



Committee: PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS REGULATORY COMMITTEE

Date: MONDAY, 14TH NOVEMBER 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 17th October, 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 that the proposed development has particular implications for community safety, the issue is fully considered within the main body of the individual planning application report. The weight attributed to this is a matter for the decision-taker.

Local Finance Considerations

Section 143 of the Localism Act requires the local planning authority to have regard to local finance considerations when determining planning applications. Local finance considerations are defined as a grant or other financial assistance that has been provided; will be provided; or could be provided to a relevant authority by a Minister of the Crown (such as New Homes Bonus payments), or sums that a relevant authority has, will or could receive in payment of the Community Infrastructure Levy. Whether a local finance consideration is material to the planning decision will depend upon whether it could help to make development acceptable in planning terms, and where necessary these issues are fully considered within the main body of the individual planning application report. The weight attributed to this is a matter for the decision-taker.

Human Rights Act

Planning application recommendations have been reached after consideration of The Human Rights Act. Unless otherwise explicitly stated in the 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.

5	A5 16/01056/FUL	Former Broadway Hotel, Marine Road East, Morecambe	Bare Ward	(Pages 1 - 13)
		Erection of 50 residential apartments with associated access, car parking and landscaping		
6	A6 16/00961/CU	Red Moss Farm, Quernmore Brow, Quernmore, Lancaster	Lower Lune Valley Ward	(Pages 14 - 19)
		Change of use of agricultural livestock and storage building to a mixed use comprising of a micro-brewery (B2) and general agricultural building		
7	A7 16/01140/CU	Market Street / Euston Road, Morecambe	Poulton Ward	(Pages 20 - 24)
		Use of designated pedestrian highway as street cafe seating and balustrades (no fixed structures)		
8	A8 16/01249/LB	Lancaster Museum, Market Street, Lancaster	Castle Ward	(Pages 25 - 28)
		Listed building application for replacement of existing slates, battens and underfelt, replacement of all lead work to roof and clock tower, redecoration of windows, security bars, railings and doors		
9	Delegated Planning Decisions (Pages 29 - 36)			

ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

(i) Membership

Councillors Carla Brayshaw (Chairman), Helen Helme (Vice-Chairman), June Ashworth, Stuart Bateson, Eileen Blamire, Dave Brookes, Abbott Bryning, Claire Cozler, Andrew Kay, 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.

(iv) Changes to Membership, substitutions or apologies

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

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

Published on Tuesday 1st November, 2016.

Agenda Item A5	Committee Date 14 November 2016	Application Number 16/01056/FUL
Application Site Former Broadway Hotel Marine Road East Morecambe Lancashire	Proposal Erection of 50 residential apartments with associated access, car parking and landscaping	
Name of Applicant Mr Michael Stainton	Name of Agent Mr David Hall	
Decision Target Date 2 December 2016	Reason For Delay None	
Case Officer	Mrs Jennifer Rehman	
Departure	None	
Summary of Recommendation	Subject to further consultation on revised ecology report and Habitat Regulations Assessment, planning permission can be approved.	

1.0 The Site and its Surroundings

- 1.1 The application site comprises a 0.28ha 'L' shaped parcel of land that previously occupied the Broadway Hotel - an iconic five storey brick-built building estimated to have been developed in the 1930s. The hotel was demolished in December 2014 following approval of planning permission for a replacement residential apartment block for McCarthy and Stone. It is understood that for commercial reasons McCarthy and Stone were unable to implement their consent and subsequently sold the site to the applicant. The site has been cleared with two metre painted timber hoardings erected enclosing the site. There is some excavated earth retained towards the front of the site.
- 1.2 The application site occupies a prominent seafront position on the Broadway and Marine Road East junction, approximately 0.7 miles east of Morecambe town centre and 0.5km west of Bare's local centre (Princess Crescent). There are two existing access points serving the site located off Dallam Avenue; one close to the junction with Broadway and the service access adjacent to the back lane which serves the rear of properties on Marine Road East. This is located next to 1 Dallam Avenue. The former hotel had a further access point off Marine Road East but this is now closed off by the site hoardings.
- 1.3 In this location there are very good pedestrian and cycle connections available, in particular the promenade which forms part of the Strategic Cycle Network (Route 69). Broadway, Dallam Avenue and Marine Road East all have the benefit of standard footways in both directions. Access to public transport is good in this location too with bus stops located immediately outside the application site on Marine Road East (in both directions). Bus services serving these stops run regularly between Morecambe and Lancaster University (Bus Nos: 3, 4 and 4A), Carnforth and Overton (Bus No.5) and the Morecambe Bare Circular (Bus No. 33). Less regular services operating from these bus stops include the Number 755 service which runs between Heysham and Kendal/Bowness. Morecambe's train station is approximately 1.7km west of the site with Bare station circa 1.2km southeast of the site.

- 1.4 Surrounding land uses are a mix of residential and leisure uses. Immediately west and adjacent to the proposed site is the Strathmore Hotel, which commands a seafront location and adjoins another hotel, a music shop and a residential care home to form a strong terrace of development. The scale of the properties along Marine Road East are typically 4 storeys high built in a similar manner and style of the former Broadway Hotel. With the exception of Morecambe High School which is also accessed off Dallam Avenue, remaining land uses surrounding the application site consist of two-storey detached and semi-detached residential houses. The site and its surroundings are generally flat (around 6m AOD) although there is a slight fall north-south across the site (between 5.99mAOD at Dallam Avenue and 7.24mAOD towards Marine Road East).
- 1.5 The site is undesignated in the Local Plan. It is identified within flood zone 2 and protected by existing sea wall defences. The site is not within a conservation area nor does it affect the setting of a Listed building. It is also outside the Morecambe Area Action Plan area. The site is close to Morecambe Bay's Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC), RAMSAR and Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) but is separated by the promenade and Marine Road East. The site falls within the SSSI Impact Risk Zone.

2.0 The Proposal

- 2.1 The applicant seeks full planning permission for the redevelopment of the site comprising the erection of 50 residential apartments incrementally rising from four storeys (excluding lower ground level) on Broadway and five storeys on Marine Road East up to eight storeys at the junction of 2 aforementioned roads. Along the Dallam Avenue frontage the development drops to three storeys close to the site access. The scheme incorporates a lower ground level which provides 50 car parking spaces (100% parking provision) with a further 10 tandem spaces provided to serve the large units. Storage for 10 cycles is provided in a lockable store. This lower ground floor level does not appear "subterranean" at the rear of the development as the site levels fall north-south across the site.
- 2.2 The accommodation consists of 40 two bedroom apartments, 8 three bedroom apartments and 2 one bedroom units. The accommodation is broken down as follows:

Lower Ground Floor	60 internal car parking spaces, plant room, refuse store and cycle store and 5 external (visitor) car parking spaces with external landscaping.
Ground Floor	1 one bedroom apartment, 7 two bedroom apartments and 1 two/three (study) bedroom apartment
First Floor	1 one bedroom apartment, 7 two bedroom apartments and 1 two/three (study) bedroom apartment
Second Floor	7 two bedroom apartments and 1 two/three (study) bedroom apartment
Third Floor	7 two bedroom apartments and 1 two/three (study) bedroom apartment
Fourth Floor	6 two bedroom apartments (one unit with small roof terrace) and 1 two/three (study) bedroom apartment
Fifth Floor	4 two bedroom apartments and 1 two/three (study) bedroom apartment with roof terraces to the two end units
Sixth Floor	2 two bedroom apartments and 1 two/three (study) bedroom apartment with roof terraces to the two end units
Seventh Floor	1 three bedroom apartment with roof terraces

The accommodation is served by two staircases and a lift. Materials comprise a grey brick plinth, extensive glazing, anthracite coloured frames, white render and metal clad panelling.

- 2.3 The development is elevated above existing neighbouring ground levels, including the highway to Marine Road East and Broadway and therefore positioned behind a low brick wall with landscaping and then a further higher wall with ventilation gaps serving the lower-ground car park. To the rear the levels are not significantly lower than existing levels due to the fall across the site.
- 2.4 In addition to the above, the proposal involves alterations to the existing access arrangements, namely the closing off the vehicular access from Marine Road East and the easternmost access off Dallam Avenue. These existing access points will be reinstated as footways with full kerbs. All vehicular traffic associated with the proposed development shall be via the slightly modified westernmost access which runs alongside No.1 Dallam Avenue but separated by a back lane which

runs between the rear of properties on Dallam Avenue and the rear of the properties on Marine Road East. The proposal also incorporates minor junction improvements to Marine Road East and Broadway junction comprising kerb realignment on the eastern side of Broadway to assist pedestrians crossing the Broadway junction by reducing the road width and reducing vehicles exist speeds.

3.0 Site History

3.1 The site has a long established history as a hotel, but in more recent years (almost a decade) there have been a number of applications submitted for the demolition of the hotel and the redevelopment of the site for residential purposes. The most relevant planning history is noted in the table below:

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
07/01236/FUL	Demolition of hotel and the erection of 47 one, two and three bed apartments with on site parking	Approved
10/00519/RENU	Application for extension of time on application 07/01236/FUL for demolition of hotel and erection of 47 one, two and three bed apartments	Approved
13/00499/RENU	Renewal of planning permission 10/00519/RENU for demolition of hotel and erection of 47 one, two and three bed apartments	Approved
13/01271/FUL	Demolition of hotel and erection of 51 Category 2 type Retirement Apartments with communal facilities and associated landscaping and car parking	Approved

4.0 Consultation Responses

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

Consultee	Response
County Highways	No objections subject to the following conditions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Off-site highway works • Precise details of access off Dallam Avenue • Car/cycle parking and turning provision • Protection of visibility from new access • Construction method statement
Environment Agency	No objection provided the development is carried out in accordance with the submitted FRA and mitigation contained therein.
Lead Local Flood Authority	No comments received in the statutory consultation period.
United Utilities	No objection subject to the following conditions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Separate systems on site. • Foul drainage scheme condition (no foul to be connected to public surface water drains) • Surface water drainage scheme to be agreed • Management and Maintenance of SuDS
Lancaster City Engineers	No formal comments have been received although they have informed the Case Officer of an existing foul drainage problem in the area around the Broadway which United Utilities and Environmental Health are dealing with under separate regulatory powers.
Natural England	No objection provided the development is carried out in accordance with the applicant’s Habitat Regulations Assessment Report. NE has advised that the Council should as the competent authority undertake a Habitats Regulations Assessment.
Environmental Health Service	No objection – comments as per 13/01271/FUL. The following conditions are recommended: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hours of construction • Asbestos Survey [<i>NB: demolition already taken place so this is not necessary</i>] • Construction noise – pile driving condition

	Further comments from EHS have been received raising issues over the lack of assessment regarding the proximity of the development to extraction systems to the rear of the adjacent hotel. <i>NB: this was not an issue raised by EHS on any of the previous consents.</i> EHS also recommend that whilst the site does not lie in an air quality management area, traffic associated with the development will impact on traffic emissions within the Lancaster District generally including the three AQMA and therefore measures to minimise traffic movements and reduce emissions should be sought.
Strategic Housing Officer	No comments received in the statutory consultation period.
County Education Authority	No objection subject to an Education contribution to the sum of £53,898.12 towards 4 primary school places.
Lancashire Constabulary	No objection in principle. However, due to a large number of reported crimes and incidents in the area, it is recommended that the apartments are built to Secured By Design security standards. A number of security measures are suggested.
Lancashire Fire Service	No objection – The Fire Service advise the development should comply with Part 5 Building Regulations.

5.0 Neighbour Representations

- 5.1 4 letters of objection have been received. A summary of the reasons for opposition are as follows:
- Increased traffic on Dallam Avenue and congestion on Broadway
 - Use of Back Dallam Avenue by construction vehicles
 - Highway safety concerns in relation to the proposed site access and its proximity to existing driveway to 1 Dallam Avenue and the back lane to rear of Marine Road East.
 - Light/shadow problems due to the buildings 8-storey scale
 - Unacceptable overlooking of property on Dallam Avenue
 - Aesthetically the developer claims the development to be Art Deco in style – this is considered fanciful – it’s too busy.
 - Concerns over noise and vibration during construction
 - Concerns over viewing information in relation to the application
- 5.2 A separate letter on behalf of residents of Farringford Court and local residents has been submitted advising that they are running a petition demanding the Highway Authority constructs a roundabout at the end of Broadway in the interests of highway safety. The letter indicates that the proposal would increase traffic by another 50+ vehicles to Dallam Avenue only 30m from the Broadway junction. The latter highlights Dallam Avenue is used as a rat run and is particularly busy and dangerous at the beginning of the day and at the end of the school day.
- 5.3 A letter from the adjacent hotel (Strathmore Hotel) has been submitted which states there is no objection in principle to the development subject to reassurances that during construction the development will not impact detrimentally on the operation of the hotel. The following concerns are raised:
- The established rear access and egress to the hotel is not impeded by during construction or post completion by McCarthy and Stone resident car parking [NB: McCarthy and Stone are not the developer].
 - Development works should not impact hotel operations – noise/vibrations/dust
 - Party Wall agreement needed.

6.0 Principal National and Development Plan Policies

- 6.1 **National Planning Policy Framework**
 Paragraphs 7, 12 and 14 – Achieving Sustainable Development
 Paragraph 17 – Core Principles
 Paragraphs 32, 34, 35, 36, 39 and 41 – Promoting Sustainable Transport
 Paragraphs 49 and 50 - Delivering High Quality Homes
 Paragraphs 56, 57, 58, 60, 61, 62, 64, 65 and 66 – Requiring Good Design
 Paragraphs 100 to 104 – Flood Risk
 Paragraph 109, 111 and 118 – Conserving the Natural Environment
 Paragraph 120 to 125 – Land contamination, noise and light pollution and air quality considerations

Paragraph **173** – Ensuring viability and deliverability

Paragraphs **187** – Decision Taking

Paragraphs **188** to **190** – Pre-application Engagement

Paragraphs **196** and **197** – Determining Applications

Paragraphs **203** and **206** – Planning Conditions and Obligations

6.2 **Lancaster District Core Strategy (2008)**

SC1 Sustainable Development

SC5 Achieving Quality in Design

SC4 Meeting the Districts Housing Requirements

SC6 Crime and Community Safety

E1 Environmental Capital

E2 Transportation Measures

6.3 **Development Management Plan DPD (2014)**

DM20 Enhancing Accessibility and Transport Linkages

DM21 Walking & Cycling

DM22 Vehicle Parking Provision

DM23 Transport Efficiency and Travel Plans

DM26 Open Space

DM27 Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity

DM35 Key Design Principles

DM38 Development and Flood Risk

DM39 Surface Water & Sustainable Drainage

DM41 New Residential Dwellings

DM48 Community Infrastructure

Appendix **B** (Car Parking Standards)

Appendix **E** (Flat Conversations)

6.4 **Other Material Considerations**

Meeting Housing Needs Supplementary Planning Document (February 2013)

Housing Land Supply Statement (September 2015)

National Planning Policy Guidance (NPPG)

Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010

Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 as amended by the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000

7.0 Comment and Analysis

7.1 The main issues in the consideration of this application are as follows:

- Principle of development
- Contribution towards Affordable Housing
- Design, Scale and Layout
- Residential Amenity
- Highway Implications
- Biodiversity
- Flood risk and drainage

7.2 **Principle of Development**

The site currently stands vacant and has done so for almost 2 years. The present condition of the site is not desirable for those living adjacent to it, nor is it attractive to the wider public particularly those visiting the town. The site is regarded a gateway location and so its redevelopment is important in the interests of amenity of the locality and the wider regeneration objectives for Central Morecambe as set out in Core Strategy policy ER2 and the MAAP.

7.3 The proposal submitted seeks to redevelop the site for residential purposes. The principle of residential development on the site is a land use previously accepted under earlier planning consents. In addition, the provision of 50 residential dwellings will positively contribute to the District's undersupply of housing. It is accepted that this Council cannot demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply and that paragraph 49 is engaged in the consideration of this application.

Paragraph 49 makes it clear that adopted policies dealing with housing supply matters (SC4 of the Core Strategy) are not considered up-to-date in these circumstances and so the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies (paragraph 14, NPPF).

7.4 The presumption in favour of sustainable development for decision-making means approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, grant planning permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

7.5 **Contribution towards Affordable Housing**

Policy DM41 of the DM DPD requires new residential development to contribute towards the provision of affordable housing in the District. This policy requires schemes for 15 dwellings or more on non-greenfield sites to provide 30% affordable housing on site. Paragraph 50 of the NPPF also requires the Council to meet the need for affordable homes from new market housing development, preferably on site, unless off site provision or a financial contribution (a commuted sum) of broadly equivalent value can be robustly justified. The Council's SPD on Meeting Housing Needs provides further guidance on affordable housing needs including tenure mix. It also takes account of viability and accepts that a negotiated approach to affordable housing provision will be adopted where appropriate. The SPD also recognises that in some circumstances on-site affordable housing provision may not be appropriate and that a financial contribution in lieu of on-site provision may be accepted with appropriate justification.

7.6 The application has been supported by an affordable housing statement and a viability appraisal. In the first instance the affordable housing statement recognises that the development should be looking to provide 15 affordable housing units on site (equivalent to 30%). The applicant accepts that to deviate from this policy position would require compelling justification. In this case, the applicant has approached five active housing associations operating within Lancaster District who work with the City Council. Not surprisingly none of these registered providers have shown an interest in the site with a couple of them specifically stating that they will not take on units within blocks of flats. The City Council is aware of this situation and understand the main concerns relate to the maintenance and management of affordable units within mixed-ownership buildings. Subsequently, it is accepted that the principle of a financial contribution in lieu of affordable housing on this site is an appropriate starting position. This is also consistent with the approach adopted on the earlier McCarthy and Stone scheme where a financial contribution in-lieu of on-site provision was secured.

7.7 The applicant has also provided viability evidence to be considered in the context of affordable housing provision. The NPPF at paragraph 173 states that pursuing sustainable development requires careful attention to viability and costs in plan-making and decision-taking. Consideration of development viability as a material consideration is also recognised in policy DM41. Following discussions with officers regarding some of the input figures, a revised appraisal has been provided. The applicant's viability appraisal includes an affordable housing contribution of £18,062. It also assumes a developer profit below market expectations (between 17.5-20%) though this is clearly something the developer is willing to accept and has confirmed as such in writing. Whilst some of the assumptions in the appraisal are not explicitly agreed it is clear that overall conclusion from this assessment is that a full financial contribution towards affordable housing is not possible.

7.8 Development viability on this site is not surprising and was an issue raised during consideration of the earlier scheme. Similarly, the fact the development stalled and the earlier developer walked away and sold their site is evidence in itself to understand the costs associated with developing this site are challenging. Despite this, the applicant has factored in a small contribution towards affordable housing and has sufficiently evidenced that a greater contribution could render the development unviable. The contribution shall be secured by a legal agreement (unilateral undertaking).

7.9 **Design, Scale and Layout**

Achieving high quality design is a key priority of local and national planning policy (Policy SC5, DM35 and Section 6 of the NPPF) and is accepted to be a key aspect of achieving sustainable development. New development should respond to local distinctiveness, create a strong sense of place and be visually attractive. Policy DM35 recognises the importance of good design in key gateway locations. The Broadway junction is regarded an important entrance to the town and the

seafront and therefore commands a landmark building that makes a positive impression of the area. The design of the development takes account of the site and its surroundings - although it cannot be underestimated that the planning history has clearly played an important part in the design evolution of the development.

- 7.10 With regard to scale, like the previously approved residential schemes on this site the proposed development is taller and larger than the former hotel. Again, like the former hotel building and the approved schemes, the proposed development maintains its greatest presence and height at the corner of the site facing onto the Broadway/Marine Road East junction. When compared to the scale of the former hotel, the most notable increase in massing and height relates to the 5 storey element of the development immediately adjacent to the Strathmore Hotel (previously was a gap site when the hotel was standing) and the 8 storey (dropping to 4 storey) element of the scheme that was once only a single storey element fronting Broadway. The tallest part of the development is a storey higher than the McCarthy and Stone scheme but similar in height to the earlier approval (13/00499/RENU). The top floor is set back from the main front wall to help minimise the massing of the development at this height. The lowest part of the development along the Broadway frontage (at the Dallam Avenue junction) is approximately half a storey taller than the earlier consented schemes. Behind the main building element fronting Broadway, there is a much smaller building element proposed which is over three floors (including the lower ground) with its frontage towards Dallam Avenue. This element is larger in scale than previous schemes. Overall the varied roofline and gradual increase in scale towards the central part of the development follows the same design philosophy as earlier developments. The planning history is clearly a significant material consideration and therefore the approach to developing the site with the gradual staircasing in height is acceptable.
- 7.11 Regarding the design and appearance of the development, the prominent corner plot clearly provides a good opportunity to recreate a new iconic building in this location. Whilst the former hotel building is no longer present, it did represent a landmark that people recognised and connected with, therefore any replacement building on this site needs to appropriately respond to the site's prominent setting along Morecambe's seafront. In advancing the application, the developer has engaged with the local planning authority via its pre-application service where design principles were discussed in detail. The submission suggests the design of the development is a contemporary response to traditional seaside architecture with some Art-Deco influences. Despite some material references to Art-Deco style buildings and the curvature of elevations, overall the building design is too fussy in its fenestration to be considered an Art-deco style building. The earlier McCarthy and Stone scheme was perhaps more responsive to Morecambe's Art-Deco heritage than this scheme. However, in accordance with paragraph 60 of the NPPF, planning should not impose particular architectural styles or stifle innovation and originality, just seek to promote and reinforce local distinctiveness.
- 7.12 It is contended that the contrast of the smooth white walls with the extensive glazing and dark cladding/anthracite frames appropriately articulates the fenestration. The window arrangements reinforce the horizontal plane while the slightly projecting rendered walls and the central glazed element focus on the verticality of the building at its tallest points. The impact of the height of the building is mitigated and softened by the introduction of the top floor's recess (in most cases) and the use of a grey cladding system to the roof/top floors. The subtle full height projections to the main walls to both Broadway and Marine Road East provide some depth to the building in order to avoid an overly flat and uninteresting elevation. The design and appearance of the principal elevations are considered acceptable and appropriate for this gateway location and do not conflict with local and national design related policy.
- 7.13 Turning to the rear elevations, the scheme has been revised to improve its visual appearance through the removal of the vertical louvres. The fenestration now emphasises the horizontal plane through the introduction of cladding infill panels between the openings on each floor. The fenestration to the rear is simple and understated and is considered to respond appropriately to the relationship to neighbouring property. Consideration of residential amenity is noted below, but ultimately a careful balance has to be made to ensure that the building does not lead to significant overlooking (or a perception of overlooking) but equally does not result in large expanses of blank elevations. The applicant has provided an acceptable design that offers a suitable solution to address both residential and visual amenity constraints in this location.
- 7.14 In terms of layout, this is also very similar to the previously approved scheme and involves an 'L' shaped building practically following the road alignment at the junction of Broadway and Marine

Road East. The building itself does not project beyond the established building lines of neighbouring development, although the elevated landscaped areas to the frontages do. From street level the development is positioned above the ground levels of the adjacent footway and defined by a low wall and landscaping strip with a higher wall behind providing a boundary between the public and private space. The ground floor properties here benefit from external decked areas fronting the highway. Despite the elevated landscaped/private amenity space extending beyond the building lines with Marine Road East and Broadway, it does not lead to any undue harm in terms of the visual amenity and appearance of the respective streetscenes. The extent of this elevated landscaping and boundary detailing is considered proportionate in scale to the proposed building and therefore in design terms, a reasonable response to addressing finished flood levels (as required by the Flood Risk Assessment), parking provision and the appearance of the development on this prominent corner site.

7.15 The rear of the site accommodates the internal road via the access off Dallam Avenue to the lower-ground parking area, visitor parking spaces and a hard landscaped to the east of the internal road between the building entrance and the small 3-storey element serving the 1-bedroom units and the bicycle and bin storage areas. One weakness to the overall layout and design is perhaps the lack of a pedestrian entrance to the development along its frontage with Marine Road East or Broadway. This was an issue raised by County Highways but in relation to proximity to the bus stops. Having regard to the layout presented and the position of internal corridors, staircases and lifts this would be difficult to achieve without significant alterations to the ground floor units. It is felt that the design along the frontage works successfully aesthetically and that whilst rear entrances are not usually encouraged, in this case the layout and the landscaping to the rear will ensure that the main entrance to the scheme is safe and secure. The rear of the development is predominately functional, however, with some soft landscaping and the change in surfacing material at the building entrance it is considered acceptable in design terms.

7.16 **Residential Amenity Considerations**

The residents most affected by the development are those located to the rear of the site on Dallam Avenue (Nos.1 and 3) and the last property on Broadway before the junction with Dallam Avenue (No.9 Broadway). The properties closest to the site on Dallam Avenue currently look out onto the vacant site and the site hoardings but previously their outlook was towards the rear of the hotel and the open car park between the Broadway and Strathmore hotels. Nos 1 and 3 Dallam Avenue are separated from the site by the rear access serving the rear of the properties on Marine Road East but are clearly bound to their north and eastern sides by the application site. The proposed development will result in different outlook for these residents. Currently they benefit from a relatively open outlook especially at first floor level due to the fact the site has been cleared with only site hoardings around its boundary. The proposed development will result in a different outlook when compared to the relationship between these properties and the former hotel when it was in situ. For no. 3 in particular when the hotel was in place, they did benefit from a gap between the existing Broadway hotel and the Strathmore. Clearly at present there are no buildings on the land in question and therefore for a short period of time they have enjoyed a more open outlook in the direction of the application site. This will be lost by the development and will be replaced by a five storey building, rising to eight storeys. The separation distance between the development and this property is approximately 30m. It is also acknowledged that this development is a storey higher up against the existing Strathmore hotel when compared to the former McCarthy and Stone scheme. However, it still exceeds the Council's interface distances stipulated in policy DM35, and with the exception of the four apartment blocks in the furthest western element along the Marine Road East frontage, all the windows facing these neighbouring properties are landing windows. Whilst these residents have enjoyed no building on the site for approximately 22 months, the fact that there are recent planning approvals for a tall building on the site, which would affect neighbouring outlook, is a significant material consideration. The loss of a view towards Morecambe Bay is unfortunate but the loss of a view is not a material planning consideration.

7.17 The impact on No.1 Dallam Avenue is more significant. The development will have an overbearing impact by virtue of the sheer scale and height of the development. When compared to the former hotel on site, this increase in scale is more pronounced along Broadway where previously the hotel only had a single storey extension. The development results in a significant increase in built form to the north and east sides of 1 Dallam Avenue. In order to mitigate this impact the development has been designed to limit the number of window openings on the south and west elevations; the scale of the development has been designed to step down towards Dallam Avenue and the building has been positioned within the plot to achieve interface distances over the required 12m. The distances

between the three storey element of the development and the side elevation of this property is approximately 13m and approximately 20m to the nearest five storey element. There are no habitable windows on the development directly facing this property and no principal habitable windows on the side elevation of this neighbouring property. The windows to the development provide natural light into the circulation corridors that run along the rear of each floor of the development. Despite meeting the Council's interface distance set out in SPG12, Officers acknowledge that there will be an impact on neighbouring residential amenity and that this impact is principally one of a sense of overbearingness and a perception of overlooking. In addition, it is likely that these neighbours will experience a greater level of activity given the position of the proposed vehicular access point, although an access point to the hotel has always been in this position, albeit used less by private cars because the hotel's main business was coach parties which did not access the site at this point. This impact should be considered in the context of the wider planning balance of the proposal, although it should be noted that the impact is not significantly worse than what was proposed under the earlier approved residential schemes.

- 7.18 In terms of other properties most likely to be affected by the development, the properties on the other side of Broadway are significantly further away (circa 54m) not to experience a loss of privacy, overlooking or an adverse outlook as a consequence of the redevelopment of the site. No.9 Broadway has its side elevation facing the development with an interface distance here of circa 24m. Despite the height of the development being considerably taller than the height this neighbouring property (and others), it is accepted that the relationship between the development on No 9 Broadway would not lead to an unacceptable harm.
- 7.19 **Highway Considerations**
Marine Road East (A5105) is a wide two-way road running in an east-west direction as it passes the site. It has footways on both sides of the carriageway with on-street parking permissible on both sides of the carriageway. There is an existing signalised crossing approximately 170m from the site frontage. Marine Road East is lit and subject to a 30mph speed limit. It is also a main bus route with bus stops located on Marine Road East adjacent to the western boundary of the site. Broadway (A589) is a wide two-way road that runs in a north-south direction as it passes the site. It has wide verges and footways on both sides of the carriageway. The road is lit and also subject to a 30mph speed limit. Dallam Avenue running east-west to the south of the site, is limited to 20mph.
- 7.20 The site previously had 3 access points; two on Dallam Avenue and one of Marine Road East. The proposal seeks to utilise the western most access on Dallam Avenue. The other access points shall be permanently closed with the kerbs reinstated. Objections have been received in respect of highway safety with particular concerns over the access location and the increase in traffic anticipated to be generated from the development. The proposed access location is no different to the consented schemes. The access is gated and set back from the highway with appropriate visibility splays at the junction to Dallam Avenue. County Highways has no objections to the location of the proposed access.
- 7.21 Issues over construction traffic and traffic generated from the development blocking the driveways to neighbouring property and the back servicing lane should not be an issue as there are already parking restrictions imposed on the highway from the junction with Broadway to beyond the school (double yellow-lines).
- 7.22 In terms of traffic generation, the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Highway Authority has previously accepted anticipated trip rates for residential schemes involving 47 apartments and a 51 retirement apartment block. The previously submitted supporting information indicated that the residential trips associated with the 47 apartments equated to 52 arrivals and 54 departures (daily) with 3 arrivals and 12 departures at the AM peak hour and 10 arrivals and 5 departures at the PM peak hours. At the time these figures were below the traffic figures for the fallback position (the hotel use). The trip rates associated with the retirement scheme were lower than the existing hotel and approved residential scheme, particularly at the peak hours.
- 7.23 The application has been supported by a supplementary Highway Note which indicates that using the same methodology for the trip generation for the 47 apartment scheme, the proposed development would generate a single additional departure at the AM peak and a single additional arrival at the AM peak hour only. This is a negligible increase from what has previously been accepted. Furthermore, these anticipated trip rates do not take account of the site's high level

accessibility. There are no objections from County Highways in relation to traffic generation and the impact on the local highway network.

- 7.24 Regarding parking provision, the maximum car parking standards set out in the DM DPD would require 98 parking spaces based on the number of bedrooms. Policy is driven to discourage car use and promote alternative transport modes, particularly in sustainable and accessible locations. A reduction of 35% from the maximum is proposed here and is regarded as an appropriate level of parking to serve the development given the site's sustainable location. A cycle store is proposed as part of the scheme. The submission indicates a provision of 10 cycle spaces, which is not sufficient. The size of the store could with careful design accommodate more bicycles than the 10 suggested so it is accepted that this can be controlled by condition. County Highways raises no objections to the level of car parking proposed.
- 7.25 Turning to the proposed off-site highway works. The applicant proposes minor improvements to the Marine Road East and Broadway junction comprising kerb realignment on the eastern side of Broadway to assist pedestrians crossing the Broadway junction by reducing the road width and reducing vehicles' existing speeds. Whilst previous schemes have included the provision of a refuge island on Marine Road East, on further investigation during the pre-application stages (by the Highway Authority in conjunction with the developer), it transpired that a range of additional works/measures would be required within the highway to make that scheme acceptable. County Highways contends that such work would result in an unreasonable cost and the scale of works to be undertaken would not be proportionate to the development. In accordance with paragraphs 203-206 of the NPPF, the imposition of conditions to force the provision of a refuge island would not therefore meet the tests, in particular being fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. Subsequently, despite the small-scale nature of the works now proposed, the purpose clearly seeks to aid pedestrian crossing over the main junction. An objection has been received advising that the community are wanting County Highways to consider a roundabout in this location. For the same reasons noted above, this development would not be expected to deliver such a significant change to the highway network in this location.
- 7.26 Matters concerning construction traffic and obstructions on the highway are principally matters for the Highway Authority and Police. However, a Site Management Plan has been provided upfront setting out measures to minimise disturbance to the local highway network and neighbouring residential amenity. County Highways is satisfied with its content and advises it should be conditioned if minded to approve the development. Despite objections to the contrary, overall, the development is considered acceptable in highway safety and accessibility terms and has adequately demonstrated sufficient parking is available to serve the development. The scheme complies with policies E2 of the Core Strategy, policies DM20 to DM22 of the DM DPD and paragraphs 17 and 32 of the NPPF in respect of highway considerations.
- 7.27 **Biodiversity**
The application site is a vacant brownfield site with little biodiversity value on site. The site does, however, lie within close proximity to designated conservation sites, in particular Morecambe Bay SPA/RAMSAR. The applicant has submitted their own Habitat Regulations Assessment (HRA) report to provide information to the authority to inform a formal HRA. The HRA is an assessment of likely significant effects on the SPA/RAMSAR. It is accepted that the principle potential effects arising from the development include the following:
- Disturbance through construction operations;
 - Pollution through construction operations; and,
 - Disturbance through increased recreational activity along the foreshore.
- The applicant's report concludes that there would be no likely significant effect (LSE) provided mitigation is undertaken. The mitigation includes pollution prevention measures and a financial contribution to offset impacts by increased visitor pressure. Natural England (NE) has raised no objections to the proposal provided the development is carried out in accordance with the suggested mitigation. Officers concur with the recommended mitigation, although slight amendments are sought with regards the implementation of the suggested mitigation which will inform a final HRA which shall be completed before Planning Committee. The principle issue currently being negotiated is in relation to the suggested financial contribution to ensure this is compliant with the tests for such obligations. An alternative to a financial contribution would be the delivery of a signage scheme to be agreed in consultation with the local planning authority and NE (perhaps via Morecambe Bay Partnerships) to be installed along the seafront (either on the promenade or the foreshore where land is in the Council's control). The purpose is to educate visitors and residents about the nature

conservation importance of Morecambe Bay and to manage recreation pressure. Given that the recreational pressures of the development will not be significant (given the site's former use as a hotel), any such signage scheme would need to be proportionate. Officers are in the process of negotiating the details and the mechanisms to deliver this form of mitigation, but are satisfied overall based on the advice from the statutory consultee, that the impact of the development on Morecambe Bay considered alone or in combination with other projects would not lead to LSE provided proportionate mitigation is secured. Such mitigation would be secured through the imposition of a condition. A verbal update will be provided on this matter.

7.28 **Flood risk considerations**

The site lies within Flood Zone 2 which represents a medium flood risk originating from the Irish Sea (Morecambe Estuary) some 25m north of the application site. The area is defended by an existing wave reflection wall currently is set at 7.96mAOD though the wall is to be raised by 300mm as part of the ongoing flood defence works. The application has been accompanied with a Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) which has been considered and accepted by the Environment Agency. The FRA proposes a series of mitigation measures:

- That the living accommodation for the development is set at a level of 9.10mAOD – 0.9m above the 1:200 year flood level with allowance for climate change.
- Internal egress and refuge are provided in the building
- A flood warning and evacuation plan to be implemented post development

A condition is recommended to ensure the development is carried out in accordance with the submitted FRA and the mitigation measures contained therein.

7.29 The submitted FRA has sufficiently evidenced that the development would be safe from flood risk and would not increase the risk elsewhere. It has also acknowledged the development in context with the Sequential and Exception Test insofar as concluding the site post development will remain "more vulnerable" and therefore acceptable in Flood Zone 2. The aim of the Sequential Test is to steer new development to areas with the lowest probability of flooding (Flood Zone 1). The applicant has failed to appropriately apply with Sequential Test, as it is clear that the flood risk vulnerability classification table provided in the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) clearly states that the table does not show the application of the Sequential Test.

7.30 The NPPG states that where there are no reasonably available sites in Flood Zone 1, local planning authorities in their decision making should take into account the flood risk vulnerability of land uses and consider reasonably available sites in Flood Zone 2 and applying the Exception Test if required. Whilst there could be alternative sites for residential development elsewhere in the District, Officers have had regard to the characteristics, public value and planning history of the site in question: The site is currently vacant and unsightly; it is previously developed land in a gateway location where its redevelopment is considered significantly important; and; has a recent planning history for residential development and currently benefits from an extant consent for the erection of a residential apartment block. These are significant materials considerations and are weighted in favour of the proposal. Furthermore, the scheme put forward has been designed with no living accommodation below the 1:200 year plus climate change allowance flood level, meaning that its flood risk vulnerability classification would be considered 'More Vulnerable'. Table 3 at paragraph 067 of the NPPG indicates that 'More Vulnerable' uses would be considered appropriate development in Flood Zone 2. With this in mind, it is accepted that the site's redevelopment is important to the wider public amenity of the area, it is also clear that the development has been designed to be safe from flood risk and will not increase flood risk elsewhere. The statutory consultees have raised no objection therefore on balance, there are no sustainable grounds for refusal on flood risk matters.

7.31 With regards drainage, the proposal intends to connect both surface water and foul water to the existing sewers. The use of a truly Sustainable Urban Drainage System (SuDS) in this location is not considered feasible by the developer for a number of reasons, although some aspects of SuDS are intended, such as underground storage and modest impermeable paving. As for foul drainage, Officers have been made aware that properties on this part of Marine Road East have historically connected their foul drainage to the surface water sewers, leading to contamination at the outfall in the Bay. This is a separate matter being investigated and dealt with by United Utilities and our Environmental Health Service. As the site is vacant, there should be no risk of this occurring in the

future as new drainage will be laid to serve the development. United Utilities has not objected to the proposal and recommend both foul and surface water drainage conditions.

7.32 **Other considerations**

Matters such as ground contamination have been adequately addressed in the application. With regards contamination, the Council's Contamination Land Officer has confirmed that only an unforeseen contamination condition would be required. In terms of disturbance during the construction phases, a Site Management Plan has been provided which sets out a number of measures the developer/contractor will take on board to minimise disturbance to residents/businesses and the highway network. This plan should offer some reassurances to residents. However, in most cases issues such as noise/pollution/highway obstructions are controlled under separate legislation. Such impacts are short-term in nature and would not lead to long term impacts on residential amenity. A condition is still recommended requiring pollution prevention measures to be adhered to but fundamentally in relation to the requirements set out in the biodiversity section of this report. This is most likely to be encompassed within the ecology related condition.

7.33 In terms of the comments from Environmental Health about the relationship of the development to hotel plant equipment, it is contended that given the distance of the plant from the site boundary and the orientation of windows proposed, that this would not lead to significant amenity issue for future residents to warrant rejection. The concerns now raised, have not been previously raised by the Environmental Health Service or considered during the assessment of earlier residential schemes. As to minimising traffic and reducing emissions, the applicant is willing to provide electric charging points within the development to support more sustainable travel for future occupants in compliance with relevant sustainability policy. It has been agreed that this can be secured by condition.

8.0 Planning Obligations

8.1 As noted above, the application has been submitted with a viability appraisal which clearly indicates that the development of the site cannot be subject to significant obligations that would threaten viability of the scheme. The Education Authority have requested an education contribution to the sum of £53,898.12 towards 4 primary school places. Whilst it is completely reasonable to make such a request, Officers have not secured this contribution for viability reasons. The lack of an education contribution is a disbenefit to the scheme and should be accounted for in the planning balance. The developer has evidence through their viability appraisal that a small contribution towards affordable housing, totalling to £18,062, shall be provided. This shall be secured by legal agreement.

9.0 Conclusions

9.1 At the heart of the NPPF is the presumption in favour of sustainable development (Paragraph 14). Overall the proposed development positively contributes to meeting the District's housing need by providing 50 open market residential units; it involves the redevelopment of a brownfield site in a prominent gateway location; it is a scheme which represents high quality design; it is sustainably located with good access to public transport and proposes modest highway improvements to enhance pedestrian accessibility and movements across a busy highway/junction; it satisfactorily addresses the risk of flooding; and will not adversely impact the special features of the SPA subject to mitigation. There will be social and economic benefits brought about through the redevelopment of this site both during construction and operational stages of the development.

9.2 The only drawbacks of the proposal relate to the impact on neighbouring residential amenity, the lack of an education contribution towards primary school places and the failure to secure a full affordable housing contribution. On balance, having regard to the benefits and drawbacks of the scheme, it is contended that the impact on neighbouring residential amenity and the lack of a full affordable housing contribution and an education contribution would not significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF and the Local Plan taken as a whole.

- 9.3 The proposed development is considered a sustainable form of development that accords with the Development Plan. Subject to a revised HRA to agree the mechanisms for mitigation, Members are recommended to support the application.

Recommendation

Subject to a revised Habitat Regulations Assessment to agree the mechanisms for mitigation that Planning Permission **BE GRANTED** subject to the signing of a legal agreement to secure a financial contribution in lieu of on-site affordable housing and the following conditions (though if the legal agreement is not signed and completed on or prior to the determination date the application is to be refused):

1. Standard time Limit
2. Approved Plans List
3. Details of the vehicular access to be submitted pre-commencement
4. Scheme for the disposal of foul drainage to be submitted pre-commencement
5. Scheme for the disposal of surface water drainage to be submitted pre-commencement
6. Schedule of window/door/roof details (including rainwater goods) to be submitted pre-construction of the building
7. Schedule and samples of all external materials and finishes to elevations and details of surfacing treatments to be submitted pre-construction of the building
8. Landscaping scheme including external lighting to be submitted pre-construction of the building
9. Notwithstanding details submitted, cycle storage and provision to be agreed (pre-occupation)
10. Scheme for management and maintenance of surface water for the life time of the development to be submitted pre-occupation
11. Off-site highway improvements (closure of existing accesses and reinstatement to footways, realignment of Broadway junction) to be implemented prior to first occupation
12. Protection of visibility at site access
13. Development to be carried out in accordance with the mitigation measures set out in the FRA
14. Mitigation measures for Habitat Regulations Assessment (TBC) to be provided during construction (pollution prevention) and pre-occupation (recreational pressures) as per revised ecology report (TBC)
15. Site to be drained on separate systems
16. Development to be carried out in accordance with the approved Site Management Plan
17. Hours of construction
18. Car parking provision
19. Electric charging point to be provide and available for use
20. Unforeseen Contamination

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:

Officers have made this 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>Agenda Item A6</p>	<p>Committee Date 14 November 2016</p>	<p>Application Number 16/00961/CU</p>
<p>Application Site Red Moss Farm Quernmore Brow Quernmore Lancaster</p>	<p>Proposal Change of use of agricultural livestock and storage building to a mixed use comprising of a micro-brewery (B2) and general agricultural building</p>	
<p>Name of Applicant Mr Alan Rainford</p>	<p>Name of Agent Mr Paul Tunstall</p>	
<p>Decision Target Date 11 October 2016</p>	<p>Reason For Delay Late request for Committee determination</p>	
<p>Case Officer</p>	<p>Mrs Petra Williams</p>	
<p>Departure</p>	<p>No</p>	
<p>Summary of Recommendation</p>	<p>Refusal</p>	

(i) Procedural Matters

This form of development would normally be dealt with under the Scheme of Delegation but has been called in to Planning Committee by Cllr Helen Helme. A written explanation for the referral is awaited at the time of writing this report.

1.0 The Site and its Surroundings

1.1 The site that forms the subject of this application is an agricultural building which is located in the remote rural area of Quernmore. The steel framed building has a footprint of 18 metres by 12 metres and has a predominantly box profile clad exterior. Internally there is a mezzanine floor. The building was originally constructed in association with agricultural operations at nearby Brow Top Farm for the purposes of hay/straw storage, agricultural equipment and the housing of ewes. It is understood that the land and buildings associated with Brow Top Farm have subsequently been sold off and that the subject building is used by the applicant in connection with 8 hectares of surrounding land.

1.2 This application site is set back from the highway and is accessed via a 200 metre single track off the northern side of Quernmore Brow. The area to the immediate west of the site is occupied by four residential properties. Quernmore is a dispersed parish, with the largest group of dwellings centred on the crossroads, approximately 1.1 kilometres to the north west of the site. There is also a church and primary school located approximately 2.6 kilometres (by road) to the north west. Lancaster city centre is located approximately 6 kilometres to the north west, the village of Caton is approximately 7.5 kilometres to the north and the village of Galgate is approximately 7.7 kilometres to the south west.

1.3 The site is within the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the District's Countryside Area. Public Footpath no.9 runs adjacent to the eastern edge of the site.

2.0 The Proposal

2.1 The application seeks a change of use of the agricultural livestock and storage building to create a mixed use comprising of a micro-brewery (B2) and general agricultural building. The supporting

documents state that the micro-brewery would occupy approximately 20% of the building. Internally, in addition to the laying-out of the tanks and necessary pipework, a small WC and kitchenette unit is proposed on the opposite side of the building which will be used for staff welfare. The supporting statement also sets out that it is likely that the part of the upper floor mezzanine will be used for office and administrative purposes.

3.0 Site History

3.1 The building was granted consent in 2003 and was conditioned to be used in association with the operation of the agricultural holding known at Brow Top Farm. The applicant has previously submitted an application for a detached dwelling on land to the east of the site. This was refused and dismissed at appeal.

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
03/01279/FUL	Erection of a general purpose and livestock building	Permitted
14/00668/FUL	Erection of a single-storey 4-bedroom dwelling house with associated car-parking, access and earthworks	Refused

4.0 Consultation Responses

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

Consultee	Response
Environmental Health	No objections – given the existing agricultural use of the site, the scale and nature of the proposal raises no concerns. If the site is to use a private water supply for brewing then this supply should be registered with Environmental Health prior to being brought into use. Lancaster City Council will then risk assess and sample the supply to ensure it is wholesome prior to it being used.
County Highways	No objections - subject to condition relating to surface treatment at the site entrance.
United Utilities	No objections – subject to drainage details.

5.0 Neighbour Representations

5.1 One item of public comment has been received which raises objections to the scheme. Concerns relate to the following:

- The water source referred to in the application is shared with 4 residential properties. There are concerns that this hasn't been taken into consideration and water flow may be compromised.
- It is noted that that the proposal indicates there should be no additional surface water and that an existing water soakaway will be used. However, it should be highlighted that current soakaway arrangements are inadequate and there are already problems with surface water within our property which is immediately downhill of the proposed microbrewery site.
- Concerns regarding possible smell and noise.

6.0 Principal National and Development Plan Policies

6.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)
 Paragraph 14 – Presumption in favour of sustainable development
 Paragraph 17 – Twelve Core Planning Principles
 Paragraphs 18 to 21 – Building a strong, competitive economy
 Paragraph 28 – Supporting a prosperous rural economy
 Paragraphs 109, 118 and 119 – Conserving biodiversity
 Paragraph 123 – Noise

6.2 Development Management DPD (DMDPD)
 Policy DM7 – Economic Development in Rural Areas
 Policy DM8 - The Re-use and Conversion of Rural Buildings
 Policy DM9 – Diversification of the Rural Economy
 Policy DM16 – Small Business Generation

Policy **DM27** – Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity

Policy **DM28** – Development and Landscape Impact

Policy **DM35** – Key Design Principles

6.3 Lancaster District Core Strategy Policies

SC1 – Sustainable Development

SC3 – Rural Communities

SC5 – Achieving Quality in Design

E2 – Transportation Measures

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

E3 – Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)

E4 – Countryside Area

7.0 **Comment and Analysis**

7.0 Comment and Analysis

The scheme raises the following issues:

- Background
- Principle of development
- Impact on character of the countryside and AONB
- Impact on residential amenity of neighbouring properties
- Access and highway impacts

7.1 Background

7.1.1 The agricultural building is located within the open countryside away from any settlements containing services, and is surrounded by land not associated with a farmstead or residential property and it is understood that the applicant lives in Lancaster. It is worth noting at this point that the original consent for the building (03/01279/FUL) includes a condition which states the following:

The building hereby approved shall be used for livestock housing, fodder storage and the storage and maintenance of agricultural machinery associated with the operation of the agricultural holding known as Brow Top Farm and for no other purpose without the prior consent in writing of the local planning authority.

Reason: To ensure that inappropriate uses do not take place in this locality.

This condition highlights the clear intention that when consent was granted it was considered critical that its use was tied to the adjacent agricultural in order to prevent inappropriate uses as well as unnecessary vehicle movements. Given that the building is not currently being used in association with the agricultural holding known as Brow Top Farm, the applicant is technically in breach of the condition.

7.1.2 As well as the decision notice relating to application 03/01279/FUL, the relevant file also contains subsequent correspondence in respect of the proposed use of the building in question around the time (2007) of the sale of land and buildings associated with Brow Top Farm. These letters clearly set out that the local planning authority would be unlikely to support an application for change of use of the building to any use not directly associated with and necessary for the agricultural working of the surrounding land in its immediate vicinity.

7.2 Principle of Development

7.2.1 Policy SC1 of the Core Strategy promotes sustainable development in terms of the location of development and sets out that development should be located where it is convenient to travel to and from the site by walking, cycling and public transport. This policy is bolstered by policy SC3 of the Core Strategy which sets out the key villages where employment development would be permitted and policy DM20 which seeks to minimise the need to travel. In relation to economic development in rural areas, Policy DM7 sets out that proposals which maintain and enhance rural vitality and character will be supported where it is demonstrated that they improve the sustainability of rural communities by bringing local economic, environmental and community benefits. Small business

generation is acknowledged within policy DM16 and other relevant key policies are DM8 which sets out the criteria for the re-use and conversion of rural buildings and DM9 which outlines the criteria relating to proposals for diversification of the rural economy.

- 7.2.2 The supporting statement refers to the Avid Brewing Company which the applicant is part owner of. Although currently a small scale operation (housed within a domestic garage) the applicant wishes to move operations to a commercial environment in order to develop a micro-brewery to increase production and considers the subject property as a suitable site. It is therefore necessary to consider the requirements of policy DM9. This policy offers support to proposals in rural areas where it is demonstrated that significant economic benefits exist from the diversification of the farm holding without generating adverse impacts on the environment. In order to be considered acceptable such proposals must demonstrate that the building can no longer be used for ongoing agricultural uses and that the agricultural diversification remains ancillary to the primary agricultural use. With regard to the first point it is considered that the submission fails to demonstrate that the building can no longer be used as a whole for ongoing agricultural uses. In fact it is considered that the proposal would actually undermine the agricultural use of the building. The supporting document and plans suggest that the micro-brewery would utilise 20% of the building. However it is considered that the layout would in fact impinge on the practical use of the rest of the building. In terms of the primary agricultural use, this is considered to be merely a hobby farm which does not provide the main source of employment for the applicant. The proposal cannot therefore be viewed as a form of diversification which would provide support for an existing rural enterprise. It is also considered that the scheme fails to accord with the requirements of policy DM16 in relation to small business generation as it is not within a sustainable rural settlement or part of a sustainable and suitable farm diversification scheme within a rural area.
- 7.2.3 Policy DM9 also states that the proposed use of the building must be appropriate in a rural location. However, it is strongly argued that the proposed use would be better suited to a small unit within an industrial estate. This policy also takes account of traffic generation and it is suggested within the supporting statement that both the applicant and his business partner already attend the site for agricultural purposes and that consequently deliveries of raw materials and barrels of finished beer would take place on a joint trip basis most of the time. Although there are no highway objections to the scheme in terms of traffic safety, it is considered that the proposal would ultimately result in increased vehicle movements to and from the site and therefore does not constitute a sustainable form of development. The submission makes reference to the employment of 3 staff once fully established but as highlighted in paragraph 7.1.1, when permitted in 2003 the building was conditioned so as to prevent unnecessary vehicle movements to and from the site. It is therefore considered that the proposal would fail to accord with policy DM20 which sets out that proposals should minimise the need to travel, particularly by private car and maximise opportunities for the use of walking, cycling and public transport.
- 7.2.4 Turning to other requirements, policy DM7 states that development proposals for economic development in rural areas which maintain and enhance rural vitality and character will be supported where it is demonstrated that they improve the sustainability of rural communities. Although the supporting statement highlights policy DM7 as offering support to the scheme this is contested by the Case Officer as it is considered that the proposal would in no way improve the sustainability of the rural community due to its detached and isolated location.
- 7.2.5 As highlighted within policy DM7, the Council has a preference for the re-use and conversion of existing buildings (as opposed to new build) within the open countryside for a range of uses consistent and compatible with the open countryside. Alongside this, policy DM8 relates to the conversion of rural buildings and offers support where the proposal is of a type that is consistent with the specific location. The submission makes the argument for developing the use in this location as the re-use of an existing building and the inherent sustainability of this approach. However, the application site is unrelated to any of the named villages within policy SC3 and is remote to the nearest village, Galgate. Ultimately there is no requirement for the proposed use to take place in this specific location. For example, if the micro-brewery was proposed in connection with an adjacent public house there may be a valid argument for allowing such a use in a rural location, but this proposal is wholly unrelated to the surrounding area. Although it is stated within the submission that after the beer is brewed, the leftover by-products would make excellent feed and fertiliser to be used on the surrounding land, this in itself does not render the proposal acceptable.

7.2.6 Although the site would utilise an existing building, it is located in the open countryside in a relatively isolated position in terms of services and facilities. Therefore, in terms of the economic and social dimensions of sustainability, it is considered that the site is not sustainable and there are no exceptional justification for the development in this location and therefore the principle of the proposal is unacceptable.

7.3 Impact on character of the countryside area and Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty

7.3.1 The site is located within an area of attractive undulating farm land within the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The site is set back from the highway and partly built into the sloping hillside. As such the site is not highly visible and is relatively well screened by adjacent trees. No external changes are proposed as part of the submission and as such it is considered that the scheme would not result in visual impacts on the AONB or surrounding Countryside Area.

7.4 Impact on residential amenity of neighbouring properties

7.4.1 It is noted that one neighbour comment has been submitted and one of the concerns raised relates to noise and odour. There are 4 residential properties to the west of the site. The closest of these is Brow Top Cottage which is situated 33m away from the subject building. However, considering the existing nature and use of the agricultural building, and scale and nature of proposed activities it is considered there will be no undue impacts associated with either noise or odour. As such the Environmental Health Officer has raised no objections to the scheme subject an hours of use condition.

7.4.2 Other matters raised by the neighbour letter relate to water supply and drainage. The submission states that the building benefits from an existing spring water supply which will be used in the production process. However, the neighbour is concerned that the proposal may compromise water flow to their property. The subject building already utilises the spring water supply and no information has been provided to suggest that the water supply to the adjacent properties would be adversely affected. Furthermore the use of the water supply in relation to the development as well as the existing adjacent properties is a licensing matter which is regulated by Environmental Health.

7.4.3 The neighbour letter also highlights that the existing soakaway arrangements are inadequate and there are already problems with surface water. However, United Utilities raised no objections to the scheme but makes recommendations which could be conditioned.

7.5 Access and highway impacts

7.5.1 The sightlines at the existing access to the development site are considered acceptable for the scale of development taking place and highlighted within paragraph 7.2.3, the proposal has been considered by the Highway Authority who has raised no concerns with regard to highway safety. However, the Highway Authority has requested a condition regarding a surface treatment at the site access in the event that planning permission is granted.

8.0 Planning Obligations

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

9.0 Conclusions

9.1 The site is not considered to be in a sustainable location and does not provide any compelling justification, such as the support of an agricultural business, to warrant the use of part of this building for the establishment of a micro-brewery business in the open countryside, remote from any service centres. The proposal is therefore considered contrary to the provisions of the NPPF, the Core Strategy and various policies in the Development Management DPD as set out above.

Recommendation

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

1. The site is in an unsustainable location within the open countryside, remote from services. There is no overriding justification to warrant the siting of a micro-brewery within this agricultural building in this isolated location. As a consequence, the proposal is contrary to the aims and objectives of the National Planning Policy Framework, in particular the Core Principles and Section 3, Policies SC1 and SC3 of the Lancaster District Core Strategy and Policies DM7, DM8, DM9, DM16 and DM20 of the Development Management Development Plan Document.

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

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

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

Human Rights Act

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

Background Papers

None

<p>Agenda Item</p> <p>A7</p>	<p>Committee Date</p> <p>14 November 2016</p>	<p>Application Number</p> <p>16/01140/CU</p>
<p>Application Site</p> <p>Market Street/Euston Road Morecambe Lancashire</p>		<p>Proposal</p> <p>Use of designated pedestrian highway as street cafe seating and balustrades (no fixed structures)</p>
<p>Name of Applicant</p> <p>Lancaster City Council</p>		<p>Name of Agent</p> <p>Mr Julian Inman</p>
<p>Decision Target Date</p> <p>4 November 2016</p>		<p>Reason For Delay</p> <p>Committee Cycle</p>
<p>Case Officer</p>		<p>Mrs Kim Ireland</p>
<p>Departure</p>		<p>No</p>
<p>Summary of Recommendation</p>		<p>Approval</p>

(i) **Procedural Matters**

This form of development would normally be dealt with under the Scheme of Delegation. However, the application has been submitted by the City Council, 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 the designated pedestrian zone in Morecambe town centre, covering the majority of Euston Road and a small part of Market Street. This area focuses around the retail core of the town centre where there are a few well established cafés and public houses.

1.2 The site is allocated as a town centre and a primary retail frontage within the Lancaster District Local Plan. The site is situated within Morecambe Conservation Area.

2.0 The Proposal

2.1 The submitted application proposes the use of a defined portion of pedestrian highway land within the town centre for street cafés. This application seeks to establish the principle of street cafés with all the detailed matters, such as access, street furniture design, balustrades, noise considerations, hours of use and access matters to be controlled and managed through the Council's Licensing procedures under Section 115 Part VIIA of the Highways Act 1980.

3.0 Site History

3.1 There has been one site within the identified red edge (application site) that has sought separate planning consent over recent years for the change of use of highway land to provide outdoor café seating. Aside from that, there have been no other planning applications covering a significant portion of the town centre that are relevant to consider in the determination of this application. However, a similar application (12/00239/CU) was approved by Planning Committee for Lancaster city centre in 2012.

4.0 Consultation Responses

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

Consultee	Response
Town Council	No comments received within the statutory timescale.
County Highways	No objections
Environmental Health Officer	No objections
Conservation Officer	No objections
Licensing Section	No comments received within the statutory timescale.
Lancashire Constabulary	No objections , subject to the advice to reduce crime and fear of crime and create safe environments.

5.0 Neighbour Representations

5.1 One piece of supporting correspondence has been received. The reasons for support include the following:

- On behalf of Morecambe Business Improvement District (BID) Limited the application should be supported as it has a forward thinking attitude in a BID zone.
- It will help improve the local economy and footfall.

6.0 Principal National and Development Plan Policies

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:

6.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Paragraph **17** - 12 Core Principles
 Paragraph **19** – Building a Strong, Competitive Economy
 Paragraph **23** – Ensuring the Vitality of Town Centres
 Paragraphs **56** and **61** – Requiring Good Design
 Paragraph **69** – Promoting Healthy Communities
 Paragraphs **126** and **131** – Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

6.2 Development Management DPD

DM1 – Town Centre Development
DM2 – Retail Frontages
DM5 – The Evening and Night-Time Economy
DM16 – Small Business Generation
DM31 – Development affecting Conservation Areas
DM35 – Key design principles

6.3 Lancaster District Local Plan

Policy **SC1** – Sustainable Development
 Policy **SC5** – Achieving Quality in Design
 Policy **E1** – Environmental Capital

7.0 Comment and Analysis

7.1 Background to the Proposal

7.1.1 To provide some context to the application, the proposal for the 'principle' of street cafés within the designated pedestrian areas of the town centre has come forward in response to the successful 2012 planning application in the Lancaster pedestrian zone that has helped encourage a number of businesses to run street café operations. This is being taken forward by the Morecambe Area Action Plan (MAAP) that aims to encourage pedestrian movement and improve streets and spaces. This will help to make Morecambe's town centre a vibrant destination for residents and visitors alike. Market and Victoria Streets have recently undergone physical improvements and changes to traffic management. This has been done to re-balance the use of the street to give pedestrians more priority and make a better, safer, less cluttered environment. It is intended that works will start early next year to extend the physical improvements the length of Euston Road up to, and including, the town centre.

7.1.2 At present, businesses seeking to obtain consent for a street café have to go through the planning process and the licensing process independently. It is thought that the need to obtain both permissions is onerous for applicants and deters initiative and applications. This application therefore seeks to streamline the process for businesses with the clear objective to support the local economy and the vitality of the town centre. The application therefore effectively seeks to establish whether the principle of street cafés anywhere in the designated town centre pedestrian zone (as identified within the red edge) is acceptable in planning terms. Businesses wishing to operate a street café would still be subject to a separate licensing application, which would deal with specific matters including hours of use, noise considerations, location, furniture design and form, balustrade details and access provisions. Principally, the Council would ensure (through the licensing process, which would have previously been duplicated through the planning process) that the use of the highway for street cafés would not be prejudicial to traffic and pedestrian movements and would be of an acceptable layout and form.

7.2 Material Planning Considerations

In considering the application, the main planning issues relate to the effect of the development in relation to the viability and vitality of the town centre; specific amenity and highway impacts; and the effect of the development on heritage assets.

7.3 Town Centre Viability

In terms of supporting the viability and vitality of the town centre, the principle of using the designated pedestrian zone for street cafés (subject to the licensing process) seems acceptable in terms of both national and local planning policy. There have been no objections received from statutory consultees and as such there is confidence that streamlining the process for street cafés in the manner proposed is appropriate and will be better managed by the Council as a whole. In this regard, the development will help support local businesses and thus the local economy, and will also seek to enhance the character of the town centre. In particular, the proposal initiates an opportunity to potentially create a more vibrant and active centre.

7.4 Amenity and Highway Impacts

Having identified that the principle of street cafés within the pedestrian zone of the town centre is acceptable in land use planning terms, it is necessary to turn to other matters which would have previously been considered by the Local Planning Authority. In short these include hours of operations, noise restrictions, pedestrian/disabled access, and design and layout of cafe furniture and balustrades. Lancashire Constabulary has commented on the application indicating that there are no hours of use stated on the submitted application. From a land use planning perspective imposing an hours of use restriction on this "in principle" application could be overly restrictive. With sensible management, there may be some cases where later/longer operating hours could support the evening economy and the vibrancy of the town centre. Equally, there may be other cases where shorter operating hours would be necessary. As such, Officers are confident that the matter of hours of use can be effectively and efficiently controlled through the licensing process, which gets reviewed annually. In terms of access, there are approved conditions for the street café licence that ensure pedestrian and vehicle access/movement is not compromised. The same applies to noise considerations. There are conditions within the licence which specify no speakers or playing of music shall be permitted. From a planning point of view, it is not considered necessary to condition matters in relation to hours of use or no amplified music as these can be controlled through the licence. Having a planning condition imposed on this application could conflict with terms agreed under the

licence. The benefit of tackling such matters through the licence rather than a separate planning consent is that the licence is reviewed annually and certain conditions of the licence may change in response to the management of the street café.

7.5 Heritage Assets

7.5.1 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 DM31.

7.5.2 Part of the application site falls within the Morecambe Conservation Area, which is a designated heritage asset. There is also one Listed building within the application area and the immediate vicinity. The main considerations in relation to the impact of the development on the heritage assets relates to how the proposal would affect the setting and character of the Conservation Area and the Listed building, particularly in relation to the layout and design of café furniture and balustrades. It should be noted however that the application does not seek any permanent structures as part of the proposal. Both this planning application and any application subsequently submitted to licensing relates to no fixed structures, with any tables, chairs and balustrades capable of being removed from the highway under the hours agreed by the licence. It is envisaged that the use of the highway for street cafés could enhance the Conservation Area by encouraging people to enjoy the pleasant historic surroundings and by creating a more active and vibrant place.

7.5.3 In terms of the tables, chairs and balustrades being placed on the highway to form the street café, these are moveable structures and as such will not cause any permanent harm to the character and appearance of the Conversation Area or the nearby Listed Building. Notwithstanding this, there are conditions within the licensing process which requires consultation with the Regeneration and Planning Service, in order to ensure there is adequate control in relation to the design of tables, chairs and balustrades, together with the use of materials and colours, and the placement of such furniture on highway land would need to comply with the terms agreed by the licence.

7.5.4 In short, the principle of street cafés within the designated pedestrian zone would preserve the setting of the heritage assets, though has the potential to enhance them. Officers are confident that the conditions of the licence, together with relevant consultation with the Regeneration and Planning Service and published design guidance would ensure an appropriate level of control of development within the Conservation Area.

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 purpose for submitting the application is to help streamline the process for businesses wishing to establish street cafés within the pedestrian zone of the town centre, in order to support the local economy and create a more vibrant town centre. The principle of street cafés within the pedestrian zone can only be viewed a positive step to improving the vitality of the town centre. Matters in relation to layout, design, hours of operation and access are all matters which can be effectively and efficiently controlled under Licensing legislation and as such Officers are confident that the approval of this “in principle” application would not compromise the vitality and viability of the town centre or the significance of the heritage assets (the Conservation Area and adjacent Listed building). Members are therefore advised that the application can be supported.

Recommendation

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

1. Standard 3 year timescale
2. Development relates solely to the land identified within the red edge (in accordance with the approved plans).

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

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

Lancaster City Council has made the recommendation in a positive and proactive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development, working proactively with the applicant to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. The recommendation has been 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 A8	Committee Date 14 November 2016	Application Number 16/01249/LB
Application Site Lancaster Museum Market Street Lancaster Lancashire	Proposal Listed building application for replacement of existing slates, battens and underfelt, replacement of all lead work to roof and clock tower, redecoration of windows, security bars, railings and doors	
Name of Applicant Ms Sarah Price	Name of Agent Mr James Gill	
Decision Target Date 26 November 2016	Reason For Delay N/A	
Case Officer	Mrs Kim Ireland	
Departure	No	
Summary of Recommendation	Approval	

(i) **Procedural Matters**

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

1.0 The Site and its Surroundings

- 1.1 Lancaster City Museum, known to many as the Old Town Hall, is located on the westernmost part of Market Square overlooking the existing public seating area in the city centre of Lancaster. The rear of the Museum is accessed from New Street. The building was constructed between 1781 and 1783 and was further restored in 1873, later being converted from the Old Town Hall to Lancaster Museum in 1923. The building is an elegant Georgian building, two storeys above basement and is constructed in sandstone ashlar with a natural slate roof and a cupola. The principal façade facing east is made up of five bays separated by giant Tuscan columns and has a rusticated ground floor, with round arched windows with glazing bars and a central round arched doorway. A projecting Tuscan portico is raised on four steps which lead to Market Square.
- 1.2 Other than parking for disabled badge holders being available in the Square, the area, along with Market Street and New Street, is designated a pedestrian zone.
- 1.3 Lancaster Museum is a Grade II* Listed Building attached to the Grade II listed Library building to the north. The site is located within the Lancaster Conservation Area.

2.0 The Proposal

- 2.1 The application proposes the replacement of the existing slates, battens and underfelt, replacement of all lead work to roof and clock tower, and redecoration of windows, security bars, railings and doors.

3.0 Site History

3.1 There is a considerable amount of planning history which relates to Lancaster City Museum, most of which seeks Listed Building Consent for minor internal and external alterations. However, none of these has a direct relevance to the proposed works contained within this application. The most recent applications are:

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
14/01319/LB	Listed building application for replacement of rainwater goods	Permitted
14/00603/LB	Listed building application for the display of 2 externally displayed suspended banners to the front elevation	Permitted
14/00600/ADV	Advertisement application for the display of 2 externally displayed suspended banners to the front elevation	Permitted

4.0 Consultation Responses

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

Consultee	Response
Conservation Officer	No objection subject to conditions requiring samples of slates and the hydraulic lime mortar pointing, and colours to be used on the windows, doors, louvres in the cupola, metal railings and metal window security bars. Additional information has been sought regarding the sealants to the window frames, door frames and masonry interfaces, and if the wooden windows are to be repaired prior to being painted.
Historic England	No comments at the time of compiling this report.
Ancient Monuments Society	No comments at the time of compiling this report.
The Council for British Archaeology	No comments at the time of compiling this report.
Georgian Group	No comments at the time of compiling this report.
Society For the Protection of Ancient Buildings	No comments at the time of compiling this report.
The Victorian Society	No comments at the time of compiling this report.
Twentieth Century Society	No comments at the time of compiling this report.

5.0 Principal National and Development Plan Policies

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:

5.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

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

5.2 Development Management DPD

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

5.3 Lancaster District Core Strategy (adopted July 2008)

Policy **SC1** – Sustainable Development

6.0 Comment and Analysis

6.1 The key issue to consider in determining this Listed Building application is whether the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of its impacts upon the historic fabric and architectural merit of the Grade II* Listed Building.

6.2 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 and DM31.

6.3 The existing natural slate roof together with the lead parapet and valley gutter linings, hip and ridge roll cover flashings, stepped abutment flashings and soakers have deteriorated or become damaged overtime. Consequently rainwater ingress has caused damage to the fabric of the building including damage to the walls, ceilings and roof structure as well as some exhibits held within the museum. The works are therefore considered vital for the long term preservation of the building.

6.4 The proposed works will involve completely replacing all of the existing slates and leadwork, salvaging sound existing slates and re-using them on the external perimeter slopes of the building. The existing perished lime mortar joints to the stone copings, gables, parapet walls and chimney stacks will be repointed. The upper storey windows and high level painted elements of the clock tower are to be redecorated including replacing the leadwork. The windows, doors, metal railings and metal window security bars are to be repainted.

6.5 The proposed works will clearly be visible on all elevations and this will of course impact on the appearance of the building as new materials will be replacing original or historic fabric. Paragraph 134 of the NPPF is therefore relevant and states that: *“Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimum viable use.”*

6.6 It is considered that the proposed works will have a less than substantial harm on this Listed building that the works will assist in the long term preservation of the building. It is therefore considered the less than substantial harm is offset by the benefits to the building fabric.

7.0 Planning Obligations

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

8.0 Conclusions

8.1 In conclusion, it is considered that this proposal represents a relatively minor scheme which will have positive benefits for the Listed building. The works will not adversely affect the character of the Listed building, subject to the agreement of specific details to be controlled by condition, and will comply with the requirements of Policy DM30 of the Development Plan Document. Furthermore the scheme has been assessed against paragraph 134 of the NPPF and is considered to be acceptable.

Recommendation

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

1. Standard Listed Building time limit
2. Development to accord to approved plans
3. Sample of the new slates to be submitted
4. Sample of the hydraulic lime mortar pointing to be submitted
5. Colours to be used on the windows, doors, louvres in the cupola, metal railings and metal window security bars to be submitted.

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

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

LANCASTER CITY COUNCIL

APPLICATION NO	DETAILS	DECISION
16/00159/DIS	75 Church Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Discharge of conditions 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19 and 20 on approved application 14/01322/FUL for Mr Zubeir Mister (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Initial Response Sent
16/00162/DIS	Arna Wood Farm East, Arna Wood Lane, Lancaster Discharge of conditions 3 and 7 on approved application 14/00907/FUL for Ms Tamm (Scotforth West Ward 2015 Ward)	Request Completed
16/00165/DIS	Grove Street Depot, Grove Street, Morecambe Discharge of condition 5 on approved application 15/00892/VCN for HB Villages Developments Ltd (Harbour Ward 2015 Ward)	Initial Response Sent
16/00167/DIS	Land Adjacent, Campbell Drive, Lancaster Discharge of condition 8 on approved application 15/00813/FUL for Mr Andrew McMurtrie (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Initial Response Sent
16/00173/DIS	Pleasureland Arcade, Marine Road Central, Morecambe Discharge of conditions 3 and 4 on approved application 16/00638/FUL for Mr Solomon Reader (Poulton Ward 2015 Ward)	Request Completed
16/00439/FUL	Land North Of, Mellishaw Lane, Heaton With Oxcliffe Erection of a gas fuelled generator plant with associated ancillary buildings and a 2.4 metre high security fence and 4 metre high acoustic fence for Mr James Hartley (Westgate Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00446/CU	Castle View Caravan Park, Borwick Road, Capernwray Change of use of land for siting of 12 caravans and retrospective application for engineering works for Mr John McCarthy (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00590/ADV	The Royal Station Hotel, Market Street, Carnforth Advertisement application for the display of 2 projecting externally illuminated signs to front and side, externally illuminated lettering over main entrance and 2 externally illuminated fascia signs for Mr Glen Pearson (Carnforth And Millhead Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00746/OUT	Store Adjacent Broadlands, Sand Lane, Warton Outline application for the demolition of two storage buildings (B8) and erection of one dwelling for Mr Stephen Robert White (Warton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00752/OUT	Land Adjacent To, 8 Anderson Close, Lancaster Outline application for the erection of 1 residential dwelling for University Of Cumbria (John O'Gaunt Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn
16/00757/VCN	Land Adjacent To , 7 Dalesview Crescent, Heysham Erection of 2 semi-detached houses (pursuant to the variation of conditions 2 and 9 on planning permission 13/01140/FUL to	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

alter the landscaping and boundary details including the fencing and hardstanding) for Mr Ian Hemmingway (Heysham South Ward 2015 Ward)

16/00807/LB	Bridge End Cottage, Main Street, Wray Listed building application for the installation of 9 replacement timber windows for Mr K Cheshire (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00819/FUL	5 Coastal Drive, Hest Bank, Lancaster Erection of a first floor front extension and construction of a ground floor bay window to the front for Mr & Mrs Swainson (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00836/VCN	Anems House, Ireby Road, Ireby Change of use and conversion of barns into extension to existing property to form bed and breakfast accommodation (pursuant to the variation of condition 3 and removal of condition 4, 5 and 6 on planning permission 04/00019/CU to convert holidays lets into ancillary accommodation) for Mr William Metcalfe (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00865/FUL	Former Tearoom, 36 Lindeth Road, Silverdale Demolition of tearoom and erection of a 2 storey dwelling and detached garage with associated landscaping and creation of a new vehicular access point for Mr Dominic Kaye (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00868/FUL	16 Brookfield View, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Erection of a 2 storey dwelling with associated landscaping, widening the existing access point and Relevant Demolition of side extension for Mr Adrian Morrocco (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00913/FUL	Escowbeck Farm, Quernmore Road, Caton Demolition of existing steel/block agricultural buildings and re development of site to provide 5 residential dwellings, including conversion and extension of existing barn and outbuilding (to form 3 dwellings) and erection of 2 new dwellings with associated access for MG & G Parker (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00920/FUL	Holmere Hall, Dykes Lane, Yealand Conyers Change of use of roofspace within office building to 2-bed flat for office manager and gardener, construction of dormer extensions to the south and west elevations, construction of a roof terrace to the west elevation and erection of a timber storage shed for Mr R. Green (Warton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/00935/FUL	Meadowfield Bungalow, Middleton Road, Heysham Demolition of existing bungalow and outbuildings and erection of a bungalow with detached garage and associated landscaping for Mr Shadrack Nelson (Heysham South Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
16/00957/FUL	Riverside Garage, Aldrens Lane, Lancaster Change of use of garage (B2) to car wash and valeting (Sui Generis) and installation of a roller shutter to the side elevation for Mr Amir Khan Sadat (Skerton East Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

16/00959/PLDC	Saddle Farm, Kit Brow Lane, Ellel Proposed lawful development certificate for the siting of a log cabin for Mrs Fiona Bowery (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
16/00989/OUT	Woodside, Ashton Road, Ashton With Stodday Outline application for the erection of 1 residential dwelling for Mr Blackwell (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
16/00992/FUL	127 Main Road, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Demolition of existing conservatory and garage, erection of single storey rear extension and erection of detached garage for Mr & Mrs J. Edwards (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01010/PLDC	4 Sulby Grove, Morecambe, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the demolition of the existing detached and erection of an outbuilding for Mrs Marianne Simpson (Bare Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
16/01012/FUL	Wrampool House, Gulf Lane, Cockerham Demolition of existing two storey dwelling and erection of a replacement two storey dwelling for Mr J. Bradshaw (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01016/FUL	Stables, Out Moss Lane, Morecambe Erection of an agricultural storage building for Mr Robert Taylor (Westgate Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
16/01021/FUL	30A - 32 Victoria Street, Morecambe, Lancashire Alterations and installation of a replacement shop front for Kieron Bassett Financial Services (Poulton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01023/LB	1 And 2 Old Hall Cottages, Kellet Road, Over Kellet Listed building application for alterations to the window openings to the rear elevation and new opening from the dining room into the utility room for Mr A Skirrow (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01027/HS	Avocado Reserch Chemicals Limited (Thermofisher Scientific), Shore Road, Heysham Hazardous substance application for the storage of various hazardous materials for Avocado Reserch Chemicals Limited (Thermofisher Scientific) (Heysham South Ward 2015 Ward)	Deemed Consent
16/01028/ADV	30A - 32 Victoria Street, Morecambe, Lancashire Advertisement application for the display of an externally illuminated fascia sign and a non-illuminated hanging sign for Kieron Bassett Financial Services (Poulton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01032/CU	365A Lancaster Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Change of use of first floor office (B1) into flat (C3) for Mrs Margaret Fort (Torrisholme Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01033/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 1 on planning permission 16/00659/VCN to substitute the approved drawings for house plot 4 and 5) for Mr Michael Stainton (Scotforth West Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

16/01036/FUL	14 Church Park, Overton, Morecambe Erection of a single storey rear extension and erection of a car port to the side elevation for Mr & Mrs S. Dakin (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01038/FUL	NTG Papermill Limited, 15 Lansil Way, Lancaster Construction of a raised platform to the rear and erection of an electrical and transformer house, substation and gas kiosk for Mr Alessandro Dinucci (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01048/FUL	30 Emesgate Lane, Silverdale, Carnforth Demolition of existing garage and erection of a detached garage for Mr John Burrows (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01050/PLDC	37 Woodrush, Morecambe, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr Andrew Stedman (Bare Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
16/01052/ADV	91 King Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Advertisement application for the display of an externally illuminated fascia sign and an externally illuminated projecting sign for Mr Wuyi He (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01053/FUL	Westfield Farm, Kellet Lane, Nether Kellet Erection of a hay and straw agricultural storage building for Mr A Riley (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01058/PLDC	11 Heysham Mossgate Road, Heysham, Morecambe Proposed lawful development certificate for the demolition of existing detached garage and erection of a detached outbuilding for Mr Wayne Gallagher (Heysham South Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
16/01061/FUL	Lunesdale, Laithbutts Lane, Nether Kellet Erection of a replacement porch/garden room to the front for Mr Carl Westworth (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01064/FUL	Rose Cottage, 119 Main Street, Warton Erection of a two storey rear extension for Mr Simon Watton (Warton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01066/FUL	School House, Lodge Lane, Wennington Erection of a single storey side extension for Mrs Sophie Ridsdale (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01067/FUL	6 Buckingham Place, Morecambe, Lancashire Demolition of garage and erection of two detached garages for James Cunningham (Harbour Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01076/CU	23 Princes Crescent, Morecambe, Lancashire Change of use from off-licence (A1) to micropub (A4) for Mr V McCann (Bare Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01077/ELDC	Chipping House, Chipping Lane, Bay Horse Existing Lawful Development Application for the continual use of land to the north of Chipping House as garden and domestic curtilage for Mr B Morris (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
16/01085/FUL	The Co-Operative, Middleton Way, Heysham Retrospective application for the installation of an ATM machine to the	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

north elevation for Mr Steve Varty (Heysham South Ward 2015 Ward)

16/01087/FUL	19 Daisy Bank, Quernmore Road, Quernmore Erection of single storey side and rear extension for Mr & Mrs Lingard (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01095/LB	Lancaster Girls Grammar School, Regent Street, Lancaster Listed building application for replacement of existing asphalt roof covering and replacement of 3 double glazed lantern roof windows. for Mr Tim Lynas (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01098/PLDC	19 South Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a single storey side extension for Mr C. Nardone (Bare Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
16/01101/FUL	Lindale, 35 Chapel Lane, Overton Erection of single storey extensions to the southern and western elevations, construction of a dormer to the northern elevation and installation of a raised replacement roof to provide additional first floor living accommodation. for Mr & Mrs Capocci (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01102/FUL	31 Emesgate Lane, Silverdale, Carnforth Erection of a replacement detached garage for Mr Justin Rickards (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01104/PLDC	19 Westover Road, Warton, Carnforth Proposed lawful development certificate for the demolition of existing conservatory and erection of a single storey rear extension for Ms H Marlow Stephenson (Warton Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
16/01105/FUL	Conder View, Corricks Lane, Conder Green Demolition of existing garage and storage buildings and erection of a replacement garage and storage building for Mr R Cornick (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01108/FUL	21 Spring Bank, Silverdale, Carnforth Erection of a single storey side extension to existing garage for Mr & Mrs Anthony Robinson (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01109/PLDC	15 Marsh Crescent, Morecambe, Lancashire Proposed Lawful Development certificate for the construction of a dormer extension to the side for Mr Andrew Woodcock (Torrisholme Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
16/01110/PLDC	7 Hale Carr Lane, Heysham, Morecambe Proposed lawful development certificate for the demolition of existing garage and erection of a single storey side extension for Mr J. Thornton (Heysham Central Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01111/FUL	18 Sunnyfield Avenue, Morecambe, Lancashire Demolition of existing porch and erection of single storey side and rear extensions for Mr J. Parker (Bare Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01112/PLDC	18 Sunnyfield Avenue, Morecambe, Lancashire Proposed Lawful Development certificate for the erection of single storey side and rear extensions for Mr J. Parker (Bare Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

16/01113/FUL	Elm Grove Nursery, Lancaster Road, Caton Erection of a single storey extension to the front elevation, construction of two side elevation dormers and construction of raised patio with canopy. for Mr Paul Kershaw (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01117/FUL	12 Kendal Drive, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of a side conservatory for Mr James Sharples (Torrisholme Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
16/01120/FUL	Undercroft, Chipping Lane, Bay Horse Erection of a front conservatory for Mr Giles Worthington (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01121/FUL	Booth Hall, Bay Horse Road, Quernmore Creation of an earth banked slurry lagoon for Mr Neil Kidd (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn
16/01129/FUL	National Probation Service, 39 - 41 West Road, Lancaster Construction of access ramp to the front elevation for Mr Jim Barrett (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01132/AD	Middle Highfield, Aughton Road, Aughton Agricultural determination for an access track for Mr A Norris (Halton-with-Aughton Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Not Required
16/01133/FUL	Middle Highfield, Aughton Road, Aughton Retrospective application for retention of hard standing for Mr A Norris (Halton-with-Aughton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
16/01135/FUL	7 Washington Close, Lancaster, Lancashire Part demolition of existing rear porch and erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr A. Ljaz (Marsh Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01141/PLDC	14 Hatlex Lane, Hest Bank, Lancaster Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a single storey side extension for Mr Stephen Bethell (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
16/01148/FUL	36 Sefton Drive, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a first floor rear extension for Mrs Pat Bell (Skerton West Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01149/LB	91 King Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Listed Building application for the fixing of an externally illuminated fascia sign and an externally illuminated projecting sign for Mr Wuyi He (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01152/PLDC	28 Milking Stile Lane, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the demolition of existing rear conservatory and erection of single storey rear extension. for Mr Ian Robinson (Marsh Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
16/01153/PLDC	12 Ascot Gardens, Slyne, Lancaster Proposed Lawful Development Certificate for the construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation for Mr & Mrs M. Beckett (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

16/01154/FUL	19 Greenwood Crescent, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Demolition of the detached garage and erection of single storey side and rear extension for Mr M Feather (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01167/ADV	Moor Park, Quernmore Road/Campbell Drive, Lancaster Advertisement application for the display of two non-illuminated freestanding signs for Mr Andrew McMurtrie (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01168/PAD	Kidds Transport And Storage, Caton Road, Lancaster Prior approval for the demolition of industrial building/warehouse for Mr A Wilson (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Not Required
16/01172/ADV	10 Penny Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Advertisement application for the display of an externally illuminated fascia sign and a non-illuminated hanging sign for Mr P Mansell (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01175/PLDC	106 Aberdeen Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed Lawful Development Certificate for the construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation for Mrs T Horak (John O'Gaunt Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
16/01177/FUL	Tudor Grange, Hornby Road, Wray Erection of a first floor front extension for Mr Harry Lea (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
16/01184/FUL	3 Gleneagles Drive, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr & Mrs Bowskill (John O'Gaunt Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01187/FUL	48 The Roods, Warton, Carnforth Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of a single storey rear extension and construction of raised decking for Mr & Mrs Jones (Warton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01193/FUL	111 Twemlow Parade, Heysham, Morecambe Erection of a detached garage for Mr Stephen Howard (Heysham Central Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01196/FUL	7 Peacock Crescent, Hest Bank, Lancaster Erection of a replacement front porch for Mr K Owen (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01208/NMA	Heysham Nature Reserve, Moneyclose Lane, Heysham Non material amendment to planning permission 15/01213/FUL to reduce size of modular building and internal alterations for EDF Energy (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01216/FUL	267 Heysham Road, Heysham, Morecambe Erection of a porch to the front for Mr Stuart Gallagher (Heysham Central Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
16/01232/FUL	Flat 1, 96 Sandylands Promenade, Heysham Creation of a new vehicular access and associated dropped kerb for Mrs Susan Rodgers (Heysham North Ward 2015 Ward)	Permitted Development

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

16/01243/NMA

Fanny House Farm, Oxcliffe Road, Heaton With Oxcliffe Non material amendment to planning permission 15/00243/FUL for the addition of four small extensions to the constructed access track for Ms Nicola Waters (Heysham South Ward 2015 Ward)

Application Permitted