equally accessible. Therefore whilst the site was only subject to a very limited marketing campaign (effectively a self-made board with a private mobile number) and no evidence of interest arising from this marketing exercise has been recorded, in this particular case there is sufficient information available to conclude that the loss of the facility is justified.

7.2.2 Carnforth is identified as one of the 4 urban areas in the District where new housing should be located. The site is located at the south end of the urban area of Carnforth, close to Crag Bank. It is situated about 750m from the centre of Carnforth with its range of community facilities, including rail station, doctors' surgery, supermarkets, library and other social infrastructure. Regular northbound bus services also stop on the A6 outside the site, with the associated southbound stop located only c100m to the north of the site. Therefore in locational terms, the proposal for 40 apartments is acceptable, especially given that they are designed for a particular end user – older people – a growing part of the local population where there is a clear, identified need for purpose built accommodation.

### 7.3 Affordable Housing Provision

7.3.1 The application was submitted with a financial appraisal, which concluded that the scheme was not viable if any planning obligations were to be imposed. However, with the agreement of the agent, the appraisal was independently assessed by an external consultant who questioned a few elements of it. The final conclusion of this work is still outstanding at the time of writing, but what has been established to date is that the development can sustain the imposition of a financial contribution towards affordable housing. Normally a residential scheme comprising 40 units within an urban area would be required to provide 30% provision on site (in this case 12 units), but no Registered Provider would take on units within such a scheme due to the complexities of the management arrangements and the associated service charging regime. Therefore the securing by legal agreement a financial contribution towards off site affordable housing provision in the District in lieu of on-site provision is acceptable.

### 7.4 Highway Impacts

7.4.1 The application site fronts onto the A6 south of Carnforth. This is a particularly busy section of highway, especially given the traffic light controlled junction that serves the Tesco supermarket generates long queues of traffic particularly during rush hour periods. The Highway Authority has reviewed the submission and raised no objection to the proposal that seeks to utilise the existing access onto Lancaster Road. 34 car parking spaces are proposed, though there is space within the site for additional spaces should the demand exceed this (subject to gaining the relevant planning consent). A buggy store is also provided at ground floor level for residents to park their mobility scooters. Subject to conditions securing the access road, car parking spaces and turning space the Highway Authority is satisfied that there is no adverse impact on highway safety or efficiency arising from the proposal. They have also sought the upgrading of the south and north bound bus stops on Lancaster Road in the vicinity of the site and the provision of dropped kerbs and tactile paving on both sides of Lancaster Road close to the site access to assist pedestrians across the road. These off site highway works should also be secured by condition.

### 7.5 Protected Trees

7.5.1 The applicant submitted a pre-application enquiry to the Local Planning Authority prior to the submission of this application. This has aided the determination process as many of the key elements of the scheme were discussed at an early stage. One of the crucial material considerations arising from the proposal is the protection and retention of the protected trees as there are 2 tree preservation orders in place. The layout has been informed by the root protection areas of the protected trees, which effectively splits the site into 2 sections – the apartment building would be situated within the larger front portion of the site with the smaller, lower section to the rear utilised for car parking and additional garden space. This allows the row of trees to the west and

south boundaries and the row through the site to be retained, in addition to the horse chestnut on the front boundary. The small group of non-native Leyland cypress trees in the north west corner would be lost, but there is no amenity loss as a result. However, their removal will be compensated for by the planting of new trees within the proposed (and agreed) landscaping scheme for the site. Tree Protection Plan and Arboricultural Implications Assessment are also agreed and, subject to conditions to secure their implementation and the requirement for a Tree Method Statement, the Tree Officer has no objection to the proposal.

### 7.6 Residential Amenity

7.6.1 To protect the roots of the existing trees within the site, the building's façade is slightly staggered. However, even the part of the building that is closest to Lancaster Road is still set back 25m from the terraced properties opposite meaning that the adopted 21m separation distance between facing habitable room windows is exceeded. The southern elevation is set back by 22m from the site boundary (except where it abuts a small parcel of public open space) so again the amenity of the residential properties on St Austell Place is preserved. The western elevation is set back from its corresponding boundary by more than 32m and is separated by 2 rows of trees, so houses and gardens on Camborne Avenue are protected. A 1.8m close boarded fence is proposed along this edge of the site which is sufficient to prevent overlooking or the glare of vehicle lights from the proposed car park. The north elevation of the apartment building is only set in from the boundary by c4.5m, which is shared by 28 Victoria Street and 150 Lancaster Road. Both neighbouring properties have blank gables facing the application site, so there are no concerns arising in terms of separation distances. Their associated external amenity spaces are screened by an existing c3m high wall at ground floor, though some limited overlooking could arise from the proposed upper floor windows. As none of the first or second floor windows serve habitable rooms (or if they do they are secondary windows) then it is appropriate to require them to be fitted with obscure, fixed (non-opening) glazing.

### 7.7 Design

7.7.1 The immediate area has a mix of housing types, including Victorian long and short terraces and more modern semi-detached and detached dwellings. Nevertheless, they are all 2 storey in height. The proposed apartment building is 3 storeys and therefore could be deemed to be out of character with its surroundings, except that the building is set in by 12m to 17m behind a high boundary wall, which is to be retained. The site can accommodate a building of this scale without it dominating the streetscene or the surrounding properties. The development has been carefully designed with its façade broken into sections (including changes to the eaves and ridge heights) to allow some relief over its c70m length. The use of balconies and string courses as well as rubble reconstituted stone (to particular sections) will create shadows during the first half of the day which will help animate the façade further. In addition the large building will sit within a landscaped environment, some of which is existing in the form of well established trees. When the existing tarmac surface and overgrown sections of the site are replaced with grassed and planted areas, the existing trees will be supplemented, providing a verdant context for the 3 storey built form. The design, including scale and materials, of the building are deemed to be acceptable subject to agreeing specific details which can be controlled by condition.

7.7.2 Whilst the apartments vary in size, they are all well proportioned and easily meet the Council's adopted internal space standards for flats. The proposal does not include care provision, as assisted living schemes would, but the building does provide a large (c110sq.m) communal lounge for residents to use and an en-suite guest bedroom for resident's visitors.

### 7.8 Other Matters

#### 7.8.1 Drainage

The site is previously developed with over a half of it having a hard surface or buildings on it. The existing permeable surface is predominantly limited to the smaller rear section of the site which is set at a lower level. It is here where the applicant proposes to install 2 large soakaways. Permeable paving is proposed to part of the access road and the manoeuvring areas around the parking spaces and grassed areas are proposed to the front of the site that currently have a hard surface. Therefore the scheme proposes more permeable surfaces than currently exist. The introduction of the soakaways is generally supported, but the Local Lead Flood Authority's (LLFA) has requested a condition requiring further details, and a further condition for the associated management/maintenance plan. As their comments were submitted very late in the determination

period, the imposition of the requested conditions will be required, which is unfortunate as had they been provided within the statutory consultation period the applicant would have been afforded the time to provide the requested information and the conditions could have potentially been worded differently (i.e. the approved surface water drainage scheme to be implemented prior to occupation rather than requesting details for approval in addition to the implementation requirement).

### 7.8.2 Ecology

A Phase One Habitat Survey and Bat Surveys were undertaken and the subsequent reports were submitted as part of the application. Each made recommendations to protect bats, hedgehogs and nesting birds and to enhance the habitats that they may utilise. These include undertaking certain works during particular months of the year or using particular methods of working if undertaken at other times. Bat and bird boxes and hedgehog domes are suggested alongside enhanced landscaped areas that incorporate native species and wild flower mix seed, and also sensitive lighting to external areas. The existing building externally has a number of features deemed suitable to support roosting bats. These features include slipped roof and ridge tiles and damaged barge boards and soffits. No sign of current or historic roosting bats was identified internally. The additional building on site is a storage outbuilding which was classed as having negligible bat roost potential. A total of three bat presence/absence surveys were undertaken over a 2 month period. Intermittent foraging activity by one bat species was observed on all three surveys, occurring in the sheltered area toward the south west corner of the main building, under the mature trees in the same area, and above the overgrown grassland on the western boundary. At no time were bats observed emerging from or entering any of the buildings on site. A total of 5 bats were observed flying from or to the west of the site, which probably means that the biological records are still relevant with a roost nearby on Camborne Avenue.

### 7.8.3 Contamination

The application has been accompanied by a phase 1 and phase 2 geotechnical and ground investigation reports. At the time of writing no response has been received from the Council's Contaminated Land officer but this has been chased. Given that part of the site has been utilised as a car park in the past, there could have been oil/fuel spillages from vehicles, and there was evidence of fly tipping during the case officer's site visit, which again could have introduced contaminants to the site which would not have resulted from any previous uses.

## **8.0 Planning Obligations**

8.1 As discussed in paragraph 7.3.1, the provision of affordable housing on site is not appropriate in this instance. However, the development proposal has been proven through analysis of the financial appraisal to be viable with the inclusion of a requirement to secure a contribution towards the provision of affordable housing in the District. The precise amount is still being negotiated and will be reported verbally at the Committee meeting. It is reasonable to request some (25%) of the monies are paid prior to the first occupation and the majority (75%) prior to the occupation of the 20<sup>th</sup> unit.

## **9.0 Conclusions**

9.1 The site has become under-utilised since the facility closed about 10 years ago, and there are signs that the site is becoming untidy. This application proposes to regenerate the site, which is prominently located on the southern arterial route into Carnforth from the south. The residential use is appropriate, especially of a form that delivers specific accommodation for older people. It is very sustainably located, with key services and facilities within short walking distances. The proposal is appropriately designed in terms of scale and materials, and the layout respects neighbouring residential properties and the protected trees whilst providing sufficient space for parking, access and manoeuvring. The application is therefore recommended for approval.

## **Recommendation**

That Planning Permission **BE GRANTED** subject to the signing and completing of a Unilateral Undertaking to secure a financial contribution towards affordable housing provision in the District and the following conditions:

1. Standard 3 year timescale
2. Development in accordance with approved plans
3. Construction Method Statement

4. Tree Method Statement
5. Surface water drainage scheme and management/maintenance plan
6. Materials, including colours and finishes (reconstituted stone, render, roof tiles, ridge tile, windows, doors, rainwater goods, fascias/verges/soffits, balconies, dormer cladding, surface treatments, boundary treatments, external lighting)
7. Off-site highway works (bus stop upgrades either side of Lancaster Road and highway works to facilitate crossing point over Lancaster Road)
8. Landscaping scheme (incorporating additional tree planting) and maintenance regime
9. Lancaster Road boundary wall – details required but not to be lowered below the height of the southern half of the existing wall and pedestrian archway to be retained
10. Recommendations of the Extended Phase 1 Habitat Survey and the Bat Survey to be implemented
11. Obscure, fixed (non-opening) glazing to first and second floor windows on north elevation
12. Approved Arboricultural Implications Assessment and Tree Protection Plan to be implemented
13. Parking, turning space and access road – approved details to be implemented
14. Hours of construction (Mon to Fri 0800-1800 and Sat 0800-1400)
15. Separate drainage system

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

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

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

### **Human Rights Act**

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

### **Background Papers**

None.

<p><b>Agenda Item</b></p> <p>A9</p>	<p><b>Committee Date</b></p> <p>22 August 2016</p>	<p><b>Application Number</b></p> <p>16/00570/FUL</p>
<p><b>Application Site</b></p> <p>Brookside Whams Lane Bay Horse Lancaster</p>	<p><b>Proposal</b></p> <p>Demolition of agricultural building, erection of a detached residential dwelling, a garage/workshop, installation of solar array panel and erection of two polytunnels</p>	
<p><b>Name of Applicant</b></p> <p>Mr Ken Parker</p>	<p><b>Name of Agent</b></p> <p>Chris Weetman</p>	
<p><b>Decision Target Date</b></p> <p>6 July 2016</p>	<p><b>Reason For Delay</b></p> <p>Awaiting additional plans and Committee Cycle</p>	
<p><b>Case Officer</b></p>	<p>Mrs Kim Ireland</p>	
<p><b>Departure</b></p>	<p>No</p>	
<p><b>Summary of Recommendation</b></p>	<p>Refusal</p>	

**(i) Procedural Matters**

The proposed development would normally fall within the scheme of delegation. However, Councillor Charles has requested that the application be referred to the Planning Committee for a decision on the grounds that the proposal will enhance the character and appearance of the countryside area due to the replacement of an outbuilding and a garage with a dwelling, garage/workshop, ground-mounted solar panels and polytunnel.

**1.0 The Site and its Surroundings**

1.1 The land which forms the subject of this application relates to land to the north east of the dwelling Brookside on Whams Lane in Bay Horse. Whams Lane lies approximately 3km south east of the village of Galgate and is a classified road (C499) which forms the main rural traffic route from Bay Horse on the A6 to Quernmore. The site is located in the open countryside within a continuous ribbon of residential development bisected by the M6 Motorway where Whams Lane crosses by bridge. The wider area is characterised by farmsteads and small clusters of buildings and isolated dwellings.

1.2 The site is allocated as a countryside area in the Lancaster District Local proposals map. There are two trees covered by a Tree Preservation Order that are situated east of the site boundary.

**2.0 The Proposal**

2.1 The application proposes the erection of one detached residential dwelling, a garage/workshop, installation of solar array panel and erection of two polytunnels. The proposed dwelling is to be sited to the north east of the dwelling of Brookside.

**3.0 Site History**

3.1 There have been three planning applications refused in 2005, 2007 and 2014 for the erection of a detached dwelling, two of which have been appealed and dismissed.



Application Number	Proposal	Decision
05/01600/FUL	Erection of a 2 storey detached dwelling and separate garage on land to the side	Refused
07/01613/OUT	Outline application for the demolition of existing bungalow and agricultural building and erection of two 4 bedroom houses	Refused (Appeal Dismissed)
14/00647/OUT	Outline application for the demolition of existing building and erection of one residential detached dwelling and detached garage	Refused (Appeal Dismissed)

#### **4.0 Consultation Responses**

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

Consultee	Response
Parish Council	<b>No comments</b> have been received during the statutory consultation period.
County Highways	<b>No objections</b> , subject to conditions requiring additional information being submitted in relation to a construction method statement and the materials that are to be used on the access. Conditions also regarding the access and turning space is to be built as per drawings and that any gateposts are positioned 5m behind the nearside edge of the carriageway.
Environmental Health	<b>No objections</b> , subject to conditions restricting the hours of construction and mitigating contaminated land.
National Grid	<b>No comments</b> have been received during the statutory consultation period.
Tree Protection Officer	<b>No objections</b> , subject to conditions requiring a Tree Works Schedule and a detailed arboricultural Method Statement, a scheme indicating type and distribution of all new trees and a tree protection plan. Also to make sure that the development is carried out as per submitted Arboricultural Implications Assessment.
United Utilities	<b>No objection</b>

#### **5.0 Neighbour Representations**

5.1 Two pieces of correspondence objecting to the application have been received. The reasons for opposition include the following:

- Poor design and the location of the dwelling severely impinges and overshadows the single storey adjoining premises.
- Much of the previous tree/orchard cover to the east of the site has been removed and would need to be replaced to preserve amenity.
- The site presents the last remaining open view area along this section of Whams Lane.
- The proposed plastic polytunnel, composting area and elevated solar panels will diminish the amenity value of the area and surrounding properties.
- The proposed polytunnels have the potential to create noise with flapping plastic

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

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

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

Paragraph 17 - 12 Core Principles

Paragraphs 14 – Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development Criteria

Paragraph 47, 49, 53 and 55 – Delivering a Wide Choice of High Quality Homes

Paragraph 56 – Requiring Good Design

6.2 Development Management DPD

- DM20** – Enhancing Accessibility and Transport Linkages
- DM22** – Vehicle Parking Provision
- DM28** – Development and Landscape Impact
- DM35** – Key Design Principles
- DM41** – New Residential Development
- DM42** – Managing Rural Housing Growth
- Appendix B:** Car Parking Standards

6.3 Lancaster District Core Strategy

- SC1** – Sustainable development
- SC4** – Meeting housing requirements

6.4 Lancaster District Local Plan (saved policies)

- E4** – Countryside area

**7.0 Comment and Analysis**

- 7.1
- Principle of development;
  - Scale, layout and design;
  - Impact on residential amenity of neighbouring properties;
  - Access and highway impacts; and
  - Impact on trees.

7.2 Principle of Development

7.2.1 This application seeks consent for the erection of one 2-storey, detached residential dwelling with associated garage/workshop, installation of a panel of solar arrays and erection of two polytunnels on land on the north west side of Whams Lane in a rural location known as Bay Horse. Bay Horse is not identified within policy DM42 as being a rural village that is considered to be in a sustainable location for new residential development. Development should be located in sustainable locations, where there is access to an appropriate range of local services that contribute to the vitality of these settlements. These services are local shops, education and health facilities, access to public transport and other valued community facilities. Proposals should demonstrate that they have clear benefits for the local community, and in particular will meet rural housing needs according to robust evidence. In terms of services, there are two public houses (The Fleece and the Bay Horse Inn) within 1.5km of the application site and a stop for school buses at Five Lane Ends (0.5km from the site).

7.2.2 In Paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) it sets out that where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services nearby. This is reflected in the wording of Development Management DPD policy DM42. However, this site would not have any discernable relationship with any of the other, more sustainable settlements in the surrounding area. Dolphinholme is the closest village but is located 2.5km to the east. Galgate, which contains more local services and facilities, is situated 3km to the north west. There are no safe walking routes to gain access to either of these settlements as the intervening highways are predominantly unlit with no footpaths and national speed limits. Therefore, any future resident of this proposal would be heavily reliant on private, motorised vehicles. There is not considered to be a convincing argument that the development of a single dwelling on this site would help sustain the vitality in either of the aforementioned villages given the distance and the absence of footpaths between them.

7.2.3 Policy DM20 of the Development Management DPD sets out that proposals should minimise the need to travel, particularly by private car, and maximise the opportunities for the use of walking, cycling and public transport and to focus development in locations which offer a choice of modes of transport. The villages of Galgate and Dolphinholme, which are in a similar part of the District, are currently identified as settlements where growth would be supported and these have more services which would reduce the need to travel. As such, by locating development in villages where there are services it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities by supporting those existing services. This approach complies with the NPPF, the overarching aim of which is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. As the proposal is not located within a settlement which is

considered suitable for growth, the site would be dealt with in policy terms as it was located within the open countryside.

- 7.2.4 The NPPF sets out that new isolated homes in the countryside should be avoided unless there are special circumstances such as: the essential need for a rural worker to live permanently at or near their place of work in the countryside; where development would represent the optimal viable use of a heritage asset; where development would re-use redundant or disused buildings and lead to an enhancement of the immediate setting; or where a dwelling is of exceptional quality or innovative design. This proposal does not fall into any of these categories and as such it is considered that the proposal does not provide a sufficient justification for a new dwelling in a location which is considered to be unsustainable.
- 7.2.5 Paragraph 49 of the NPPF sets out that relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered up to date if the local planning authority cannot demonstrate a five year supply of housing. Although this is currently the case, the Council has a very clear approach to sustainable development within rural locations. It is not considered that a lack of a five year housing land supply justifies a dwelling in this location which does not comply with the Council's approach to sustainable development across the District.
- 7.2.6 Notwithstanding the need to boost significantly the supply of housing (as defined by the NPPF, and paragraph 47 in particular), and the fact that housing applications should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development (paragraph 49), this proposal for a private detached residential dwelling in open countryside does not represent sustainable development. It is not a location that can be made sustainable and so approving the application would run contrary to the NPPF and Development Plan policies. This position has supported by the Planning Inspector at the recent appeal for 14/00647/OUT. That appeal decision (23 July 2015), has been attached as a background paper. Members will note that the appeal was dismissed. The Inspector concluded that whilst utilisation of renewable energy, incorporation of sustainable building techniques, and self-sufficiency in respect of growing food would be factors that would weigh in support of the development, they do not outweigh the harm which was identified in respect of the sustainability of the location and therefore the proposal did not amount to sustainable development. Matters relating to sustainability have not changed, and so the current application must also be recommended for refusal.
- 7.3 Scale, Layout and Design
- 7.3.1 There is a mixture of different sizes and designs of dwellings in this locality that are predominantly two storey dwellings and bungalows. The proposed dwelling is of a simple design and proportion and will be made up of red brick walls, under a grey tiled roof with timber windows and doors.
- 7.3.2 The dwelling would be set back 8m away from the road with a small garden to the front. A shared footpath/driveway would be situated to the side, which would benefit from a permeable surface and form the access to a small parking court to the rear between the proposed dwelling and the proposed garage/workshop. The plans appear to show areas of private amenity space to the other side of the dwelling, which are considered to be an acceptable size and exceed the Council's adopted standard of 50sq.m. However, the extent of the garden space is not explicitly stated on the submitted plan, so if Members are minded to approve this application the extent of the domestic garden associated with the new dwelling would need to be carefully considered and conditioned accordingly. Given the above, it is considered that the building is in keeping with the character and appearance of the area and will not have a detrimental impact on the locality.
- 7.3.3 The proposed garage/workshop would be 7m in width, 8.9m in length and 6.3m in height to the ridge and would be sited to the north west of the proposed dwelling and constructed of red brick walls, under a grey tiled roof with timber windows and side door. The proposed solar panels would be installed to the north of the proposed dwelling and would be 8.1m in length, 2.95m in width and 2.4m in height. The proposed polytunnels are to be sited to the north of the proposed solar panels and would be 23.5m in length, 15m in width and 3m in height.
- 7.3.4 Development Management DPD policy DM35 states that new development should make a positive contribution to the identity and character of the area through good design, having regard to local distinctiveness, appropriate siting, layout, palette of materials, separating distances, orientation and scale. Policy DM28 of the same DPD also states that the development proposals should, through

their siting, scale, massing, materials and design seek to contribute positively to the conservation and enhancement of the protected landscape. Whilst the design of the dwelling is considered to be acceptable and meets the requirements of policy DM35, the polytunnels will all be highly visible from Whams Lane. However polytunnels are usually found in the countryside area and therefore the design, materials and having regard to the local distinctiveness are seen to comply with policies DM28 and DM35 and saved policy E4 of the Local Plan.

### 7.4 Impact on residential amenity of neighbouring properties

Policy DM35 of the Development Management DPD states that new development should make a positive contribution to the identity and character of the area through good design, having regard to local distinctiveness, appropriate siting, layout, palette of materials, separating distances, orientation and scale.

- 7.4.1 There have been two letters of objections received from neighbouring properties. One of the grounds of objection relates to the location of the proposed development and how it would severely impinge upon and overshadow the single storey adjoining property. Paragraph 17 of the NPPF states that one of the twelve principles of planning should be to always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings. To the east of the site is the two-storey property of Oak Villa. The nearest part of the proposed development is the polytunnels that are sited 23m away from the neighbouring property. Consequently given the distance to the neighbouring property, the proposed development is not thought to have a detrimental impact upon the residential amenity enjoyed by Oak Villa and are found contrary to DM35 of the Development Management DPD and the provisions of paragraph 17 of the NPPF.

### 7.5 Access and Highway Impacts

- 7.5.1 The application proposes access is to be established from Whams Lane. Given the road is used for access by all of the properties that are situated along Whams Lane and the nature and scale of the proposal, it is not considered that there would be an adverse impact upon highway safety. This is echoed by County Highways who have raised no objections to the proposal.

### 7.6 Impact on Trees

- 7.6.1 There are existing trees that are to the north, east and south boundaries of the site, some of which are subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). There are no proposals to remove the trees with the exception of those that are identified to the north west of the existing dwelling of Brookside that are in a poor overall condition and are not subject to the TPO. The Tree Protection Officer has raised no objections subject to the submission of a tree protection plan, a tree works schedule and an arboricultural method statement.

## **8.0 Planning Obligations**

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

## **9.0 Conclusions**

- 9.1 The principle of the proposed dwelling is not supported. The site remains unsustainable, as the Planning Inspector concluded last year, and the proposal is clearly contrary to Policy DM42 and section 6 of the NPPF, as it is proposed to be located within Bay Horse, which contains minimal key services and consequently is not sustainable in terms of its location. Additionally the proposal has not demonstrated that there are clear benefits for the local community, and in particular has not provided robust evidence that it will meet an identified rural housing need.

- 9.2 The proposal fails to satisfy Policy DM20 that sets out that the proposal should minimise the need to travel, particularly by car. The villages of Galgate and Dolphinholme have been identified as sustainable villages that can support growth as there are services within these settlements that will enhance and maintain the vitality of rural communities in which they serve. However, the application site is divorced from both of these villages by at least 2.5km. Future residents would be heavily reliant on private forms of motorised transport, which is also contrary to the overarching aim of the NPPF - a presumption in favour of sustainable development.

- 9.3 The proposed polytunnels by reason of their size, scale and footprint are thought to have an unneighbourly feature at a relatively close proximity to the neighbouring property of Oak Villa and therefore are contrary to policies DM35 DPD and paragraph 17 of the NPPF.

### **Recommendation**

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

1. The site is located within Whams Lane in a central position of existing ribbon development in the rural hamlet of Bay Horse. Bay Horse contains minimal key services and as such is not considered to be sustainable in terms of its location. The site does not have immediate and direct access to key services and infrastructure and would realistically only be accessible by using a private car. In addition it has not been demonstrated that the development would enhance or maintain the vitality of the local community or help sustain services in nearby settlements. There has been no exceptional justification provided to support this development in an unsustainable rural location such as an existing agricultural or forestry need. As such the proposal is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular the Core Planning Principles, and Section 6, Core Strategy policy SC1, and Policies DM20 (criteria II) and DM42 of the Development Management Development Plan Document.
2. The proposed polytunnels, by virtue of their size, scale and footprint, will be a dominant feature in the wider landscape and will be an unneighbourly feature at relatively close proximity to the nearest neighbouring dwelling (Oak Villa). As a consequence they are considered to represent inappropriate development by virtue of the impact upon Oak Villa and are therefore considered contrary to policy DM35 of the Development Management DPD and the provisions of paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

### **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 service and the resulting proposal is unacceptable for the reasons prescribed in the Notice. 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**

1. Appeal Decision APP/A2335/W/15/3003571 – Brookside, Whams Lane, Bay Horse.

---

## Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 20 May 2015

**by M Seaton BSc (Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 23 July 2015**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/A2335/W/15/3003571**

**Brookside, Whams Lane, Bay Horse, Lancaster, LA2 9BZ**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs K Parker against the decision of Lancaster City Council.
  - The application Ref 14/00647/OUT, dated 10 June 2014, was refused by notice dated 5 August 2014.
  - The development proposed is the erection of a detached dwellinghouse and garage.
- 

### Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

### Procedural Matter

2. The application has been submitted in outline with all matters (access, layout, appearance, landscaping and scale) reserved for later approval. I have dealt with the appeal on this basis, treating the plans submitted as indicative of the type of development that could be carried out.

### Main Issue

3. The main issue is whether, having regard to local and national planning policy, the proposal would amount to a sustainable form of development.

### Reasons

4. The appeal site is located in the open countryside within the rural hamlet of Bay Horse, which is comprised of a continuous ribbon of residential development bisected by the M6 Motorway where Whams Lane crosses by bridge. The wider area is characterised by farmsteads and small clusters of buildings and isolated dwellings punctuating the countryside. The appeal site itself incorporates part of the existing side garden of the dwelling known as Brookside, and accommodates an existing large outbuilding and detached garage, both of which would be demolished. The existing access to Whams Lane would remain.
5. Since the planning application was determined and prior to the submission of this appeal, the Council adopted in December 2014 the Local Plan for Lancaster District 2011-2031: Development Management DPD (the Lancaster DM DPD), which has superseded some of the saved policies referred to in the Lancaster District Local Plan 2008 (the Local Plan) and Lancaster District Core Strategy 2008 (the Core Strategy). In this respect, policies E2 of the Core Strategy and H7 of the Local Plan, which were highlighted within the reason for refusal have

now been superseded, whilst emerging policies DM20 (criteria II) and DM42 of the draft Lancaster DM DPD now subsequently form part of the Development Plan. Policies SC1 and SC3 of the Core Strategy remain partially relevant, albeit that the majority of the latter has been replaced by policy DM42. I have therefore assessed the appeal on the basis of the up-to-date Development Plan, including policies where saved.

6. Policy DM42 of the Lancaster DM DPD sets out the Council's strategy for managing rural housing growth. The policy sets out a list of sustainable rural settlements where new housing will be supported, and indicates that housing in other rural settlements will be supported if it can be demonstrated that the development will enhance or maintain the vitality of the local community. The policy also advises that new homes in isolated locations will not be supported unless clear benefits of development are articulated, which would outweigh the dis-benefits of development in an isolated location. The policy highlights that the special circumstances where potential benefits of isolated development may lead to more favourable consideration are as described at paragraph 55 of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework).
7. Paragraph 55 of the Framework promotes sustainable development in rural areas, guiding that housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities, or where there are groups of smaller settlements that development in one village may support services in a village nearby.
8. Bay Horse is not identified within policy DM42 as a sustainable rural settlement, and on the basis of my observations of the limited services and facilities available within the settlement, there is no reason to dispute this classification. Nevertheless, the submitted sustainability statement has highlighted the accessibility of the site in respect of the access to the National Cycle Routes in particular, rural footpaths, and bus routes, which accords with the objective of promoting development with access to sustainable transport modes as set out in Section 4 of the Framework. This it is contended would provide an alternative to a reliance on the private car, although in this respect I have also noted the appellant's comparison between the impact of rural and urban driving. However, whilst I have noted the stated distances from the appeal site to services, education facilities, community facilities, leisure/recreation uses, and local employment opportunities within the immediate area, I am not persuaded that the distances alone would render the site to be within a highly accessible location as contended by the appellant.
9. The appellant's sustainability statement highlights the guidance within the Institute of Highways and Transportation *Guidelines for Journeys on Foot (2000)* which sets out both average and percentile distances for walking journeys in urban areas. However, it relies upon the former Planning Policy Guidance Note 13 'Transport' (PPG13) when advising that walking has the greatest potential to replace car trips for distances up to 2 kilometres (1.3 miles). With this in mind, it is evident from the appellant's own conclusions that a number of the identified services and facilities are located either close to the maxima set by the 2 kilometre threshold or are beyond this distance, particularly in respect of the accessibility to the sustainable settlement of Galgate. In this respect, even when applying the appellant's own accessibility criteria, the appeal site could not be concluded as being highly accessible in distance terms in respect of walking journeys. Whilst I have had regard to the

- appellant's testimonies regarding their own experiences of walking to various destinations, I note that beyond Whams Lane itself there is an absence of a safe pedestrian environment in a number of places, which would restrict the opportunities for a reliance on walking to various destinations, particularly I noted along the road and National Cycle Route to Galgate.
10. Turning to cycling as a sustainable transport mode, the appellant has highlighted the guidance within former PPG13 that journeys under 5 kilometres (3.11 miles) may substitute for car trips. In this respect, I acknowledge the proximity of the appeal site to the National Cycle Route, and also that local services and facilities within Galgate and Forton would be within the 5 kilometre threshold. Furthermore, I have noted the accessibility of local employment opportunities at Forton Services and Lancaster University in particular. I would therefore agree with the contention that the site is relatively accessible for cycling.
  11. The appellant has drawn my attention to the provision of a bus shelter at the junction with Five Lane Ends to meet the needs of children waiting for school services, which would be within a reasonable walking distance of the proposed development. However, there is no evidence before me that this bus stop is used regularly by any other non-school services. Whilst I accept that the bus services on the A6 would provide a regular public transport link, pedestrian accessibility would again be reliant on a 0.7 mile walk, which would at least be in part along narrow unlit lanes lacking in a safe pedestrian environment.
  12. Whilst I accept that the appeal site would be relatively accessible by cycling, I consider that the distances to various services and facilities, and the absence of a safe pedestrian environment within the wider vicinity undermines the contribution which public transport and walking may have as sustainable transport modes. Consequently, and despite its proximity to existing dwellings on Whams Lane, I am satisfied that the Council's conclusion relating to the development being isolated would be reasonable for the purposes of assessment against paragraph 55 of the Framework. Furthermore, the appellant has not drawn my attention to the development specifically according with any of the special circumstances as set out in the Framework which would justify new isolated homes in the countryside.
  13. Paragraph 55 of the Framework also requires consideration as to whether the proposed development would enhance or maintain the vitality of the local community. In carefully considering this matter, I am mindful that the development of a single dwelling would have in itself only a limited benefit in respect of the provision of additional housing in the rural area, as well as support for existing services and facilities within the immediate area and larger villages. Nevertheless, I note that whilst the Council has indicated that the development would not assist viability, it has not placed any evidence before me to demonstrate that allowing such a development would have an adverse effect on the existing vitality of the local community. Consequently I would conclude that the proposed development would maintain the existing vitality of the local community, and would therefore meet this aspect of the requirement.
  14. The appellant has drawn my attention to paragraph 6 of the Framework, where it states that the Framework taken as a whole constitutes the government's view of what sustainable development in England means in practice for the planning system. This contrasts with the appellant's view of the Council's



- approach which it contends has been to consider sustainability purely with regards to access to and from the site to services. As a consequence, the appellant has highlighted a number of other factors which it is contended would weigh in support of the proposal being considered to be sustainable development.
15. The appellant has indicated that the proposed development would meet local housing need. Whilst it is accepted that the proposed development is in outline only at this stage, the appellant has indicated the expectation that the site could accommodate a four-bedroom dwelling, which I would not disagree with. This would address an identified housing need for 4+ bed dwellings in rural settlements, as highlighted within Lancaster City Council document *Meeting Housing Needs Supplementary Planning Document (2013)*. Furthermore, whilst there is no indication that the proposed dwelling would be provided as affordable housing, the appellant has indicated an expectation that a commuted sum would be required towards providing affordable housing elsewhere within the District, although I note that no details as to the mechanism for the payment of such a sum have been provided. These are factors which would attract some limited weight in support of the development.
16. I have also had regard to a series of other matters which the appellant has contended indicate that the proposal amounts to sustainable development. These include the efficient use of land, utilisation of renewable energy and incorporation of sustainable building techniques, encouragement of self-sufficiency in respect of growing food, the provision of live-work accommodation for a future occupier, as well as improvement of the visual amenity of the site. In respect of these points, I agree that the indicative proposal would amount on part of the site to the efficient use of previously developed land, and that the demolition of the existing outbuilding and replacement with an appropriately designed dwelling would result in some limited visual improvement to the appeal site. However, whilst I accept that the principle of utilising renewable energy and incorporating sustainable design techniques within the dwelling would be factors which would weigh in support of a development, details of these have not been provided or secured at this outline stage and therefore cannot attract any significant supporting weight. In addition, whilst it is possible that the dwelling may incorporate ancillary accommodation and the necessary technologies to enable working from home, the outline application has been made for a dwelling rather than a formal live-work unit which would not accord with the details as applied for, and in any event would not completely obviate the need to travel, which is a point referenced by the appellant from an accompanying appeal decision.
17. In reaching my conclusion on whether the proposed development would amount to sustainable development, I have noted the references which the appellant has made to the Planning Practice Guidance (PPG). In particular, I have had regard to the reference that housing should support the broader sustainability of villages and smaller settlements with rural housing essential to ensure viable use of these local facilities, and that all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development.
18. However, for the reasons I have set out above, I do not consider that the factors which would weigh in support of the development would be sufficient to outweigh the harm which I have identified in respect of the sustainability of the location, and therefore the proposals would not amount to sustainable

development. As a consequence, the proposed development would not accord with saved policies SC1 and SC3 of the Core Strategy, or policies DM20 and DM42 of the Lancaster DM DPD. These policies seek to ensure that new residential developments are as sustainable as possible, and that proposals for new homes in isolated locations will not be supported unless clear benefits of development outweigh the dis-benefits of development in an isolated location. Furthermore, the proposed development would conflict with paragraphs 7 and 55 of the Framework, as it would not amount to sustainable development and would represent an unjustified and isolated new residential development in the countryside, for which there are no special circumstances.

### **Other Matters**

19. The appellant has highlighted that the Council is unable to demonstrate a 5 year supply of deliverable housing land. This is not a point which the Council has contested. In accordance with paragraph 49 of the Framework, in the event that such a supply cannot be demonstrated, relevant policies for the supply of housing should not be considered to be up-to-date and housing applications should therefore be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. As set out above, I have assessed the proposals on this basis, but have nevertheless concluded that the development would not amount to sustainable development. As a consequence, this is not a matter which would weigh significantly in support of the proposed development.
20. I have also noted that the appellant has cited the conversion of the existing outbuilding as a viable development alternative, and that that this should be regarded as a valid fallback position. However, I have not been provided with any details or alternative plans from which to consider whether the existing building would be capable of conversion, or would have a satisfactory relationship with the existing dwelling. This has therefore not been a matter which has attracted any significant weight in my assessment of the proposals.
21. My attention has also been drawn by the appellant to the approach which has been taken by decision-makers on other planning appeals. However, I note that limited information has been placed before me in respect of the examples which have been referenced, to allow me to draw conclusions with regards to the similarities with the proposed development. Nevertheless, on the basis of the information submitted, it would appear that the August 2014 appeal related to a development in close proximity to an existing village recognised to possess sustainability credentials, and with a relatively safe route for walking to services. In respect of the appeal decision at Brereton Heath in Cheshire, it appears quite clear that the balance of the decision was significantly influenced by the numbers of dwellings and the proportion of affordable housing proposed, as a means of meeting an acknowledged deficiency in supply and provision, which it was concluded outweighed policies related to development in the countryside and an undoubted reliance on the private car. I am not therefore persuaded that the decisions cited are directly comparable to the proposals the subject of this appeal.
22. The appellant has also indicated that the proposed development would not set an undesirable precedent for similar development within the countryside. Whilst I am mindful that each application must be considered on its own planning merits, I am nevertheless satisfied that the Council would retain the

basis upon which to resist development which was unacceptable, and this has not therefore been a significant factor in my assessment of the development.

**Conclusion**

23. For the reasons given above, and subject to the conditions listed, the appeal is dismissed.

*M Seaton*

INSPECTOR

<p align="center"><b>Agenda Item</b></p> <p align="center">A10</p>	<p align="center"><b>Committee Date</b></p> <p align="center">22 August 2016</p>	<p align="center"><b>Application Number</b></p> <p align="center">16/00806/VCN</p>
<p align="center"><b>Application Site</b></p> <p align="center">Moss Wood Caravan Park Crimbles Lane Cockerham Lancaster</p>		<p align="center"><b>Proposal</b></p> <p align="center">Change of use of land for the siting of 25 static caravans (pursuant to the variation of condition 4 on planning permission 16/00201/FUL relating to the use of colours of the static caravans)</p>
<p align="center"><b>Name of Applicant</b></p> <p align="center">Mr Henry Wild</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">23 September 2016</p>		<p align="center"><b>Reason For Delay</b></p> <p align="center">Committee Cycle</p>
<p><b>Case Officer</b></p>		<p>Mrs Petra Williams</p>
<p><b>Departure</b></p>		<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>Summary of Recommendation</b></p>		<p>Approval</p>

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

- 1.1 The application relates to the expansion of an established holiday caravan park located in a position approximately 1.5km south of the A588 on Crimbles Lane, Cockerham. The existing site is well established with mature trees along all the boundaries of the site and little views of the development other than at the points of access off Crimbles Lanes. The application site lies immediately to the north of the existing site and comprises a single large field bounded on the east by Crimbles Lane, north by farm land with an access track running along it to the west by pastoral land outside the applicant's control and on the south by the existing site. Consent was granted on 4 April 2016 for the siting of 25 static caravans on the field.
- 1.2 The site boundaries are well established with mature tree and hedgerows planted over 10 years ago. The boundaries have a couple of weak areas in the belt of planting. The main area is due to the presence of a field access in the north-east corner of the site and a lack of tree belt planting to the south-west corner. The southern boundary with the existing caravan site is well developed other than for the provision of access point to and provision of visitor car parking area.
- 1.3 The field is predominantly flat rising slightly south to north but with a more pronounced rise of several metres in a north/south alignment along the eastern boundary of the site. Within this rising land further tree planting has been developed to provide effective screening form the adjacent Crimbles Lane.
- 1.4 The open land has been used on an informal basis as an amenity area for the adjoining caravan site (dog walking, informal recreation) but has no development upon it other than a small visitor parking area (10 cars) on its southern boundary close to the existing shop/reception area.

## **2.0 The Proposal**

- 2.1 Following the recent approval of 16/00201/FUL for the siting of 25 static caravans, the current submission seeks a variation of condition 4 of the consented scheme. Condition 4 states:

*Notwithstanding the details hereby agreed under the amended plan and information dated 22 March, the caravan colours shall be limited to green and brown only and in particular cream is not to be permitted.*

*Reason: In the interests of the visual amenity of the area.*

The application proposes to vary the condition to allow the use of cream coloured caravans in addition to green and brown. The revised condition 4 would state:

*Notwithstanding the details hereby agreed under the amended plan and information dated 22 March, the caravan colours shall be limited to cream, green and brown.*

*Reason: in the interest of visual amenity of the area.*

### **3.0 Site History**

3.1 The application site has a limited planning history relating to the use of the site as a holiday caravan site (static and tourers). The site has been established for over forty years and has a limited number of extensions.

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
<b>16/00201/FUL</b>	Change of use of land for the siting of 25 static caravans	Approved
<b>14/01060/FUL</b>	Change of use of land to allow holiday occupation of caravans between 4 February and 4 January in the following year (11 month season)	Approved
<b>03/00138/CU</b>	Extension to the site to provide a total of 168 statics, 27 Tourers and one staff residential unit.	Approved

### **4.0 Consultation Responses**

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

Consultee	Response
<b>Cockerham Parish Council</b>	No objections

### **5.0 Neighbour Representations**

5.1 No consultations received during the statutory consultation period.

### **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  
 Section 3 – Supporting a prosperous rural economy  
 Section 4 – Promoting Sustainable Transport  
 Section 11 – Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment

6.2 Lancaster District Core Strategy Policies  
 SC5 – Achieving Quality in Design  
 ER6 – Developing Tourism

6.3 Development Management DPD  
 DM14 – Caravan Sites, Chalets and Log Cabins  
 DM28 – Development and Landscape Impact  
 DM29 – Protection of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland  
 DM35 – Key Design Principles

6.4 Lancaster District Local Plan Saved Policies  
 E4 – Development within the Countryside

## **7.0 Comment and Analysis**

7.1 The principle of the siting of 25 static caravans has already been accepted by the approval of 16/00201/FUL in April of this year. In light of this the key considerations of this submission are landscape and visual impacts of allowing cream coloured caravans within the park.

### **7.2 Landscape and Visual Impacts**

7.2.1 Planning policy seeks to ensure that development of the site has no adverse impact upon the landscape character or visual amenity of the area. As highlighted within the previous Committee report, the site is well screened from the wider public aspect due to surrounding topography and mature tree/hedgerow planting.

7.2.2 The previously-approved application was reported at the April Committee where Members were informed by a verbal update that the colours of the caravan should be restricted to cream, brown or green. However, Members were minded to allow only green and brown caravans on the extended part of the site. Without the benefit of a Committee site visit, this was a reasonable position to adopt. However a large proportion of the existing caravans on the site are already cream-coloured and they do not raise issues regarding landscape and visual impacts. Furthermore it is worth highlighting that there is a condition on the 16/00201/FUL consent, which would be repeated on this consent (should Members grant permission), that will ensure the provision of supplementary planting both within the site and along the boundaries. Therefore the visual impact of the development will be limited and is considered to not to unduly impact on the area. It is therefore considered reasonable to allow the inclusion of cream-coloured caravans in this proposal.

## **8.0 Planning Obligations**

8.1 No planning obligations are applicable to this variation of condition application.

## **9.0 Conclusions**

9.1 It is considered that the site is located in an appropriate location, well screened and that the inclusion of cream coloured static caravans alongside green and brown would not result in an undue impact upon the wider landscape. Subject to appropriate conditions, the application is recommended for approval.

## **Recommendation**

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

1. The development has been implemented within 3 years from the date of the permission (4 April 2016)
2. Development to be in accordance with approved plans
3. Amended plans – landscaping, colours, materials and finishes
4. Notwithstanding the details hereby agreed under the amended plan and information received on 22 March 2016, the caravan colours shall be limited to cream, green and brown.
5. Details relating to the caravan ground anchor system as amended by information received on 29 March 2016.
6. Approved landscape scheme dated 22 March 2016 shall be implemented within first planting season following commencement of development.
7. Caravans for holiday purposes only (maximum of 25 units)
8. Register of caravan owner/occupies main home address to be provided
9. Precise detail of the site office 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 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 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**

None

<p align="center">Agenda Item A11</p>	<p align="center">Committee Date 22 August 2016</p>	<p align="center">Application Number 16/00692/FUL</p>
<p align="center"><b>Application Site</b></p> <p align="center">8 Fell View Caton Lancaster Lancashire</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 Tom Greenwood</p>		<p align="center"><b>Name of Agent</b></p> <p align="center">Miss Lucy Tindall</p>
<p align="center"><b>Decision Target Date</b></p> <p align="center">28 July 2016</p>		<p align="center"><b>Reason For Delay</b></p> <p align="center">Committee Cycle</p>
<p><b>Case Officer</b></p>		<p>Mrs Kim Ireland</p>
<p><b>Departure</b></p>		<p>No</p>
<p><b>Summary of Recommendation</b></p>		<p>Approval</p>

**(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 Lancaster City Council, and as such the application 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 two storey mid terrace property, located on Fell View in Caton. The surrounding area mainly consists of terrace and semi-detached residential properties.
- 1.2 The site falls within the Countryside Area and Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as designated on 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 southern elevation by 4.1m with a width of 6.4m with a flat roof 3.15m above ground level. The materials that are proposed to be used are pebble dashed walls, under a single ply membrane roof with white upvc windows and doors. The proposed rear extension will provide a bedroom and a shower room. The additional accommodation is for an individual with special needs.

**3.0 Site History**

- 3.1 There have been no previous applications submitted for this property that relate to this proposal.

**4.0 Consultation Responses**

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



Consultee	Response
Parish Council	No objections
Property Services	No comments received during the statutory consultation period.

## **5.0 Neighbour Representations**

5.1 No comments received during the statutory consultation period.

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

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

### National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Paragraph 17 – 12 Core Principles  
Paragraphs 67 and 68 – Requiring Good Design

6.2 Development Management DPD

**DM35** – Key design principles

6.3 Lancaster District Local Plan (saved policies)

**E3** – Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty  
**E4** – Countryside Area

## **7.0 Comment and Analysis**

7.1 The key considerations arising from the proposal are:

- General design; and
- Impacts upon residential amenity

7.2 General Design

The proposed development has been designed to reflect that of the existing dwelling, particularly in terms of the material palette. The property already benefits from a slight flat-roofed protrusion from the main rear elevation; this proposal will connect to that to provide the facilities described in Paragraph 2.1. Whilst the proposed extension will clearly change the appearance of the rear elevation, the proposed extension will not be viewed from within the streetscene.

7.3 Impacts upon Residential Amenity

The length of the extension has been the subject of some discussion with officers, particularly as there were concerns that the structure could have an overbearing impact on the neighbouring property of 10 Fell View. This excessive length was exacerbated by the fact that the building was proposed to be sited 0.2m away from the boundary fence. The original scheme projected from the southern elevation by 6.8m with a width of 4.8m. Amendments were negotiated to the proposal to effectively re-orientate the extensions and slightly reduce its size. This involved removing the existing store to maintain access to the rear garden. The dimensions of the extension are now as reported in Paragraph 2.1.

7.3.1 Notwithstanding the amendments, the proposed extension will still be in breach of the '45 degree rule', and so will have an impact on the ground floor lounge window of the neighbouring residential property (no.10 Fell View). However, the reductions to the length of the building is deemed to be less overbearing whilst the proposal provides an individual with special needs the required bedroom

and bathroom. Given this, and the considerable depth of the gardens (for both the applicant and the neighbouring dwelling), on balance the proposal represents the best design solution given the constraints of the site.

### **8.0 Planning Obligations**

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

### **9.0 Conclusions**

9.1 The proposed size of the extension has been amended to improve the amenity for the neighbouring resident. Whilst the scheme was amended and the impact on 10 Fell View was reduced, it was not completely eliminated. However, given the circumstances of the case and the considerable length of the garden area, the proposal it is deemed acceptable.

### **Recommendation**

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

1. Standard 3 year timescale
2. Development to be carried out in accordance to the amended 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

<b>Agenda Item</b> A12	<b>Committee Date</b> 22 August 2016	<b>Application Number</b> 16/00828/ADV
<b>Application Site</b> Salt Ayre Sports Centre Doris Henderson Way Heaton With Oxcliffe Lancaster		<b>Proposal</b> Advertisement application for the display of one internally illuminated individual letter sign
<b>Name of Applicant</b> Suzanne Lodge		<b>Name of Agent</b> Alistair Ewing
<b>Decision Target Date</b> 24 August 2016		<b>Reason For Delay</b> None
<b>Case Officer</b>		Mr Andrew Clement
<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, Lancaster City Council is the applicant, and as such the application must be determined by the Planning Committee.

**1.0 The Site and its Surroundings**

1.1 The application site relates to Salt Ayre Sports Centre, owned by Lancaster City Council. The site is located south of Morecambe Road and approximately 40 metres south of the nearest dwellinghouse in Scale Hall Farm residential area.

**2.0 The Proposal**

2.1 The application seeks advertisement consent for the display of one internally illuminated fascia sign. The fascia board measures 7 metres wide by 0.7 metres tall, constructed of russwood, with internally illuminated individual lettering measuring 0.42 metres in height, with polished chrome sides around the white lettering. It would be sited 3.12 metres above ground level. The signage will form part of a redeveloped main entrance, which was approved at the last Committee meeting (16/00552/FUL).

**3.0 Site History**

3.1 The site has a long planning history dating back to 1993 with the construction of an eight lane floodlit athletics track through permission 93/00071/DPA. Various other sporting developments have been granted planning permission since, the most recent being the extensions to the building and the provision of the Jump Tower and Briefing Cabin.

**4.0 Consultation Responses**

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

Consultee	Response
County Highways	No objection subject to a condition regarding signage luminance.

## **5.0 Neighbour Representations**

5.1 No observations received.

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

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

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

**Paragraph 17:** Core planning principles

**Section 7:** Requiring good design

### **6.2 Development Management DPD**

**DM6:** Advertisements

**DM35:** Key design principles

### **6.3 Lancaster District Core Strategy – saved policies**

**SC5:** Achieving quality in design

### **6.4 Other Material Considerations**

**SPG7:** Advertisements and shop fronts design guide

## **7.0 Comment and Analysis**

7.1 The key considerations arising from the advertisement proposal are:

- Amenity; and
- Public safety.

### **7.2 Amenity**

7.2.1 As part of a series of inter-related developments to enhance the leisure facilities at the Sports Centre, including alterations to the main entrance, this application seeks consent to display an internally-illuminated individual letter sign. The proposed materials are considered to be a higher quality to those existing, and match the materials of the recently approved developments at the site. The current signage is wider than the proposed fascia.

7.2.2 The proposed sign is considered proportionate to the site and the scale of the facility. The location of the main entrance is visually contained by the main Sports Centre building, which is located centrally within the site, at a lower elevation to the adjacent floodlit artificial grass pitch, and confined by trees and vegetation around the wider site. The Sports Centre has an evening use until 21:30, and the illumination of signage will help identify the location of the main entrance outside of daylight hours. Although internally illuminated signage can be discouraged in certain areas (such as Conservation Areas), in this particular case there are no heritage assets affected and the site is effectively self-contained due to its scale. Therefore the visual impact of the proposal is considered acceptable and the proposal is consistent with policies DM6, DM35 and NPPF Section 7.

7.2.3 The application specifies an advertisement period of 5 years, which is consistent with the standard time limit for advertisement consents, and is considered appropriate.

### **7.3 Highway safety**

7.3.1 The proposal has raised no objection from the Highway Authority, but a condition to control the level of illumination has been suggested, and is considered appropriate as the signage faces the car park.

**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 proposed signage, as part of the redevelopment of the main entrance, is proportionate in scale and will be constructed in sympathetic materials. The internally illuminated lettering, located above the main entrance, will help identify the location of the entrance, whilst raising no amenity concerns due to the nature of the site, visually contained from public areas. Subject to standard advertisement conditions, and a condition limiting the luminance to protect motorists using the site parking facilities, the application can be supported.

**Recommendation**

That Advertisement Consent **BE GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard Advertisement Timescale (5 years)
2. Advertisements to be carried out in accordance to approved plans
3. Advertisement Standard Condition Number 1
4. Advertisement Standard Condition Number 2
5. Advertisement Standard Condition Number 3
6. Advertisement Standard Condition Number 4
7. Advertisement Standard Condition Number 5
8. Limits of the luminance of signage

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

In accordance with the above legislation, 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">A13</p>	<p align="center"><b>Committee Date</b></p> <p align="center">22 August 2016</p>	<p align="center"><b>Application Number</b></p> <p align="center">16/00824/LB</p>
<p align="center"><b>Application Site</b></p> <p align="center">Ashton Memorial Williamson Park Wyresdale Road Lancaster</p>	<p align="center"><b>Proposal</b></p> <p align="center">Listed building application for internal repair works to dome</p>	
<p align="center"><b>Name of Applicant</b></p> <p align="center">Ms Sarah Price</p>	<p align="center"><b>Name of Agent</b></p> <p align="center">Mr Frank Sedgwick</p>	
<p align="center"><b>Decision Target Date</b></p> <p align="center">23 August 2016</p>	<p align="center"><b>Reason For Delay</b></p> <p align="center">None</p>	
<p><b>Case Officer</b></p>	<p>Mr Andrew Clement</p>	
<p><b>Departure</b></p>	<p>No</p>	
<p><b>Summary of Recommendation</b></p>	<p>Approval</p>	

**(i) Procedural Matters**

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

**1.0 The Site and its Surroundings**

1.1 Ashton Memorial (a Grade I Listed building) is located in Williamson Park (a Grade II Listed Registered Park and Garden, and Conservation Area) on the east side of Lancaster. It is a prominent landmark building situated on top of a hill affording views in all directions. It was built between 1905 and 1909 in memory of Lord Ashton's second wife, and was listed in 1953. The Ashton Memorial is a landmark building in the vicinity of Lancaster, visible from passing vehicles on the M6 as well as from the city of Lancaster and beyond to Morecambe and its bay. From these vantage points its impressive copper covered roof and Portland stone elevations are prominent. It is in the ownership of Lancaster City Council.

**2.0 The Proposal**

2.1 The application seeks listed building consent for internal repair works to the dome. The repair works will require the erection of birdcage scaffolding for access, in order to make good the corroding steelwork and plasterwork, then redecoration down to the cornice and of both full height staircases. To facilitate the refurbishments, the canvas paintings to the dome will be removed and later reinstated, and existing fittings and finishes will be protected during works. In addition, chipped paving stones will be made good and joints reappointed.

**3.0 Site History**

3.1 There have been a number of applications determined by the Local Planning Authority relating to works to the Ashton Memorial over the decades, but none that specifically relate to the current proposal. The last remedial works to the interior took place between 1985 and 1987.

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
01/85/0876	Listed Building Application to renovate and repair the damaged interior and exterior and introduce main services	Permitted

#### **4.0 Consultation Responses**

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

Consultee	Response
<b>Conservation Section</b>	<b>No objection</b> subject to a number of conditions regarding the agreement of the method of protecting fittings and finishes, condition survey of ground floor, colour, paint analysis and specifications of redecorated dome, and samples of plaster, repointing and mortar.
<b>Historic England</b>	<b>No objection</b> subject to a condition for a timeline for reinstatement of the murals
<b>Georgian Group</b>	No comments received during the statutory consultation period.
<b>Victorian Society</b>	No comments received during the statutory consultation period.
<b>Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings</b>	No comments received during the statutory consultation period.
<b>Twentieth Century Society</b>	No comments received during the statutory consultation period.
<b>Ancient Monument Society</b>	No comments received during the statutory consultation period.
<b>Council for British Archaeology</b>	No comments received during the statutory consultation period.
<b>The Garden Trust</b>	No comments received during the statutory consultation period.

#### **5.0 Neighbour Representations**

5.1 No comments received during the statutory consultation period.

#### **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  
**Section 12** Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

6.2 Development Management DPD  
**DM28:** Landscape impacts  
**DM30:** Development Affecting Listed Buildings  
**DM31:** Development affecting Conservation Areas  
**DM35:** Key Design Principles

6.3 Lancaster District Core Strategy  
**SC1:** Sustainable Development  
**SC5:** Achieving Quality in Design

#### **7.0 Comment and Analysis**

7.1 The key considerations arising from the proposal are:

- Principle of the development; and
- Scale, design and landscape impacts on the character of the Listed building, Conservation Area and Registered Park and Garden.

## 7.2 Principle of the Development

7.2.1 The application proposes internal repair works to the dome of the Grade I listed building Ashton Memorial in Williamsons Park. The plasterwork to the ground floor dome at the Ashton Memorial has shown signs of cracking, movement and separation from the structural steel framing, with canvas paintings attached to the dome showing signs of damage. Subject to the agreement of details and samples to ensure that the proposed repair works are sympathetic to the significant heritage asset, the principle of the development to repair the dome, paintings and paving within the Ashton Memorial is acceptable, and will sustain and enhance the significance of this heritage asset.

## 7.3 Scale, Design and Landscape Impact on the Character of the Listed Building and Conservation Area

7.3.1 In accordance with the Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act, when considering any application that affects a Listed building, a Conservation Area or their setting, the local planning authority must pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the heritage asset or its setting. This is reiterated by policies DM30, DM31 and DM32.

7.3.2 The proposed works seek to preserve this impressive Grade I Listed structure, which is a key building within the District. Whilst the interior of the Memorial is not the most prominent feature when viewed from a distance, it clearly forms an integral and significant part of this heritage asset. The internal appearance of the dome and attached paintings following the proposed works will not have altered significantly, although there will be benefits resulting from the restoration of these features, whilst the structure upon which they will sit will have been significantly improved to give them a sound base for the foreseeable future.

7.3.3 A significant amount of care and attention to detail will be required to preserve the dome, canvas paintings and interior of the memorial during the works. The overall acceptability of this proposal will rely on details, samples and methodology to be agreed. These elements should be subject to conditions to ensure an appropriate methodology, sympathetic samples and details, and appropriate timeline for the reinstatement of murals. Subject to the agreement of these details through conditions, the proposal will maintain and enhance the Grade I Listed building, to the benefit of this heritage asset and the wider Williamsons Park Conservation Area and Grade II Listed Registered Park and Garden. The proposed works are considered sympathetic and complies with policies DM28, DM30, DM31 and DM35 and Sections 7 and 12 of the NPPF, which guide development in relation to heritage assets and design.

## **8.0 Planning Obligations**

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

## **9.0 Conclusions**

9.1 In conclusion, this proposal does not adversely affect the character of the Listed building and will act to preserve one of the City's significant heritage assets. It is on this basis that Members are advised that this application can be supported, subject to a number of conditions to ensure the suitability of methodologies, details and samples.

## **Recommendation**

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

1. Standard 3 year timescale
2. Works to be carried out in accordance to approved plans
3. Condition survey interior ground floor
4. Scheme for the protection of interior and fittings, including details of removal, secure storage, restoration and reinstatement where required
5. Methodology and details of dome paint
6. Details and sample of plaster, mortar and stone
7. Timescale for reinstatement of paintings/murals



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

In accordance with the above legislation, 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

## LANCASTER CITY COUNCIL

APPLICATION NO	DETAILS	DECISION
15/01122/FUL	Alice Street Works , Alice Street, Morecambe Demolition of existing warehouse and erection of 6 dwelling houses for Ms Sarah Dobson (Poulton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00020/DIS	Former Frontierland Site, Marine Road West, Morecambe Discharge of conditions 7, 8, 9, 16, 17, 18 , 22 and 24 on application 14/00388/FUL for OPUS Land North (Morecambe) Ltd (Harbour Ward 2015 Ward)	Initial Response Sent
16/00046/CU	Guys Farm Outdoor Centre, Gleaves Hill Lane, Ellel Change of use of agricultural land for the creation of two ponds with associated landscaping for Kevin Greene (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
16/00091/DIS	Riverview House , Bulk Road, Lancaster Discharge of conditions 11 and 13 on approved application 13/00843/FUL for Mr Matt Crawford (Bulk Ward)	Request Completed
16/00094/DIS	Faraday Building, Physics Avenue, Bailrigg Discharge of condition 5 on planning permission 13/01061/FUL for Lancaster University (University And Scotforth Rural Ward)	Request Completed
16/00101/DIS	Land Adjacent, Campbell Drive, Lancaster Discharge of conditions 3, 4, 5 and 7 and part discharge of condition 6 on planning permission 15/00813/FUL for Mr Andrew McMurtrie (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Initial Response Sent
16/00103/DIS	Swarthbeck House, Capernwray Road, Capernwray Discharge of conditions 4, 5, 6 and 7 on planning permission 14/01022/FUL for Mr Steven Norwood (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Initial Response Sent
16/00110/DIS	Chorley Community Housing, Westgate, Morecambe Discharge of conditions 4 and 10 on application 14/01289/FUL for Mrs Karen Lee (Westgate Ward 2015 Ward)	Request Completed
16/00111/DIS	Pharmacy, Heysham Primary Care Centre, Middleton Way Discharge of conditions 3, 4, 6 and 8 on application 15/01188/VCN for ML (HEYSHAM) LIMITED (Heysham South Ward 2015 Ward)	Request Completed
16/00113/DIS	Lancaster University, Bigforth Drive, Bailrigg Discharge of conditions 3, 4 and 5 on approved application 16/00211/FUL for Mr Sturzaker (University And Scotforth Rural Ward)	Request Completed
16/00116/DIS	5 And 6 Cable Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Discharge of condition 4 on approved application 15/01368/FUL for Lancaster SPV Limited (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Initial Response Sent

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

16/00121/DIS	Fellside Barn, Leck Fell Road, Leck Discharge of conditions 3, 5 and 9 on prior approval 16/00424/PAA for Redmayne/Shuttleworth (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Request Completed
16/00122/DIS	Barn North Of, Leck Hill House, Low Lane Discharge of conditions 2 and 6 on prior approval 15/00267/PAA for Mr Andrew Redmayne (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Request Completed
16/00126/DIS	Sidegarth, Sidegarth Lane, Halton Discharge of condition 4 on approved application 15/01399/FUL for Mr & Mrs Swindlehurst (Halton-with-Aughton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00133/DIS	Outwood, Main Street, Arkholme Discharge of all conditions 4, 5 and 6 on application 15/00351/FUL for Mr David Ogden (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00138/DIS	Extension Walney Wind Farm, Borrans Lane, Middleton Discharge of requirement 33 on approved application 14/01379/NSIP - SOS approved Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project for Miss PIPPA DOODSON (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Request Completed
16/00139/DIS	Extension Walney Wind Farm, Borrans Lane, Middleton Discharge of requirement 42 on approved application 14/01379/NSIP - SOS approved Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project for Miss PIPPA DOODSON (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Request Completed
16/00143/DIS	Site For Fast Food Takeaway Unit, Caton Road, Lancaster Discharge of condition 13 on approved application 16/00551/FUL for Mr . (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00145/FUL	Lancaster And Morecambe College, Morecambe Road, Lancaster Erection of replacement walls and gates to the front and rear entrances for Mr Peter France (Torrisholme Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00238/FUL	Land To The Rear Of Dragons Head Hotel, Main Street, Whittington Demolition of outbuildings, conversion of barn to dwelling, erection of 3 dwellings with associated landscaping, parking and alterations to the existing access for Mr Simon Nutter (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
16/00409/FUL	Parkfield Garage, Bowerham Road, Lancaster Erection of four 2.5 storey dwellings for Mr Peters (Scotforth West Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
16/00415/FUL	1 Stirling Road, Lancaster, Lancashire 2Change of use of laundrette (Sui Generis) to one 2-bed flat (C3), insertion of 2 windows to replace existing shop front, insertion of a door to replace existing window, excavation of land to front to provide light well for basement and construction of a boundary wall for Mr Saffique Master (John O'Gaunt Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

16/00445/FUL	Stables Field Number 0003, Kit Brow Lane, Ellel Creation of a riding menage, concrete hardstanding to the yard area and erection of a replacement stable block for Mrs Fiona Bowery (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00453/LB	89 King Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Listed building application for the installation of replacement timber windows and re-pointing to the front elevation, re-roofing and refurbishing of gutters, downpipes, front and rear dormer extensions and windows to the rear elevation for Mr Mustaq Mister (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00454/FUL	Williamsland Farm, Hasty Brow Road, Slyne Change of use of agricultural buildings into 4 dwellings(C3), demolition of existing modern agricultural sheds, construction of new carports, bin store and bio-mass plant room, and the creation of new access for Mr J Hoggarth (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00458/RCN	26 Bailey Lane, Heysham, Morecambe Change of use of old dairy to domestic use (pursuant to the removal of condition 4 on planning permission 97/01062/CU, seeking to allow the old dairy to be sold separately to the main domestic property) for Mrs B Tollitt (Heysham Central Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00464/ADV	Quernmore Park, Former Nightingale Hall, Quernmore Road Advertisement application for the display of a non-illuminated free-standing sign for Fiona Dootson (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00495/FUL	Field Number 6950, Lancaster Road, Overton Change of use of former football field to paddock for grazing horses and creation of a hardstanding for Mrs Karine Knowles (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
16/00526/FUL	Former Crown And Anchor, Middleton Road, Heysham Conversion of outbuilding to create ancillary accommodation in association with existing dwelling for Mrs S. Pollard (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00534/LB	Ivy Lodge, Lowgill Lane, Lowgill Listed building application for the replacement of two windows to the rear elevation and one roof window to the side roofslope for Miss Caroline Parkinson (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00538/CU	Mole End Farm, Woodman Lane, Burrow Change of use of buildings from agricultural animal training/study centre for special needs children to 5 no. business units (B1), ancillary offices, workshops and stores to the existing livery business and indoor riding arena, alterations to existing access (retrospective), alterations to areas of hardstanding and retention of outdoor riding arena for Mr Robert Lister (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00546/VLA	Old Roof Tree Inn, Middleton Road, Middleton Variation of legal agreement attached to planning permission 11/00702/FUL to remove the requirement for affordable housing for Mr N Brunt (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

16/00549/VCN	Old Roof Tree Inn, Middleton Road, Middleton Change of use of existing public house to form two dwellings, erection of 8 additional dwellings within the site and associated landscaping and access arrangements (pursuant to the variation of condition 3 on planning permission 11/702/FUL to change units A to F to three-bed units) for Mr N Brunt (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00556/FUL	19 Cove Road, Silverdale, Carnforth Demolition of existing porch, detached garage and shed to the rear and erection of a single storey rear extension and new rear detached garage for Mr Andrew Bodenham (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00557/FUL	64 Quernmore Road, Caton, Lancaster Erection of a two storey side extension for Mr Melvyn Lowe (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00558/LB	Leighton Hall Home Farm, Leighton Park, Leighton Listed building application for works, including demolition and extensions, to facilitate the conversion of the existing buildings to self-catering holiday units for Miss Sinead Mulvenney (Warton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00579/CU	Upp Hall, Upphall Lane, Priest Hutton Change of use of barn into ancillary accommodation in association with Upp Hall Farmhouse for Mr & Mrs Terry Halhead (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00580/LB	Upp Hall, Upphall Lane, Priest Hutton Listed building application for works to facilitate the conversion of barn into ancillary accommodation in association with Upp Hall Farmhouse for Mr & Mrs Terry Halhead (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00585/FUL	Stepping Stones Short Stay School, Bowerham Road, Lancaster Erection of replacement fencing to the south east and north east boundaries and works to existing play area and lawn to create new footpaths, new soft play surfaces and a retaining wall for Mrs Alison Dodd (Scotforth East Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00586/FUL	Watson House, Whitebeck Lane, Priest Hutton Conversion of existing outbuilding into garage and store with first floor extension above to create ancillary self-contained annexe for Mr & Mrs Andrew Foulds (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00587/LB	Watson House, Whitebeck Lane, Priest Hutton Listed building application for works to facilitate the conversion of existing outbuilding into garage and store with first floor extension above to create ancillary self contained annexe for Mr & Mrs Andrew Foulds (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00589/FUL	The Royal Station Hotel, Market Street, Carnforth Erection of a part single/part 2 storey rear extension incorporating external seating area and pergola at first floor, installation of rooflights and lighting to front and side elevation, canopy to main entrance, external escape staircase and extractor flue to the rear for Mr Glen Pearson (Carnforth And Millhead Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

16/00593/LB	Lancaster Castle, Castle Park, Lancaster Listed building application for repairs to masonry and windows for Mr Graeme Chalk (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00596/CU	Box Tree, Ravens Close Road, Wennington Change of use of part of an agricultural building to house a biomass boiler system and fuel store for Mr Ian Armour (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn
16/00597/FUL	Booth Hall, Bay Horse Road, Quernmore Demolition of existing agricultural building and erection of an agricultural workers dwelling for Mrs M Kidd (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00611/FUL	Unit 1, Southgate, White Lund Industrial Estate Demolition of part of existing warehouse and erection of a new warehouse (B1c) for Ms Sharron Wood (Westgate Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00612/FUL	21 Noel Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Installation of an ATM machine for Mrs Ling Dadswell (Skerton East Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00613/ADV	21 Noel Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Advertisement application for the display of a non-illuminated ATM surround for Mrs Ling Dadswell (Skerton East Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00621/FUL	10 Durham Avenue, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a part single, part two storey side and rear extension, incorporating a Juliet balcony for Mr & Mrs T. Jaki (Scotforth East Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00622/ADV	Corner Of Main Road/Long Dales Lane, Nether Kellet, Lancashire Advertisement application for the display of a free standing directional sign for Mr Geoff Billington (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
16/00624/ADV	Market Hall, Common Garden Street, Lancaster Advertisement application for the display of 2 externally illuminated fascia signs for Mr Dobbie (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00626/FUL	School House, Lodge Lane, Melling Erection of a replacement single storey rear extension, construction of a replacement front porch, erection of a detached garage and regrading of rear garden for Mr And Mrs Raynham (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00630/LB	31 - 33 Sun Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Listed building application for the installation of roof lights to the front and rear elevations, removal of existing rear extension, installation of a replacement door to the rear and removal and relocation of partition walls on the ground, first, second and third floors to facilitate the change of use of offices to six 1-bed holiday let apartments for Mr Iain Crabtree (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00633/FUL	10 - 12 Cheapside, Lancaster, Lancashire Installation of replacement entrance door for McDonald's Restaurants Ltd (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

16/00634/ADV	Site For Fast Food Takeaway Unit, Caton Road, Lancaster Advertisement application for the display of 1 internally illuminated gateway, 21 non-illuminated free standing signs, 3 internally illuminated free standing signs, 6 internally illuminated totem signs for McDonald's Restaurants Ltd (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00636/ADV	Site For Fast Food Takeaway Unit, Caton Road, Lancaster Advertisement application for the display of 7 internally illuminated fascia signs and 2 non-illuminated fascia signs for McDonalds Restaurant's Ltd (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00638/FUL	Pleasureland Arcade, Marine Road West, Morecambe Alterations and remodelling of existing front elevation including new structural elements, new cladding and replacement windows to first floor for Mr Solomon Reader (Poulton Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00640/ADV	32 - 34 Penny Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Advertisement application for the display of 4 non-illuminated plaque signs, 3 externally illuminated fascia signs and 3 externally illuminated hanging signs for Marks & Spencer (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00644/LB	Caterleisure Ltd Platform 4, Castle Station, Westbourne Road Listed building application for refurbishment of existing shop unit for Mr Peter O'Connell (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00645/VCN	Land Adjacent Grasscroft, Borwick Avenue, Warton Erection of a detached two-storey dwelling with attached garage (pursuant to the variation of condition 2 on planning permission 15/00567/FUL to amend the approved plans to accommodate elevational changes and a slight repositioning of the dwelling) for Mr Terry Anderson (Warton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00649/ADV	1 Mannin Way, Lancaster, Lancashire Advertisement application for the display of 2 internally illuminated fascia signs for Mr M Brooks (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00650/CU	Springfield, Over Hall Road, Ireby Change of use of agricultural land to form part of domestic curtilage including the excavation of land to create level access, erection of a single storey rear extension, detached garage to the rear and alterations to existing side porch for Mrs Heather Marsden (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00658/FUL	69 - 71 Queen Street, Morecambe, Lancashire Installation of a replacement shop front, replacement of existing flat roof with pitched roof to the front and installation of a ventilation duct to the rear for Mr Tsun Chen (Poulton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn
16/00659/VCN	Land To The South Of, Aldcliffe Hall Drive, Lancaster Erection of 6 dwellings with associated access and landscaping (pursuant to the variation of condition 2 on planning permission 15/01119/FUL to substitute the approved drawings for house plot 3) for Mr Michael Stainton (Scotforth West Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

16/00660/FUL	Silverdale Golf Club, Red Bridge Lane, Silverdale Erection of two semi detached dwellings with associated gardens and car parking for Mr C Middlebrok (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00662/ADV	Arndale Shopping Centre, Royalty Mall, Morecambe Advertisement application for the display of 3 internally illuminated fascia signs and 1 externally illuminated projecting sign for Mr J Constable (Poulton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00666/FUL	Kidds Transport And Storage, Caton Road, Lancaster Demolition of existing office building (B1) and erection of a new 3 storey office building (B1) for Mr S Park (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00667/FUL	8-10 Marketgate, Lancaster, Lancashire Installation of new shop front and window for Ms Debbie Illingworth (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00669/CU	Sea View, Ringstones Lane, Lowgill Change of use of agricultural buildings to two dwellings (C3) for Mr George Morphet (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
16/00670/FUL	Nordean, Lancaster Road, Slyne Erection of a part two storey and part single storey side and rear extension for Ramone Johnson (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00672/FUL	81 Hest Bank Lane, Hest Bank, Lancaster Erection of a 2 storey side extension, construction of a rear dormer extension and creation of a new vehicular access for Mr P. Jackson (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00674/CU	1 Chatsworth Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Change of use of a hotel (C1) to multi-occupied supported living accommodation with an integrated managers dwelling (sui generis) for Mrs Jane Dutton (Harbour Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
16/00675/ADV	Unit 1, Bulk Road, Lancaster Advertisement application for the display of 1 internally illuminated fascia signs, 3 non illuminated fascia signs and 2 new poster frames for DSGI (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision
16/00680/LB	Caterleisure Ltd Platform 3, Castle Station, Westbourne Road Listed building application for internal alterations to existing shop and sign, installation of a non-illuminated sign and mechanical and electrical works to the basement for Mr Peter O'Connell (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00681/FUL	University Of Cumbria, Bowerham Road, Lancaster Revisions to the roof of the previously-approved Teaching Block (15/00913/FUL) including an increase in height by 370mm for University Of Cumbria (John O'Gaunt Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00682/FUL	47 Park Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a single storey rear extension for Ms Ailsa Josland (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted



## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

16/00685/FUL	3 Winder Garth, Over Kellet, Carnforth Erection of a front porch, a single storey side extension and construction of raised decking to the rear for Mr & Mrs J And V Bergus (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00687/FUL	Mishnish, 1 Home Farm Close, Wray Erection of a single storey rear extension and first floor side extension over existing garage for Mr & Mrs Richard Topliss (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00689/FUL	32 The Drive, Carnforth, Lancashire Demolition of existing side and rear extensions and erection of a 2 storey extension to front, side and rear for Mr & Mrs Antony Cawood (Carnforth And Millhead Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00691/FUL	21 Levens Way, Silverdale, Carnforth Erection of a single storey side extension for Mr H Willett (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00694/FUL	Alexandra Building, University Of Cumbria, Bowerham Road Installation of two new fire escape doors to Room 030A for University of Cumbria (John O'Gaunt Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00699/ADV	McDonalds Restaurant, Morecambe Road, Morecambe Advertisement application for the display of one new internally illuminated fascia sign and the display of one and relocation of two internally illuminated individual letter signs for McDonalds's Restaurants Ltd . (Torrisholme Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00703/FUL	3 Old Hall Cottages, Cove Road, Silverdale Erection of a single storey side extension, construction of a dormer window to the side elevation and removal of existing masonry chimney and installation of a metal flue for Ms Susan Caddy (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00707/FUL	5 Oakwood Gardens, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of an extension to existing front porch for Mr & Mrs Kevin and Diane Dangerfield (Scotforth East Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00710/FUL	16 Roeburn Drive, Morecambe, Lancashire Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of a single storey rear and side extension to link to existing garage for Mr T. Freitag (Skerton West Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00712/VCN	Stock A Bank Plantation, Littledale Road, Quernmore Demolition of existing outbuilding and erection of a 3-bed dwelling (pursuant to the variation of condition 3 on application 15/01561/FUL to substitute the drawings in order to move the footprint of the dwelling) for Mr & Mrs Richard And Pauline Ainley (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00721/PLDC	33 Parkfield Drive, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of an outbuilding for Mr Mark Monks (Scotforth West Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

16/00724/FUL	8 Castle Park, Lancaster, Lancashire Replacement of existing asphalt roof covering, installation of a double glazed lantern roof window and replacement of timber doors and screens to the south elevation for Mr D Fatkin (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00725/LB	8 Castle Park, Lancaster, Lancashire Listed building application for replacement of existing asphalt roof covering, installation of a double glazed lantern roof window and replacement of timber doors and screens to the south elevation for Mr D Fatkin (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00727/FUL	20 Cyprus Road, Heysham, Morecambe Erection of a 2 storey side extension for Mr Jonathon Clayton (Heysham South Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00734/FUL	Land Opposite Wisp Cottage, Littledale Road, Brookhouse Erection of a greenhouse for Philip Durow (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00736/FUL	22 Moor Platt, Caton, Lancaster Erection of a rear conservatory for Mr & Mrs D. Cafferty (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00742/NMA	Fanny House Farm, Oxcliffe Road, Heaton With Oxcliffe Non material amendment to planning permission 15/00243/FUL to change the design and layout for Primrose Solar (15) Limited (Heysham South Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00743/FUL	267 Heysham Road, Heysham, Morecambe Retrospective application for the retention of a porch to the front elevation for Mr S. Gallagher (Heysham Central Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
16/00747/FUL	2 Shrewsbury Drive, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a single storey side and rear extension for Mr & Mrs T Wilkinson (John O'Gaunt Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00748/FUL	Bank House Cottage, Slack Lane, Thurnham Erection of a two storey rear extension for Mr Alan Tonge (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00753/CU	24 Cheapside, Lancaster, Lancashire Change of use of cafe (A3) to betting shop (sui generis) for Done Brothers (Cash Betting) Ltd (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
16/00758/FUL	11C The Grove, Carnforth, Lancashire Erection of a first floor side extension for Mrs Dawn Louise McGuiness (Carnforth And Millhead Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00760/AD	Blackwood End Farm, Bay Horse Road, Quernmore Agricultural Determination for the erection of an agricultural building for Mr & Mrs Peter Whitaker (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Not Required
16/00763/AD	Land At, Sidegarth Lane, Halton Agricultural Determination for the erection of a covered midden for Mr J Maxwell (Halton-with-Aughton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

16/00765/FUL	32 Lowther Avenue, Morecambe, Lancashire Demolition of existing rear conservatory and erection of a replacement single storey rear extension and raised decking with obscure glazed panels for Mr & Mrs D. Lord (Torrisholme Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00769/FUL	14 Hest Bank Lane, Hest Bank, Lancaster Erection of a new porch and extension of existing single garage to form double garage with accommodation over for Mr And Mrs J Collins (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00779/FUL	Currys, Unit 1, Bulk Road Installation of an external wall louvre on the rear elevation for Dixon Carphone Group (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00783/FUL	14 Hatlex Lane, Hest Bank, Lancaster Erection of a single storey side extension to create double garage for Mr S Bethell (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
16/00785/PAD	Former Chicken Farm , Kellet Road, Over Kellet Prior approval for the demolition of chicken sheds for Mr Dennis Towers (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Not Required
16/00787/LB	Musgrave House, Thurland Castle, Tunstall Road Listed building application for part removal of internal structural wall to form opening and relocation of internal doors, partition walls and steps on ground floor for Mr And Mrs Duxbury (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00788/FUL	211 Bowerham Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a single storey rear extension and construction of dormer extensions to the front elevation for Mrs Clare Eccles (John O'Gaunt Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00789/FUL	18 Marketgate (Primark), Lancaster, Lancashire Replacement of external doors and re-finish existing glazing framework in dark grey for Mr Dobbie (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00794/FUL	61 Westbourne Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Demolition of existing outbuildings and erection of a rear single storey extension for Mr & Mrs L. Follis (Marsh Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00820/FUL	2 Coniston Road, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Erection of a single storey side extension for Mr & Mrs O'Connor (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00838/AD	Knotts Farm, Quernmore Road, Quernmore Agricultural Determination for the erection of a roof over feed yard for Mr Andrew Sheerin (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Not Required
16/00840/NMA	Field 4900, Hazelrigg Lane, Ellel Non material amendment to planning permission 15/00330/FUL to clad building down to ground level for Mr Darren Hodgson (University And Scotforth Rural Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00849/PLDC	37 Hope Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a single storey rear extension for Mrs M. Murphy (John O'Gaunt Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted

## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

16/00859/NMA	Lancaster Castle, Castle Park, Lancaster Non material amendment to planning permission 15/01621/CU for more detailed ceiling finishes for Mr Graeme Chalk (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00864/AD	Estate Office, The Rake, Abbeystead Agricultural determination for the construction of new roads in various locations for Mr Greg Vickers (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Not Required
16/00878/CCC	Water Hereditament, Denny Beck Lane, Quernmore Change of use of land to waste water treatment and erection of a control kiosk for United Utilities (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	No Objections
16/00916/NMA	Land Bounded By , Chatsworth Road, Albert Road, Westminster Road And Regent Road, Morecambe Non material amendment to planning permission 13/01237/FUL to remove chimneys from house types 1, 3A and 3B and remove the existing single storey side extension from house type 2B for Stephen Clewes (Harbour Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted