



**Committee:** PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS REGULATORY COMMITTEE

**Date:** MONDAY, 29 APRIL 2019

**Venue:** MORECAMBE 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 1 April, 2019 (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	<b>A5 19/00163/FUL</b>	<b>Lancaster University Sports Centre, Bigforth Drive, Bailrigg</b>  Erection of a front and side extension to existing sports centre and alteration to land levels.	<b>University and Scotforth Rural Ward</b>	<b>(Pages 1 - 8)</b>
6	<b>A6 18/00380/FUL</b>	<b>The Corner House, Woodwell Lane, Silverdale</b>  Demolition of existing property and outbuilding, erection of replacement detached dwelling, alteration to vehicular access and associated landscaping.	<b>Silverdale Ward</b>	<b>(Pages 9 - 15)</b>
7	<b>A7 19/00083/FUL</b>	<b>Marsh House Farm, Crag Bank Lane, Carnforth</b> Erection of an agricultural workers dwelling and associated installation of a package treatment plant.	<b>Carnforth and Millhead Ward</b>	<b>(Pages 16 - 22)</b>
8	<b>A8 19/00277/FUL</b>	<b>31 Dutton Drive, Lancaster</b>  Erection of a single storey extension to the rear.	<b>Bulk Ward</b>	<b>(Pages 23 - 25)</b>
9	<b>A9 19/00349/ADV</b>	<b>Land East Of Golden Lion, Moor Lane, Lancaster</b>  Advertisement application for the display of a hoarding sign on existing fence comprising of 27 panels.	<b>Bulk Ward</b>	<b>(Pages 26 - 30)</b>

## **10 Delegated Planning List (Pages 31 - 39)**

### **ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS**

#### **(i) Membership**

Councillors Carla Brayshaw (Chairman), Helen Helme (Vice-Chairman), June Ashworth, Jon Barry, Stuart Bateson, Alan Biddulph, Eileen Blamire, Dave Brookes, Abbott Bryning, Ian Clift, Mel Guilding, Jane Parkinson, Jean Parr, Robert Redfern and Sylvia Rogerson

#### **(ii) Substitute Membership**

Councillors Claire Cozler, Tim Hamilton-Cox, Andrew Kay, Geoff Knight, Susan Sykes and Malcolm Thomas

#### **(iii) Queries regarding this Agenda**

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

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

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

KIERAN KEANE,  
CHIEF EXECUTIVE,  
TOWN HALL,  
DALTON SQUARE,  
LANCASTER, LA1 1PJ

Published on Monday 15<sup>th</sup> April, 2019.

Agenda Item	Committee Date	Application Number
A5	29 April 2019	19/00163/FUL
<b>Application Site</b>  Lancaster University Sports Centre Bigforth Drive Bailrigg Lancaster	<b>Proposal</b>  Erection of a front and side extension to existing sports centre and alteration to land levels	
<b>Name of Applicant</b>  Mr David Griffiths	<b>Name of Agent</b>  Mr Tim Casselden	
<b>Decision Target Date</b>  31 May 2019	<b>Reason For Delay</b>  None	
<b>Case Officer</b>	Mr Andrew Clement	
<b>Departure</b>	None	
<b>Summary of Recommendation</b>	Approval	

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

- 1.1 Lancaster University lies approximately 3 miles south of Lancaster City Centre between Bailrigg and Galgate on moderately raised land between the A6 Scotforth Road and the M6 Motorway. The site that forms the subject of this application is the Lancaster University Sports Centre, located to the east of the main access to the University campus, between the rugby fields to the west and Lake Carter to the east. The new Sports Centre was constructed through permission 08/00246/FUL on a site formerly occupied by the playing field pavilion, a fisheries building and a car park, and has recently been extended through permission 18/00803/VCN. The Sports Centre is surrounded by mature woodlands to the north and east, with more recent planting to the south, whilst the west is more open with playing fields, namely rugby pitches. The site occupies a prominent position at the entrance to the Campus off the A6 Scotforth Road. The application site is within an open space allocation for outdoor sports facilities as part of a designated Urban Green Space and Key Urban Landscape.

## **2.0 The Proposal**

- 2.1 The application seeks consent to erect a front and side extension to the existing Sports Centre to provide a new sports hall, with associated plant, storage area, external access and landscaping. The proposed development has a footprint of 1,810sq.m, which represents an approximately 40% increase to existing building footprint. The sports hall is to measure a maximum of 15.95 metre tall, with the sports hall measuring 37.8 metre long and 43.7 metres wide, in addition to a subservient link extension development between the proposed sports hall and existing sports centre, measuring 10 metres wide by 15.7 metres deep with a parapet roof up to 5.6 metres tall. This development would create a significant extension to the existing Sport Centre, to be finished predominately in black and off-black cladding, with smaller elements of anthracite colour cladding and pewter splitfaced concrete facing blockwork. The large elevations of cladding to the proposed sports hall is to be broken horizontally by a band of LED strip lighting around the front and side elevations approximately halfway up the proposed extension.
- 2.2 To facilitate the proposed development, 100 trees are to be removed from the north of the existing Sports Centre building to accommodate the footprint of the sports hall. Significant alterations to

levels are required to develop on the currently sloping site and accommodate the widening of the existing private access road to provide a layby for a fire vehicle. Also within the development area are external stairwells, bicycle storage facilities and a surface water drainage cellular storage tank to control discharge rates to a drainage pipe.

## 3.0 Site History

- 3.1 Notwithstanding the many applications that relate to the wider University Campus as a whole, the most relevant planning history in relation to this application is listed below.

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
08/00246/FUL	Erection of new sports centre comprising 25m swimming pool, 8 court sports hall, health and fitness facilities, squash courts and climbing wall	Permitted
12/00253/FUL	Creation of an overflow car park for sports centre development with associated landscaping	Permitted
18/00803/VCN	Erection of a projecting first floor extension to existing sports centre with plant room at roof level (pursuant to the variation of conditions and 3, 4 and 6 on planning permission 18/00102/FUL to vary the approved plans)	Permitted
18/01352/PRETWO & 18/01538/PREMTG	- Erection of an extension to existing Sports Centre to provide a new sports hall with plant and storage area, and associated access and landscaping	Advice Provided

## 4.0 Consultation Responses

- 4.1 The following responses have been received from statutory and non-statutory consultees (though the re-consultation following the submission of amended details expires on 23 April):

Consultee	Response
<b>Environmental Health</b>	No observation received to date.
<b>Natural England</b>	No observation received to date.
<b>County Highways</b>	<b>No objection</b> to original proposal subject to implementation of mitigation measures within the submitted Travel Assessment.
<b>Tree Officer</b>	<b>Objection.</b> The location and volume of trees proposed to be felled has significant potential to adversely impact upon the character and appearance of the site and that of the wider public domain.
<b>Lead Local Flood Authority</b>	<b>No objection</b> in principle. However, the LLFA requires further details to ensure the proposed drainage strategy is sufficient for the development.
<b>Sport England</b>	<b>No objection</b> to original proposal.

## 5.0 Neighbour Representations

- 5.1 No observation received to date. Any comments received prior to planning committee will be verbally reported.

## 6.0 Principal National and Development Plan Policies

- 6.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2018

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 11). The following sections of the NPPF are relevant to the determination of this proposal:

Paragraphs 8 and 11 – Sustainable Development  
 Section 8 – Promoting healthy communities  
 Section 12 – Requiring Good Design

Section 14 – Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change

Section 15 – Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Section 16 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

## 6.2 Development Management DPD

DM12: Leisure Facilities & Attractions

DM20: Enhancing Accessibility and Transport Linkages

DM21: Walking & Cycling

DM22: Vehicle Parking Provision

DM26: Open Space, Sports & Recreation Facilities

DM27: Protection & Enhancement of Biodiversity

DM29: Protection of Trees, Hedgerows & Woodland

DM33: Development affecting Non-Designated Heritage Assets or their Settings

DM35: Key Design Principles

DM37: Air Quality Management and Pollution

DM38: Development & Flood Risk

DM39: Surface Water Run-Off & Sustainable Drainage

DM48: Community Infrastructure

DM49: Local Services

Appendix B: Car Parking Standards

## 6.3 Lancaster District Core Strategy Saved Policies (adopted July 2008)

ER1 – Higher and Further Education

SC5 – Achieving Quality in Design

SC8 – Recreation and Open Space

## 6.4 Lancaster District Local Plan Saved Policies (adopted 2004)

E29 – Urban Greenspaces

E31 – Key Urban Landscapes

R1 – Outdoor Playing Space

R12 – Lancaster University

## 6.5 Local Planning Policy Overview – Current Position

On 15 May 2018, and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended), Lancaster City Council submitted the following documents to the Secretary of State (Planning Inspectorate) for examination:

- (i) The Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD; and,
- (ii) (A Review of) The Development Management DPD

The Examination Hearing Sessions commenced on 9 April 2019

The **Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD** will replace the remaining policies of the Lancaster District Core Strategy (2008) and the residual ‘saved’ land allocation policies from the 2004 District Local Plan.

The **Review of the Development Management DPD** updates the policies that are contained within the current document, which was adopted in December 2014. As it is part of the development plan the current document is already material in terms of decision-making.

Given the current stage of both DPDs, it is considered that significant weight can be attributed to the policies contained therein where no significant objection to them has been raised.

## 7.0 Comment and Analysis

### 7.1 The proposal raises the following key considerations:

- Principle of the development and employment opportunities;

- Design, scale and landscape impact upon the setting of non-designated heritage assets;
- Impact on trees and ecology;
- Sports pitch provision;
- Highways and parking; and
- Drainage, flooding and air quality.

### 7.2 Principle of the development and employment opportunities

7.2.1 The application proposes to increase the internal usable floorspace of the existing Sports Centre by constructing a new sports hall as an extension to the existing facility linked by a subservient foyer and multifunctional sports room. The proposal will directly connect to a rowing store within the existing Sports Centre. Access will be provided into the existing building in addition to a new external access via the proposed foyer. 1,810sq.m of floor area would be created for the aforementioned sporting uses and ancillary storage space at ground floor level, with an addition 50sq.m externally accessible storage space within the undercroft of the proposed sports hall and 200sq.m of first floor level ancillary plant room space. This represents a significant increase to the existing Sports Centre, which will enhance the offer available at this sporting facility, to the benefit of members and casual users of this local service and sports provision, whilst improving the student and staff offer at the university, both of which weigh strongly in favour of the proposal. A new sports hall in addition to the existing facilities within the Sports Centre will allow for a greater range and degree of sports and activities to be undertaken concurrently, providing a broader service offer throughout the year and particularly during university sporting occasions and events. Being able to attract and retain staff and students is key for the university and enhancing its sports provision assists in this regard, though the benefits of the proposal also extend to the wider, non-university community. Given the established use in this area and the social and economic benefits the proposal would bring, it is considered that the proposed scheme is acceptable in principle, and contributes positively to the policy requirements of policies DM12, DM26, DM49 and NPPF Section 8.

7.2.2 The application form states there will be no permanent, long-term Sports Centre employment generated by the proposal, though the construction of an extension of this scale will generate significant short-term employment and economic benefits to the local area. This application has met the threshold for requiring production of an Employment and Skills Plan (ESP). The ESP will need to detail how opportunities for, access to and up-skilling local people through the construction phase of the development proposal will be provided. Development Management policy DM48 (Community Infrastructure) establishes the requirement and is supported by an ESP Supplementary Planning Document. As such, a pre-commencement condition will need to be applied to any consent granted to deliver the ESP.

### 7.3 Design, scale and landscape impact upon the setting of non-designated heritage assets

7.3.1 The proposed extension is large in scale, and despite the maximum roof height being slightly lower than that of the existing Sports Centre, due to its forward projection it will partially dominate the existing building. Whereas the existing Sports Centre is sited atop of a grassed slope, the proposed extension projects beyond and over this, giving an impression of cantilevering albeit with the inclusion of pre-cast concrete column supports. The siting and orientation has been discussed at length through a pre-application process and during this current application, and the submitted Design and Access Statement details the consideration of alternatives. These discussions were an attempt to prevent the proposed extension appearing as a separate building albeit linked by a small foyer. However, from most viewpoints the proposed extension and the existing building will appear as one structure with a coherent and consistent design approach. Conditions are proposed to ensure that the materials, including their colours and finishes, marry the existing with the proposed so the design solution is not undermined.

7.3.2 Although the siting and orientation of the development may not create the appearance of a continuous frontage of one succinct building (projecting forwards 8.8m from the existing building), the benefits of the proposed design are that it creates a visual break from the massing of the existing Sports Hall. From the west perspective, the proposed extension would appear taller than the existing Sports Centre, despite having a lower overall height. However, given that the Sports Centre has a much longer western frontage length, it is considered that the proposed extension would still appear subservient to this.

- 7.3.3 The university campus is within a designated Key Urban Landscape, whilst the western side of the campus, including the application site, is also within the designated Urban Green Space. This latter policy makes exceptions for extensions and education facilities, both of which apply to this proposal, whilst the former permits development that preserves the open nature and appearance of the area and surroundings. An extension to the existing Sports Centre building would preserve the appearance of the area, as despite the scale of the development, this would be seen in context of the existing built form, and is relatively modest in relation to the surrounding playing fields and open space.
- 7.3.4 The proposed sports hall extension is to be finished predominantly in black and off-black cladding with hidden joints, with elements of similar cladding in anthracite grey colour to the subservient foyer and multifunction sports room element and the first floor plant room sited to the rear elevation of the development. Two barns retained on site and pre-dating the university use by over 100 years are present on the first OS map and considered to be non-designated heritage assets. One in particular is in close proximity to the Sports Centre and proposed extension, just 25 metres north east of the existing building, although sited at a slightly higher topography to the Sports Centre. The proposed development is just under 22 metres from the barn, and given the height of the development and particularly the removal of a significant number of trees within the setting of the barn, the proposal will certainly impact upon the setting of this non-designated heritage asset. However, given the significant changes to the site and setting of this barn over the long duration of the university use of the site, the existing setting is far removed from the historic setting of this former agricultural barn, and this existing setting does not contribute positively to this non-designated heritage asset. The barn is in close proximity to the existing Sports Centre, bowling green and associated access roads and parking facilities, and in this setting the scale of harm of the current proposal would be relatively modest and less than substantial. However, this harm should still be outweighed by public benefits of the proposal.
- 7.3.5 To the undercroft, concrete columns and concrete facing brickwork is proposed. The existing Sports Centre forms a large and dramatic structure of contemporary design and materials, occupying a prominent position although still well integrated into the landscape. Existing mature trees screen the Sports Centre, although this screening is to be partially reduced through this proposal to facilitate the extension. The proposed development is to be finished in similar contemporary materials, and these external finishes and horizontal LED element are considered to be positive solution to subtly breaking the appearance of the proposed large elevations without introducing a much greater variety of materials to the existing Sports Centre, which already present a range of materials, colours and finishes.
- 7.3.6 Given the sympathetic materials and the existing design of the strong and positive statement building towards the entrance to the University campus, the proposed extension is considered to be congruent to the existing built form. Due to its forward projection and scale of attachment to the existing building, the extension will appear distinct from existing, though to ensure it does not dominant the existing building its finishes should be matt, as gloss or satin to such large elevations could detract from the proposed extended Sports Centre. The proposed design is considered to be acceptable in the setting of the University, subject to the matte external wall finishes, and is compatible with policy DM33, DM35 and NPPF Section 12 and 16.
- 7.4 Impact on trees and ecology
- 7.4.1 To the north of the existing Sports Centre is a sitka spruce plantation and several native trees, which are visible from the wider public domain and make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the frontage of the university site, in addition to opportunities for a potential range of wildlife communities. The footprint of the proposed development and changes to land levels are within a significant portion of this aforementioned plantation and trees, and to facilitate the proposal 100 trees would need to be removed from this location. Only one of these trees is to be removed through poor condition, whilst the 96 Category B trees and 3 Category C trees would otherwise remain in situ if this development does not progress. The removal of so many high profile and semi-mature trees from one area will have potential to adversely impact the character and appearance of the area, whilst their removal could also increase the risk of failure of those intended to be retained to the north of the proposed development. Due to the location and volume of trees proposed to be felled to facilitate the proposed Sports Centre extension, the Tree Officer has objected to the application.



- 7.4.2 The existing tree plantation makes a positive impact upon the site, and helps to integrate the Sports Centre into the landscape. The loss of this plantation and the native trees would be unfortunate and must be justified through the proposal. Although other locations for the extension have not been explored in depth as part of the Design and Access Statement, this is likely to be due to the obvious constraints around the Sports Centre. To the east is an access road, established woodland and Lake Carter, whilst to the south is the main car parking facilities and vehicular access to the Sports Centre. This elevation is also partially glazed to allow natural light into the swimming pool area. Whilst land to the west is open, this slopes down significantly to designated outdoor sports playing pitch provision, which should be retained. Therefore the only location that could accommodate an extension is to the north of the existing Sports Centre.
- 7.4.3 The scale of impact upon the existing plantation, particularly in the short term, would weigh against the proposal, though when considering the planning application as a whole the public benefits of the scheme significantly outweigh this one drawback. The short term impact of felling a large quantity of mature trees cannot be mitigated, though in the long term the retained treescape to the north can be enriched with additional planting of semi-mature trees. Furthermore these new trees can include more diverse and native species than those being lost. This should be controlled through a planning condition for the hard and soft landscaping scheme for the site to at least partially mitigate the short and long term impact upon of the felling of existing mature trees.
- 7.4.4 A preliminary ecology appraisal has been submitted as part of this application, detailing that protected species and ecology does not provide a constraint to development, subject to mitigation measures and avoided nesting and hibernation periods of species. Therefore, subject to the implementation in accordance with the mitigation measures within this report, the proposal is considered to have an acceptable impact upon ecology, consistent with policy DM27 and Section 15 of the NPPF.
- 7.5 Sports pitch provision
- 7.5.1 The proposed development is within a designated open space for outdoors sports provision, adjacent to two full sized rugby pitches. An open space assessment was submitted with this application, detailing that a 5 metres exclusion zone around these sports pitches would be retained, whilst the proposal would enhance the sports provision at the site, albeit with internal pitches rather than outdoor provision. The proposal would result in no loss of sporting provision, despite the built form extending into the existing open area, as the proposed development affects only land incapable of forming part of a playing pitch due to topography and existing vegetation. The development and associated hardstanding is actually over 15 metres from the edge of the sports pitch, and alongside the in-goal area where players are less likely to leave the extents of the pitch during a match. Sport England have raised no objection to the proposal, and the application is considered to improve the indoor sports and recreation offer at the university in a location that has no detrimental impact upon the usage of the existing open space. The proposal is considered to comply with policy DM26 and NPPF Section 8.
- 7.6 Highways and parking
- 7.6.1 The application proposes an increased floorspace for the Sports Centre use, but no additional parking provision forms part of this application. Beyond the dedicated car parking area approved through the original 08/00246/FUL consent for short term 2 hours parking only, the coach parking lane immediately to the east of the Sports Centre along an access road now displays signage on lampposts for ticket and display parking. The submitted Travel Assessment details this coach parking lane is used by sport centre staff when no coaches are expected. Furthermore, additional overflow parking beyond the nearby barn at the end of the access road has been granted planning permission through 12/00253/FUL. This area of overflow parking area can be used for 2 hours of free parking or with staff parking permits until 6pm weekdays. Given the location of the car park in the north west corner of the campus near the Sports Centre, vehicles parked here are more likely to be users of this sporting facility rather than staff within the wider site. However, the existing parking within and around the existing Sports Centre in addition to the floorspace through the proposal would fall well below the maximum of 1 car parking space per 22sqm of gross floor area, as stipulated in Appendix B of the Development Management DPD for the existing and proposed use.
- 7.6.2 The submitted Travel Assessment details that the majority of Sports Centre members are either staff or students, with only 13% of membership attributed to the non-university community. Although there

may be additional non-membership use of the facilities, given the high levels of student and staff membership, most of these Sports Centres users are likely to visit the site as part of a combined trip to the wider campus. Furthermore, those driving to the campus may benefit from parking passes elsewhere within the site, particularly as over two thirds of Sports Centres members are members of staff at the University. The proposed sports hall use has a maximum occupancy of 20 to 32 people at any one time, depending on the sport being played. Given the proposed use of the development, existing parking provision adjacent to the centre and within the wider site, regular bus services immediately outside the Sports Centre and separation of Sports Centre from any external neighbouring residential uses, the proposed development is considered to have no severe impact upon the public highway or parking provision. The County Highways consultee returned no adverse comment, although they would wish to see the inclusion of bus departure information displayed within the Sports Centre. This forms part of the mitigation measures within the submitted Travel Assessment, in addition to provision of additional bicycle parking provision, the implementation of which should be controlled through planning condition. Subject to this, the proposal is considered to be acceptable with regards to parking and highway impacts, compatible with policy DM22.

### **7.7**      Drainage, flooding and air quality

- 7.7.1      The proposed extension is located on an existing sloping lawned area and tree plantation, offering a good degree of rainwater permeability and interception. The proposed extension will have an impermeable roof so to compensate a drainage solution, comprising a cellular storage tank to restrict flow to a drainage outfall along the north of an established wooded area to the east and towards Lake Carter, is proposed. From the areas of hardstanding to the north and east of the building, water is captured into filter drains, reducing the runoff rate back into the ground. As for foul drainage, it is proposed to connect to the existing mains sewer.
- 7.7.2      The Lead Local Flood Authority has returned a consultation response confirming that the proposed SuDS and other drainage matters are acceptable in principle, though further information is required to demonstrate that this system is achievable and sufficient to accommodate surface runoff through the proposed development. This information has been received and sent through to the Lead Local Flood Authority consultee for further comment. Subject to the proposed details satisfying this consultee, either through the currently received information and/or to be agreed through planning condition prior to implementation, the proposed development is considered to have an acceptable impact with regarding to flooding and drainage, compatible with policy DM38, DM39 and NPPF Section 14.
- 7.7.3      An Air Quality Assessment has been submitted with this application due to the scale of the proposal in addition to the proximity to Air Quality Management Areas. The overall operational air quality impacts of the development are considered to be not significant, and can be satisfactorily mitigated through the measures stipulated within the submitted assessment, which is compliant with policy DM37.

### **8.0**      Planning Obligations

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

### **9.0**      Conclusions

- 9.1      The proposed extension to the existing Sports Centre will improve the local service offer at the University site, to the benefit of those directly using this facility in addition to positive dispersive impacts upon the wider community. Although the massing may appear a little disjointed, given the existing Sports Centre's built form and sympathetic materials, the proposed extension will appear congruent to the existing building. The removal of a large amount of semi-mature trees cannot be satisfactorily mitigated in itself, nor the less than substantial impact upon the adjacent non-designated heritage asset, particularly in the short term. However, in the long term, growth of additional tree planting can go some way to replace the existing plantation trees and associated potential wildlife communities through additional native tree planting. On balance, the detraction of tree felling and associated impacts to facilitate the development is considered to be significantly outweighed by the social and economic benefits of expanding upon the university's existing sports offer through the proposed sports hall extension. The retained access and parking arrangements will have an acceptable cumulative highway safety impact subject the implementing the mitigation measures within the submitted Travel Assessment. Although the final reports on surface water

drainage are still awaiting final response from the relevant consultee, the surface water drainage arrangements can be resolved in due course in consultation with the Lead Local Flood Authority. Other matters can be satisfactorily mitigated through the implementation of the recommendations within the reports received prior to determination. The application is therefore recommended for approval.

### **Recommendation**

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

1. Standard three year timescale
2. In accordance with amended plans
3. Employment and Skills Plan
4. Development carried out in accordance Preliminary Ecological Appraisal mitigation measures
5. Surface drainage details
6. Soft and hard landscaping scheme, including significant tree planting
7. Development carried out in accordance Arboriculture Implications Assessment mitigation measures
8. Development carried out in accordance Environmental Sound Survey mitigation measures
9. Development carried out in accordance with Air Quality Assessment mitigation measures
10. Development carried out in accordance Travel Assessment mitigation measures
11. Details of covered and secure cycle storage facilities
12. Matt finish to cladding

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

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

### **Background Papers**

None

Agenda Item	Committee Date	Application Number
A6	29 April 2019	18/00380/FUL
<b>Application Site</b>  The Corner House Woodwell Lane Silverdale Carnforth	<b>Proposal</b>  Demolition of existing property and outbuilding, erection of replacement detached dwelling, alteration to vehicular access and associated landscaping	
<b>Name of Applicant</b>  Mrs Adele Higham	<b>Name of Agent</b>  Michael Harrison	
<b>Decision Target Date</b>  12 July 2018	<b>Reason For Delay</b>  Ongoing negotiations to seek an improved design	
<b>Case Officer</b>	Mrs Petra Williams	
<b>Departure</b>	No	
<b>Summary of Recommendation</b>	Refusal	

- (i) This form of development would normally be dealt with under the Scheme of Delegation. However, a request has been made by Cllr Goodrich for the application to be reported to the Planning Committee for the proposal's design and scale to be considered by Members.

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

- 1.1 The application relates to an existing dwelling and associated domestic curtilage. The two storey property occupies a rectangular corner plot on the junction of Lindeth Road and Woodwell Lane in Silverdale. The existing 3-bed property dates from the early 1900s and comprises pitched roofs and gables with a detached pitched roof garage. The dwelling is set well back from Lindeth Road in a relatively elevated position as land levels increase across the site in a generally west to east direction. The substantial front garden is overgrown and it is understood that a number of large trees were removed from the front of the plot during 2016 and this allows views of the property from Lindeth Road.
- 1.2 There are a range of property types within Silverdale and this is evident along Lindeth Road where there is a mix of traditional terraced dwellings, large detached houses and more modest bungalows. Nevertheless the built form is softened and screened by the significant tree planting along this road. Woodwell Lane is a pleasant, leafy thoroughfare which offers a route to Bottoms Wood, Scout Wood and Wood Well and provides connectivity to Stankelt Road the north and Hollins Lane to the east.
- 1.3 The site is located within the Arnside and Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and a Public Right of Way (FP 8) runs along Woodwell Lane to the south of the site. A Tree Preservation Order (TPO 589(2016)) affects part of the site close to the western boundary as well as the grass verge which abuts the southern boundary.

## **2.0 The Proposal**

- 2.1 The application proposes the demolition of the existing house and garage and the erection of a replacement dwelling which will incorporate five bedrooms and an attached garage. The submission also includes minor alterations to the vehicular access in order to increase its width and associated landscaping within the site.

### 3.0 Site History

3.1 There is no associated planning history.

### 4.0 Consultation Responses

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

Consultee	Response
<b>Arnside and Silverdale AONB</b>	<b>Comments raise concerns</b> - The current property is of a scale and design appropriate to the character of the local area. The proposed dwelling is of a much larger scale and massing, of a modern and urban design with extensive fenestration, is not in keeping with the local character of Silverdale village. The new development will be highly visible and its scale and design will be intrusive and have an adverse impact on the visual amenity of this predominantly rural area. The massing of the new development will be highly visible from Woodwell Lane and the PRoW. The proposed development does not contribute positively to the conservation and enhancement of the AONB, does not contribute positively to the landscape and character of the area and will be detrimental to the visual amenity of this part of Silverdale. In addition to the proposed 5 bed dwelling is not reflecting local needs.
<b>Tree Officer</b>	<b>No objections</b> – subject to conditions to ensure that the development is carried out in accordance with the submitted Arboricultural Implications Assessment and that a planting scheme is submitted prior to commencement.
<b>Parish Council</b>	<b>Neither objects nor supports</b> but highlights the following concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential impact of the scale and in particular, the height of the proposal. Suggests that the LPA gives careful consideration to this aspect especially as the site occupies a position at the gateway to the particularly sensitive landscape and public amenity area of Woodwell Lane and Woodwell, which are owned by Silverdale Parish Council.</li> <li>• There are trees within verges adjacent to the site which are protected by a TPO.</li> <li>• The Parish Council owns the land between the highway Woodwell Lane and the boundary of Corner House, a strip of land approximately two metres in width, and the current driveway is allowed with Parish Council permission. Any building work will undoubtedly result in damage to the land with heavy vehicles crossing it.</li> </ul>

### 5.0 Neighbour Representations

5.1 3 items of public comments have been received in respect of this submission. 2 of the comments are from the same person who firstly queries the differences in height between the existing and proposed dwellings. The second letter raises objections due to concerns regarding the potential visual impacts of the scale and height of the proposal when viewed from the south along Woodwell Lane. The third item of comment raises the point that part of the access to between the property and Woodwell Lane is not owned by the applicant and is Parish Council land. Also points out that there may be possible damage to this land caused by contractor's vehicles.

### 6.0 Principal National and Development Plan Policies

6.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Paragraph 48 – Weight of emerging plan

Paragraph 77 – Rural housing

Section 11 – Making effective use of land

Paragraphs 124 and 127 – Achieving well-designed places

Paragraph 170 and 172 – Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty

Paragraphs 170, 172, 175 and 176 – Protecting and enhancing biodiversity

6.2 Local Planning Policy Overview – Current Position

At the 20 December 2017 meeting of its Full Council, the local authority resolved to publish the following 2 Development Plan Documents (DPD) for submission to the Planning Inspectorate:

- (i) The Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD; and,
- (ii) A Review of the Development Management DPD.

The Examination Hearing Sessions commenced on 9 April 2019

The **Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD** will replace the remaining policies of the Lancaster District Core Strategy (2008) and the residual 'saved' land allocation policies from the 2004 District Local Plan.

The **Review of the Development Management DPD** updates the policies that are contained within the current document, which was adopted in December 2014. As it is part of the development plan the current document is already material in terms of decision-making.

Given the current stage of both DPDs, it is considered that significant weight can be attributed to the policies contained therein where no significant objection to them has been raised.

## 6.3 Development Management DPD (adopted December 2014)

DM27 – The protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity  
DM28 – Development and Landscape Impacts  
DM29 – Protection of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland  
DM35 – Key Design Principles  
DM39 – Surface Water Run-off and Sustainable Drainage  
DM41 – New Residential dwellings  
DM42 – Managing Rural Housing Growth

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

SC1 – Sustainable Development  
SC5 – Achieving Quality in Design

## 6.5 Lancaster District Local Plan – saved policies (adopted 2004)

E3 – Development Affecting Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty  
E4 – Countryside Area

## 6.6 Arnsdale & Silverdale AONB Development Plan Document (adopted 2019)

AS01 – Development Strategy  
AS02 – Landscape  
AS03 – Housing Provision  
AS04 – Natural Environment  
AS08 – Design  
AS12 – Water quality, sewerage and sustainable drainage

## **7.0 Comment and Analysis**

- 7.1
  - Principle of development
  - Scale, siting and design and impact on the character of the area
  - Impact on residential amenity
  - Trees, landscaping and ecology
  - Drainage

## 7.2 Principle of development

- 7.2.1 Silverdale is identified within policy DM42 of the Development Management DPD as a sustainable rural settlement. Given the established use of the site and the residential character of the area it is considered that the principle of a residential development is acceptable. Policy AS03 of the recently adopted Arnsdale and Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) DPD, states that within

the AONB, the size and types of all homes provided should closely reflect identified local needs in accordance with current AONB housing needs evidence at the time of the application. Policy AS01 discusses the Development Strategy for the AONB and this too requires development to closely reflect identified local needs within the AONB. In this regard the scale of the proposal raises issues. The submission proposes a large 5-bed dwelling. However, the housing need within Silverdale, as identified in the Housing Needs Survey Report for the AONB (September 2014) is for one to three bedroomed homes rather than five bedroomed properties. Policy AS03 sets out that proposals will be expected to demonstrate that densities make best and efficient use of land and reflect local settlement character. It is considered that the site in question could effectively be redeveloped with two smaller residential units which in turn would make a valuable contribution to affordable housing within the AONB. AS03 also advises that it is inappropriate to use those sites that are suitable for development in the AONB to deliver development that does not help to meet local affordable or other local needs.

7.2.2 While the principle of a residential development on this site is acceptable it is considered that the scale and density of the proposal fails to accord with the provisions of policy AS03 of the Arnside and Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) DPD.

## 7.3 Scale, design and landscape impact upon the AONB

7.3.1 Key design principles are set out within policy DM35 of the DPD which advises that new development should contribute positively to the identity and character of the area through good design, having regard to local distinctiveness, materials and scale. Policy DM28 of the DPD affords protection to protected landscapes. The site is located within an AONB, which is afforded the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty, as highlighted in paragraph 172 of the NPPF which states *“Great weight should be given to conserving and enhancing landscape and scenic beauty in ... Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, which have the highest status of protection in relation to these issues.”*

7.3.2 The Arnside and Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) DPD also sets out a number of policies which are relevant to the consideration of this application. The test in policy AS01 is whether the application is consistent with the primary purpose of the AONB, closely reflects identified local needs within the AONB, and conserves and enhances the local landscape and settlement character. Policy AS02 requires development proposals to demonstrate how they will conserve and enhance the landscape and natural beauty of the area. Policy AS08 contains detailed guidance on a number of design characteristics. The reasoned justification of this policy describes the broad significances of the existing vernacular styles and settlement characteristics in Silverdale. This policy is not referenced at all by the applicant's planning statement.

7.3.3 The proposed replacement dwelling is of a significantly larger scale in terms of footprint as well as being 1.8 metres higher than the current building. It will also be set further forward within the site which is considered to increase the visual impacts from Lindeth Road and would be a dominant feature within Woodwell Lane. The development includes a particularly large attached building to provide two double garages (which could accommodate 6 vehicles) which serves to exacerbate the scale of the proposed building. Although plans have been amended during the course of the application in order to provide a revised dormer design to the Lindeth Road elevation, concerns remain regarding the design, scale and appearance of the new dwelling as it appears very eclectic as if it was a house which has undergone numerous unsympathetic extensions.

7.3.4 The submitted Planning Statement states that the design approach is a contemporary one which has been dictated by the applicant's requirements. Internally the new dwelling would provide five bedrooms, one of which would be at ground floor and it is understood that this would provide accommodation for an elderly relative. A study is to be incorporated within the roofspace/second floor and this would be served by the dormer fronting Lindeth Road. The majority of the window openings are within the southern and western elevations in order to maximize light into the property. While this is understandable, it is considered that the Lindeth Road elevation is dominated by glazing and is not typical of what would be expected for a principle frontage. The extensive glazing is one of the concerns raised by the AONB consultee. When viewed from Woodwell Lane the ground floor protrusion to the western elevation would appear as an incongruous addition due to the cat-slide roof and balcony. Notwithstanding the large plot size, the footprint appears excessive and the mix of roof forms which include the dormer is overly complicated. Although the proposed materials, which comprise natural slate, natural stone, white render and grey powder coated aluminium

windows and doors are acceptable, this does not mitigate the serious concerns regarding scale and design which is considered to result in harm to the character and appearance of the wider street scene and the visual amenity of the area.

7.3.5 Overall, it is considered that this proposal fails to adequately take account of the requirements of the Arnside and Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) DPD in addition to policies DM28 and DM35 of the Development Management DPD, saved policy E3 of the Local Plan and paragraph 172 of the NPPF.

### 7.4 Impact on residential amenity

7.4.1 The siting of the development ensures that there would be adequate separation distance from all external elevations of the proposed dwellinghouse to neighbouring houses. Windows within the northern elevation of the property are limited to three at first floor, one of which will serve a bathroom and therefore could be obscure glazed. The remaining two windows would serve a bedroom which would face the garden of no.41b to the north but due to intervening planting in the neighbouring plot it is considered that this would not raise issues of overlooking. The proposed balcony within the front (Lindeth Road) elevation would have an external floor area of 4 metres by 3.4 metres and this clearly has the potential for overlooking and the perception of being overlooked by the occupants of no.41a to the north. However, the indicative section drawing indicates a privacy screen and therefore notwithstanding the design concerns regarding the balcony, this could be conditioned to be installed and retained.

### 7.5 Trees, landscaping and ecology

7.5.1 Policy DM29 supports the protection of trees which contribute positively to the visual amenity of the area and supports opportunities for the planting of new trees. Policy AS04 of the Arnside and Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) DPD contains guidance on trees, including replacement trees. The submission includes an Arboricultural Implications Assessment which identifies two individual trees (T1 & T2) and three groups of trees (G1 – G3) in addition to a single hedge (H1) in relation to the proposed development. The trees identified can be clearly seen from the wider public domain and are entirely in keeping with the character and appearance of the locality. On the whole the identified trees are established at sufficient distances from the proposed development so as not to be implicated. There is a requirement for hand dig techniques to be employed where an encroachment into the root protection area (RPA) of trees within G1 occurs. This is taken into account within the submitted Arboricultural Implications Assessment and considered acceptable.

7.5.2 The submitted plans indicate new planting and this would significantly improve the overall cover of trees within the site. A detailed planting scheme which specifies the types of trees and includes a 10 year maintenance regime and commitment to replace any tree that should fail to establish would need to be conditioned should consent for the development be granted.

7.5.3 The AONB consultee is concerned that the proposed patio/terrace and steps will lead to a significant loss of open green space within the plot. However, it is considered that the plot is of a sufficient size to accommodate this as well as new planting which is proposed and, as highlighted above, this offers a potential enhancement to the site.

7.5.4 As highlighted within the consultee responses, access into the site is across land within the ownership of the Parish Council and the access entrance will be widened slightly as part of the scheme. Notice has been served by the applicant in this regard. The Parish Council has requested that measures are put in place prior to the commencement of any works to ensure protection of the trees and verges. This is a key consideration as these trees are protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). The submitted Arboricultural Implications Assessment includes a Tree Constraints Plan which makes provision for tree protection fencing which has been considered by the Tree Officer and found to be acceptable.

7.5.5 Policy DM27 considers the safeguarding of protected species from development proposals and this approach is echoed within the provisions of policy AS04 of the Arnside and Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) DPD. The proposal seeks to demolish the existing dwelling and as highlighted above there are protected trees close to the site boundary in addition to woodland within 100 metres of the site and as such the habitat around the site offers a high potential for



foraging for bats. Although the application has been supported by an Arboricultural Implications Assessment, no ecological information has been provided in respect of bats and in particular the presence or absence of roosting bats within the building. Consequently, the application does not adequately demonstrate the extent to which this protected species may or may not be affected and the full impacts of the proposal understood prior to determination in order to comply with the duties under the Habitats Regulations. The proposal therefore fails to accord with the provisions of policy DM27 of the Development Management DPD and policy AS04 of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) DPD.

### 7.6 Drainage

- 7.6.1 Policy AS12 of the Arnside and Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) DPD highlights problems relating to the lack of mains sewerage systems. This is particularly prominent in Silverdale where no properties are connected to mains sewers. As there is no public sewerage infrastructure in Silverdale, the application proposes that the development is served by a septic tank (which is understood to be the existing arrangement). These works would need to be approved under the Building Regulations during the course of the development. However, a sequential approach to foul drainage, discounting of preferable options such as package treatment plant does not appear to have taken place. The details of the foul and surface water drainage of the proposal are basic at present, and the scale of the development will place increased demand on the foul drainage system. However, the precise details could be satisfactorily controlled through condition.

### 7.8 Other Matters

- 7.8.1 It is noted that Parish Council highlights the importance that no obstruction is caused within the lane (PRoW) and highway adjacent to the site during demolition and construction in order to allow the bus service to continue to operate to timetable and serve the community effectively. However, the granting of planning permission would not give the applicant the right to block the Public Right of Way and would not override the powers held by County Highways and the Police to control such an issue should it arise.

## **8.0 Planning Obligations**

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

## **9.0 Conclusions**

- 9.1 The site is located within the Arnside & Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty where the design and detailing of individual buildings, the form, layout and pattern of villages and hamlets and the settings of many of the buildings are key elements of settlement character. Although the principle of a residential development is acceptable, given the location of the site within the AONB and adjacent to a Public Right of Way, it is considered that due to the design, scale and density of the proposal the development would result in significant adverse impacts on the character and appearance of the area and would not meet the identified local need. Furthermore the submission fails to fully consider what implications the development may have on protected species. For these reasons Members are advised that this application cannot be supported.

## **Recommendation**

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

1. The site occupies a prominent corner plot at the junction of Lindeth Road and Woodwell Lane which is the route of a Public Right of Way and lies within the Arnside and Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty which has the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. Great weight is given to conserving the landscape and scenic beauty within such areas, as confirmed by Paragraph 172 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Due to the scale and incoherent appearance of the proposed replacement dwelling, the development is considered to be of poor design that does not relate well to the surrounding built form or ensure that the character and appearance of the wider protected landscape is conserved or enhanced. Consequently, the proposal is deemed to be contrary to the requirements of saved policy E3 of the Lancaster District Local Plan, policies DM28 and DM35 of the Development Management DPD, policies AS01, AS02, and AS08

of the Arnsdale and Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) DPD and Section 15 of the National Planning Policy.

2. The application proposes the redevelopment of a substantial plot with a large five bedroom dwelling. Policy AS03 of the Arnsdale and Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) DPD, requires the size and types of all homes provided within the AONB to closely reflect identified local needs and requires proposals to demonstrate densities which make best and efficient use of land and reflect local settlement character. The housing need within Silverdale is for one to three bedroomed homes rather than five bedroomed properties and it is considered that the site in question could effectively be redeveloped with two smaller residential units which in turn would make a valuable contribution to affordable housing within the AONB. As such the proposal fails to accord with the provisions of policies AS01 and AS03 of the Arnsdale and Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) DPD and sections 5 and 11 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. The application fails to fully consider how the proposal would impact on bats which are a protected species. Consequently, there is insufficient information to determine the extent to which the protected species may be affected and the full ecological impacts of the proposal understood. As such the application is considered to be contrary to the provisions of policy DM27 of the Development Management DPD and policy AS04 of the Arnsdale and Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) DPD and section 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

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

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

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

### **Background Papers**

None

<b>Agenda Item</b> A7	<b>Committee Date</b> 29 April 2019	<b>Application Number</b> 19/00083/FUL
<b>Application Site</b> Marsh House Farm Crag Bank Lane Carnforth Lancashire	<b>Proposal</b> Erection of an agricultural workers dwelling and associated installation of a package treatment plant	
<b>Name of Applicant</b> Mr E Parker	<b>Name of Agent</b> John Metcalfe	
<b>Decision Target Date</b> 18 March 2019	<b>Reason For Delay</b> Additional information submitted required further consultation	
<b>Case Officer</b>	Clare Bland	
<b>Departure</b>	Yes – inappropriate development in the green belt	
<b>Summary of Recommendation</b>	Approval	

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

- 1.1 The Site extends to 100 sq.m of greenfield land at the north west corner of a field within the demise of a farmstead known as Marsh House Farm. Marsh House Farm is located approximately 400m west of Crag Bank Lane, Carnforth, to the east of the Keer Channel adjacent to Warton Sands, and north of Black Dike. Marsh House Farm extends to approximately 60 acres of predominantly pasture/grazing land and has been owned and operated by the applicant and their immediate family for three generations. The family also actively manages and farms an additional 100 acres of land in the immediately surrounding area, including land at Holgates. Overall, the applicant and his immediate family are responsible for approximately 700 breeding ewes and 20 suckler cattle.
- 1.2 Marsh House Farm includes a complex of various agricultural buildings and a 2 storey, 3 bedroom farmhouse. These buildings are located at the head of the access track leading from Crag Bank Lane. The application Site is located within 10m of the existing cluster of farm buildings, adjacent to the head of the track.
- 1.3 Immediately to the south of the farm buildings is a single storey bungalow. Both the bungalow and the 3 bedroom farmhouse are tied by S106 agreement to occupation by '*a person solely or mainly employed or last employed in the locality in agriculture or in forestry or a dependant of such a person residing with him or her or a widow or widower of such a person*'. The farmhouse is occupied by the applicant, his wife, their two sons and the partner of one of the sons. The second dwelling lies outside the applicant's ownership. It was permitted to be constructed pursuant to planning permission 1/85/0888 to house the applicant's brother and his family, who also worked at the Farm. The S106 agreement was entered into concurrently with the determination of the 1985 application. The applicant's brother has since passed away and the property remains owned and occupied by his widow in accordance with the provisions of the agreement.
- 1.4 In addition to the agricultural operations, the applicant also operates a campsite within the demise of Marsh House Farm, including a number of static caravans, and areas for the siting of touring caravans and the pitching of tents. All of these operations are authorised.

- 1.5 The application Site boundary includes the existing access track from Crag Bank Lane, albeit no works are proposed in this area. The track has been included in the application boundary so as to demonstrate suitable access can be achieved.
- 1.6 The Site is located within, albeit on the outer periphery of, the North Lancashire Green Belt. It is also located within a mineral safeguard area, and a SSSI Impact Risk Zone.
- 1.7 The eastern boundaries of the Morecambe Bay SAC and RAMSAR designations abut the western edge of the Farm demise but the Site does not fall within these designations. This is also the case for the Morecambe Bay and Duddon Estuary Special Protection Area and the Morecambe Bay SSSI.
- 1.8 The access track (which is included within the application Site boundary) falls within EA Flood Zone 3 (SFRA Zone 3a). Although this is the principal route to the proposed lodge no development or engineering works are proposed within this area. The application Site is not susceptible to any other surface water flooding constraints and is susceptible to a less than 25% change of groundwater flooding.

## **2.0 The Proposal**

- 2.1 It is proposed to erect a modest, single storey, 2 bedroom timber lodge in the north western corner of a field immediately opposite the existing farm buildings. The building would extend to 9.86m in length, 6.11m in width, and an overall height above ground of 3.6m. The lodge is classed as a mobile structure and would have no direct connection to utilities, with these being provided by a link to the existing farmhouse, other than foul water which would be directed into the proposed package treatment unit. The lodge would be screened by native species trees and hedgerow, some of which already exists along the north and west boundaries of the site, and some of which is proposed as part of the application.
- 2.2 The field is authorised for the siting of touring caravans and camping, with permission dating back to 1989. The lodge is proposed to be occupied by one of the applicant's sons and his partner, both of whom currently reside in the 3 bedroom farmhouse with the applicant's parents and brother. The intended occupant, Mr Thomas Parker, is a partner in the Marsh House Farm business and is the farm manager, with his parents being semi-retired. In accordance with policy requirements, the application has been supported by evidence to demonstrate why the applicant needs to reside within the immediate vicinity of the Farm and why it is not possible for them to reside within the farm house or in other existing accommodation within the immediate area.
- 2.3 In association with the lodge, it is proposed to install a package treatment unit (a form of sewage treatment which removes the requirement for the lodge to be connected to the main sewer). No parking is proposed as part of the application as there is already sufficient parking within the Farm complex immediately opposite the proposed location of the lodge.
- 2.4 The applicant is aware of planning policies pertaining to agricultural workers accommodation and has confirmed their acceptance of controls to restrict the occupancy of the lodge to an agricultural worker at Marsh House Farm.

## **3.0 Site History**

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
1/85/0888	Outline application for agricultural workers bungalow	Approved with associated S106
1/86/0079	Reserved matters to erect agricultural workers bungalow	Approved
1/90/01324	Retention of use of field for tents and touring caravans	Approved

## **4.0 Consultation Responses**

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

Consultee	Response
Natural England	No objection
Parish Council	No comments received
Fire Safety Officer	No objection raised, recommend advising applicant to comply with building regulations

## **5.0 Neighbour Representations**

- 5.1 There have been no responses received from neighbouring residents.
- 5.2 The application has been advertised as a departure from Green Belt policy. No responses have been received pursuant to this advertisement though the consultation period does not expire until 26<sup>th</sup> April 2019. Any consultation responses that are received following preparation of this report will be verbally reported at the Committee Meeting.

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

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

Paragraphs 7-14 : Achieving Sustainable Development  
 Paragraphs 38, 47-50 & 54-57 : Decision Making  
 Paragraphs 77-79 : Delivering a Sufficient Supply of Homes  
 Paragraph 108 : Promoting Sustainable Transport  
 Paragraph 124 : Achieving Well Designed Places  
 Paragraphs 133 – 147 : Protecting Green Belt Land  
 Paragraph 164 : Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change  
 Paragraphs 170, 175-176 : Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

### **6.2 Local Planning Policy Overview – Current Position**

On 15 May 2018, and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended), Lancaster City Council submitted the following documents to the Secretary of State (Planning Inspectorate) for examination:

- (i) The Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD; and,
- (ii) (A Review of) The Development Management DPD

The Examination Hearing Sessions commenced on 9 April 2019.

The Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD will replace the remaining policies of the Lancaster District Core Strategy (2008) and the residual 'saved' land allocation policies from the 2004 District Local Plan.

The Review of the Development Management DPD updates the policies that are contained within the current document, which was adopted in December 2014. As it is part of the development plan the current document is already material in terms of decision-making.

Given the current stage of both DPDs, it is considered that some weight can be attributed to the policies contained therein where no significant objection to them has been raised.

### **6.3 Lancaster Core Strategy (Saved Policies)**

SC3 – Rural Communities  
 SC4 – Meeting the Districts Housing Requirements

### **6.4 Lancaster District Local Plan (Saved Policies)**

E1 – Green Belts  
 E4 – Countryside Area

### **6.5 Development Management DPD Policies**

DM11 – Development in the Green Belt

DM14 – Caravan Sites, Chalets and Log Cabins  
DM27 – The Protections and Enhancement of Biodiversity  
DM28 – Development and Landscape Impact  
DM29 – Protection of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland  
DM35 – Key Design Principles  
DM36 – Sustainable Design  
DM38 – Development and Flood Risk  
DM40 – Protecting Water Resources and Infrastructure  
DM43 – Accommodation for Agricultural and Forestry Workers  
Appendix C – Criteria for Housing Development for Rural Enterprise Workers

## **7.0 Comment and Analysis**

7.1 The main issues are:

- Development in the Green Belt
- Principle of Residential Development Linked to Agricultural Use
- Impact on Biodiversity
- Flood Risk & Drainage

### Development in the Green Belt

7.2 As set out in paragraph 143 of NPPF, *‘inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances’*.

7.3 The applicant has submitted a Statement to address the very special circumstances that they believe apply to their proposal. Within this Statement they refer to the lodge being a ‘small scale temporary structure within a parcel of land used for touring caravans’ and ‘the proposed lodge is essential for the farm business’. It has been proposed so as to allow the applicant’s son, Thomas Parker, and his partner to live independently of the applicant whilst remaining at the Farm which Thomas Parker principally manages. His responsibilities in respect of animal husbandry require him to be as close as possible to his place of work so as to ensure he is on hand at all times to care for the Farm’s livestock.

7.4 The applicant has investigated various options for accommodation elsewhere within the demise of the farm and off-site, however, all of the existing agricultural buildings at the farm are in use and as such not available for conversion (notwithstanding most would not be suitable for residential conversion); the static caravans located to the south of the complex of farm buildings are privately owned (the land is owned by the applicant and the caravan site is operated by them but the actual caravans are each in private ownership) and none are available for occupation in conjunction with the farm; and there are no other available, affordable, existing properties within close proximity to the Site which could be bought or rented. In light of this, the applicant considered various locations within the Site to locate the lodge and has proposed to site it on the north western corner of the field authorised for the siting or touring caravans and pitching of tents. This location is well related to the existing farm house and farm buildings (from which the lodge would be supplied with utilities/services); it is not a field used for livestock; is in Flood Zone 1; and it is well placed for the occupant to gain unrestricted access to the fields and barns where the livestock are located.

7.5 Paragraph 145 of the NPPF sets out exceptions to where development within the Green Belt should be considered inappropriate. These exceptions include a) buildings for agriculture and forestry, and f) limited affordable housing for local community needs under policies set out in the development plan (including policies for rural exception sites). Although neither are directly related to the application proposals, the general thrust or purpose for excluding these types of development are of a very similar nature to the proposed development. The lodge fulfils a very distinct local housing need insofar as it would be affordable accommodation for an agricultural worker, directly associated with an existing, long established, farm. The proposals would have no greater detrimental impact on the Green Belt than an agricultural building in the same location which could, in theory, be built larger and of a more permanent construction pursuant to agricultural permitted development rights. Although this is not what the applicant is, or has, proposed, it is included only so as to demonstrate that the proposals would have less impact on the Green Belt than other permitted forms of development within the farm complex.

- 7.6 The proposal would not result in an isolated dwelling, divorced from other built form. The lodge is proposed to be sited in the closest suitable location to the existing farm house and complex of farm buildings. Due to the modest scale of the lodge, and the proposed materials (wooden clad walls with composite tile effect roof) it would not be overbearing when viewed from public vantage points or from within the farm. The structure has a significantly lower roofline than the adjacent farm buildings which will dissipate views from the east. The Lancashire Coastal Way runs to the west of the existing farm buildings which effectively screen the proposed location of the lodge from this viewpoint. Similarly, the existing static caravan site screens the location in respect of views from the south, and, although the lodge would be visible from the north, it would be well screened by existing and proposed planting.
- 7.7 In this instance we are considering a small scale lodge which is of a temporary nature insofar as it is akin to a mobile home/chalet structure that has no permanent foundations or services. Should the development be approved a S106 legal agreement would bind the occupation of the lodge to Marsh House Farm and it would be both reasonable and enforceable to require the lodge to be removed from the Site (and the land returned to its current condition) at any point in the future should it no longer be required in conjunction with the agricultural operations at the Farm.
- 7.8 On balance of considerations, although technically inappropriate development pursuant to the criteria set out in NPPF, the proposals are similar in nature and purpose to acceptable exclusions and, as the structure is of a temporary nature, is akin to a mobile home in terms of level of development and permanence, and as controls can be put in place to require the removal of the lodge in the future should it no longer be required, it is not considered that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the Green Belt or the purposes for including the Site within it.

## Principle of Residential Development Linked to Agricultural Use

- 7.9 In accordance with the Council's adopted policy (DM43), the applicant has submitted information to demonstrate the need for essential residential accommodation associated with the agricultural operations at Marsh House Farm.
- 7.10 Marsh House Farm has been owned and operated by the Parker family for 3 generations and is a well-established business. The applicant maintains an active role in the day to day operations of the farm, however, the overall management has now passed to his son, Thomas Parker, for whom the proposed lodge is intended.
- 7.11 In accordance with the advice in Appendix C of the Development Management DPD, the proposed lodge is not considered to be unusually large in relation to the needs of the farm or unusually expensive to construct. It is clearly being proposed to meet a functional need in order to allow Thomas Parker to remain available at the farm for which he has management responsibility with his family. As the proposed occupant already lives at the farm and the lodge is proposed solely to provide private accommodation for him and his partner, they would utilise the existing parking and amenity areas of the existing farmhouse, as well as have the electricity and water services linked to the same.
- 7.12 The proposal meets Policy Test A, demonstrating a functional need, as it is Thomas Parker who has principal responsibility for animal husbandry at the farm. The application was supported by detailed information as to the responsibilities imposed pursuant to the Animal Welfare Act 2006 and welfare requirements imposed by the Welfare of Farmed Animals (England) Regulations 2007, including an indication of the standard labour required for the animals throughout the year. There are 700 breeding ewes (including a small flock of rare breed Herdwick sheep) and a 20 suckler cattle within the management of the farm. Overall these would require a minimum of 3880 man hours which equates to 75 man hours a week, or over 10 man hours a day. A traditional standard farm worker is considered to work approximately 1,900 hours a year. Clearly these hours are not a uniform requirement, with more hours being required during lambing season. Thomas Parker undertakes the majority of the work himself although he is assisted at the busiest times by the applicant and his brother. In light of his position of responsibility for overall management of the farm, it is considered reasonable for the applicant's son to reside at the farm. There are no other dwellings available within the farm complex that could reasonably accommodate the proposed occupant and his partner, providing them with the privacy and personal space ideally required – they have been residing with the applicant, his wife, and their second son in the existing 3 bedroom farm house. There is another property at the farm which was developed in 1986 and was also tied to occupation by persons

involved in the agricultural use of the farm and their family. This property is occupied by the widow of the applicant's brother in accordance with the provisions of the S106 agreement and is therefore not available for occupation by the applicant's son. There are also a number of static caravans at the farm (within the defined campsite), however, these are privately owned units, restricted from permanent residential occupation, and are not available for occupation by the applicant's son. Although there are a small number of properties available for rent and purchase in the surrounding area, those closest to the farm are not considered affordable to the applicant.

- 7.13 The proposal meets Policy Test B, being financially sound. It is a long established family business with the farm demise extending to 60 acres of grassland and the farm business being responsible for a further 100 acres of tenanted grazing land. The applicant owns the land and existing farm buildings, as well as operating the static caravan site and touring caravan and camping site. In addition they are enrolled on the Basic Payment Scheme for the 60 acres within the farm curtilage.
- 7.14 Having regard to the information submitted by the applicant in support of their application and having undertaken a site visit to assess the use of existing buildings at the farm, the proposals appear to soundly address the Council's requirements for providing the lodge as accommodation for the applicant's son in conjunction with his role in the management of the existing agricultural concern.

### Impact on Biodiversity

- 7.15 The Site is located within close proximity to the outer boundary of Morecambe Bay Special Area of Conservation and Ramsar designations, with these abutting the western edge of the farm demise but the Site does not fall within any of these designations. This is also the case for the Morecambe Bay and Duddon Estuary Special Protection Area and the Morecambe Bay Site of Special Scientific Interest.
- 7.16 Due to the limited nature of the works proposed it is not anticipated that they would have any direct or indirect impact on any of the above designations.
- 7.17 The proposals would not require an intensive or intrusive period or method of construction, they will not result in any increase in vehicular or pedestrian activity within the area, and will have a very minor impact on disturbance of the land within the application site boundary during the installation of the proposed plant treatment works and site levelling prior to the siting of the lodge.
- 7.18 The proposals could have a very minor enhancement of on-site biodiversity through the planting of a small native hedge and tree screen around the proposed lodge.
- 7.19 Natural England were consulted on the application and had no objection to the proposals.

### Flood Risk and Drainage

- 7.20 The application includes the installation of a small scale package treatment plant that would process all waste water from the lodge. In the absence of mains drainage this is the preferred method of waste water treatment.
- 7.21 The location of the proposed lodge does not fall within an area at risk of flooding and as such there is no in principle reason to resist the proposals on this basis. The access road to the site does fall within Flood Zone 3a which is defined as having a high probability of flooding and as such it would normally be necessary for the applicant to pass the Exceptions Test for essential infrastructure in such areas. However, as the track is the existing means of access to the farm, as no physical works are being proposed within the defined Flood Zone, and as the proposals are technically relocating the residence of the applicant's son from one building within the Site to another (both of which fall outside Flood Zones 2 and 3), it would be unreasonable to require an Exceptions Test in this instance.

## **8.0 Planning Obligations**

- 8.1 It is recommended that a S106 agreement be entered into to ensure the lodge is only ever occupied by an agricultural worker employed at Marsh House Farm (and their immediate family). Should there come a time when the lodge is no longer required to be occupied in such a manner then it should



be removed from the property and the land reinstated to its former condition (having regard to the fact that the proposed lodge is a temporary structure and located within the Green Belt).

## **9.0 Conclusions**

- 9.1 Having regard to the information that has been submitted with the application, and having undertaken a visual assessment of the use of existing buildings at the Site, the proposals appear to comprise a reasonable scale of essential accommodation for an individual who is actively employed in the long established agricultural operations of Marsh House Farm.
- 9.2 Although located within the Green Belt, the proposals are not considered to cause harm to the openness of the Green Belt or the reasons for including the land therein. The lodge would not be a permanent building, it is well related to the existing complex of farm buildings, and it would not require peripheral works or ancillary development that would affect the Green Belt.
- 9.3 The proposals would not impact, directly or indirectly, on the nearby biological heritage assets. They would not result in any increase of activity, either during the construction or operational stages of the works, which would have an unacceptable impact on the surrounding environment.
- 9.4 On balance of all factors, the proposals are considered acceptable subject to conditions and a S106 legal agreement to control the nature of occupation of the lodge and in respect of its removal from the Site, and subsequent remediation of land, should it no longer be required for its intended purpose.

## **Recommendation**

Subject to the signing and completing of a S106 agreement to restrict occupation of the lodge and for its removal should the need for it cease, that Planning Permission **BE GRANTED** subject to the following conditions:

1. Standard Timescales
2. Development to Accord with Submitted Plans
3. Submission of Materials
4. Submission of Landscaping Details
5. Hours of Construction

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

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

## **Background Papers**

None

Agenda Item	Committee Date	Application Number
A8	29 April 2019	19/00277/FUL
<b>Application Site</b>  31 Dutton Drive Lancaster Lancashire LA1 3FT		<b>Proposal</b>  Erection of a single storey extension to the rear
<b>Name of Applicant</b>  Mrs Beaton		<b>Name of Agent</b>  Mrs Linda Hardicker
<b>Decision Target Date</b>  2 May 2019		<b>Reason For Delay</b>
<b>Case Officer</b>		Mr Sam Robinson
<b>Departure</b>		No
<b>Summary of Recommendation</b>		Approval

(i) **Procedural Matters**

This form of development would normally be dealt with the Scheme of Delegation. However, as the applicant works for Lancaster City Council the application is to be determined by the Planning Committee.

**1.0 The Site and its Surroundings**

- 1.1 31 Dutton Drive is a new build property in Lancaster situated between the old Moor Hospital and the M6. The property comprises brick exterior walls with white uPVC windows throughout under a grey tiled roof. To the front is a driveway and open plan garden whilst to the rear is a larger garden measuring approximately 125m<sup>2</sup> enclosed by 1.8m high timber fencing.
- 1.2 The surrounding area is also populated by new build houses of a similar design and style.

**2.0 The Proposal**

- 2.1 The application seeks planning permission for a single storey rear extension.
- 2.2 The extension measures approximately 3.5m in depth, 5m in width with an eaves height of 2.3m and a maximum height of 3.4m. The extension features a glazed roof with windows and doors on the rear and side (west) elevation finished in white uPVC. The remaining walls will be finished in brick to match the main house.

**3.0 Site History**

- 3.1 The site has no relevant planning history.

**4.0 Consultation Responses**

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

Consultee	Response
Cadent Gas	No objection – Advice note to the applicant

## **5.0 Neighbour Representations**

5.1 No comments received within the statutory consultation period

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

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

Paragraphs 7 to 10 – Achieving Sustainable Development  
 Paragraphs 11 to 14 – The Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development  
 Paragraphs 47 to 50 – Determining Applications  
 Paragraphs 124 to 132 – Achieving Well-Designed Places

### **6.2 Local Planning Policy Overview – Current Position**

On 15 May 2018, and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended), Lancaster City Council submitted the following documents to the Secretary of State (Planning Inspectorate) for examination:

- (i) The Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD; and,
- (ii) (A Review of) The Development Management DPD

The Examination Hearing Sessions commenced on 9 April 2019.

The Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD will replace the remaining policies of the Lancaster District Core Strategy (2008) and the residual ‘saved’ land allocation policies from the 2004 District Local Plan.

The Review of the Development Management DPD updates the policies that are contained within the current document, which was adopted in December 2014. As it is part of the development plan the current document is already material in terms of decision-making.

Given the current stage of both DPDs, it is considered that significant weight can be attributed to the policies contained therein where no significant objection to them has been raised.

### **6.3 Lancaster Core Strategy Policies**

SC1 – Sustainable Development  
 SC5 – Achieving Quality in Design

### **6.4 Development Management DPD Policies**

DM35 – Key Design Principles

## **7.0 Comment and Analysis**

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

- General design
- Impacts upon residential amenity

### **7.2 General Design**

7.2.1 In terms of design, the scale of the extension is relatively modest whilst providing additional living space for the residents. The proposal remains subservient to the main dwelling whilst the matching brick to the exterior walls is considered acceptable and thought to tie in well with existing. The design is typical of a conservatory/orangery and with the proposal located to the rear behind the existing

boundary treatments combined with the limited height, its impact on the wider area will be limited even with the footpath to the east.

7.2.2 Overall, the design is considered unfussy and appropriate to the surrounding area and will not cause any visual harm. The property will still retain an acceptable amount of garden space and as such, the proposal is considered to comply with Policy DM35.

### 7.3 Impacts on Residential Amenity

7.3.1 The proposal includes windows and doors on the rear and side (west) elevations which will overlook the applicant's own garden. The existing 1.8m high fencing will confine views to within the site and consequently no privacy issues are raised as part of the proposal.

7.3.2 The extension will be set in approximately 1m from side (western) boundary, which is shared with 29 Dutton Drive and is the property closest to the proposal (the other side is approximately 3.5m whilst to the rear the distance is 8m). Again, due to the limited 3.5m depth and 2.3m eaves height the impact on the adjacent property is considered to be relatively low. This impact is further mitigated by the existing boundary which will also screen a significant portion of the 2.3m high eastern wall. Due to these factors, the proposal is considered not to have any adverse impacts on the residential amenity for the neighbouring properties.

## 8.0 Planning Obligations

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

## 9.0 Conclusions

9.1 The proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of design and appearance and without any detrimental impacts on residential amenity is recommended for approval.

## Recommendation

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

1. Standard 3 year timescale
2. Development in accordance with plans

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

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

## Background Papers

None

<b>Agenda Item</b> A9	<b>Committee Date</b> 29 April 2019	<b>Application Number</b> 19/00349/ADV
<b>Application Site</b> Land East Of Golden Lion Moor Lane Lancaster Lancashire LA1 1QD	<b>Proposal</b> Advertisement application for the display of a hoarding sign on existing fence comprising of 27 panels	
<b>Name of Applicant</b> Mr Paul Rogers	<b>Name of Agent</b>	
<b>Decision Target Date</b> 22 May 2019	<b>Reason For Delay</b> None	
<b>Case Officer</b>	Mr Andrew Clement	
<b>Departure</b>	None	
<b>Summary of Recommendation</b>	Approval	

## **(i) Procedural Matters**

This form of development would normally be dealt with under the Scheme of Delegation. However, as the application has been submitted by Lancaster City Council, the application must be determined by the Planning and Highways Regulatory Committee.

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

- 1.1 The site is within the Canal Quarter, which under the 2004 Local Plan is allocated for housing, and forms part of the published Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD as a development opportunity site. The site has been identified as a sequentially preferable location to provide for comprehensive regeneration of a central location and significantly improve and re-shape the retail and cultural offer for the wider city centre. The signage is within the setting of a number of non-designated heritage assets and Listed buildings, namely Yates And Jackson Brewery, St Catherine's Court and Dukes Playhouse, all Grade II Listed Buildings, and the non-designated heritage assets street records for Moor Lane, Edward Street and Bulk Street. The site is within the Canal Corridor North character area of the Lancaster Conservation Area. The site is identified as a low-grade environment in the Conservation Area Appraisal, situated between positive frontages and Listed Buildings in the immediate visual context.

## **2.0 The Proposal**

- 2.1 This application seeks advertisement consent for the display of an advert across 27 panels and two elevations of boundary treatment fencing. Each panel measures 2.4 metres tall by 1.2 metres wide, creating a maximum advertisement width of 29.3 metres along Moor Lane to the south, and 3.7 metres wide along Brewery Lane. The hoarding advertisement is proposed to be non-illuminated, and would promote the regeneration of the Canal Quarter area to re-shape the retail and cultural offer for the wider city centre.

### **3.0 Site History**

- 3.1 There is an extensive planning history across the large area of the four sites proposed, the most relevant of which relating to the site and the wider Canal Quarter area is below:

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
18/01485/ADV	Advertisement application for the display of 4 standalone signs within the Canal Quarter development site	Permitted
17/00536/UNAUTD	Installation of razor wire on top of fencing at old Mitchells Brewery site	Permitted Development, no consent required for temporary works
08/00866/OUT	Comprehensive redevelopment comprising a retail led mixed used scheme to include demolition of existing buildings and associated structures, the demolition of all residential dwellings, the closure and alteration of highways, engineering works and construction of new buildings and structures to provide, retail, restaurants, cafes, offices, workshop, rehearsal space and residential accommodation, together with ancillary and associated development including new pedestrian link bridge and entranced pedestrian routes and open spaces, car parking and vehicular access and servicing facilities	Refused following public inquiry
07/00602/OUT	Outline application for the redevelopment of the site to provide a building for retail at ground floor level with offices above and associated car parking	Permitted

### **4.0 Consultation Responses**

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

Consultee	Response
<b>Conservation Section</b>	No observation received to date, consultation period expires on 18 April 2019; comments will be verbally reported
<b>County Highways</b>	<b>No objection</b>
<b>Canal and River Trust</b>	<b>No objection</b>

### **5.0 Neighbour Representations**

- 5.1 No observation received to date, consultation period expires on 18 April 2019; comments will be verbally reported

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

#### **6.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2018**

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 11). The following sections of the NPPF are relevant to the determination of this proposal:

Paragraphs 8 and 11 – Sustainable Development  
 Section 12 – Achieving well-designed places  
 Section 15 – Conserving and enhancing the natural environment  
 Section 16 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

#### **6.2 Development Management DPD**

DM6 – Advertisements

DM31 – Development Affecting Conservation Areas

DM32 – The Setting of Designated Heritage Assets

DM33 – Development affecting Non-Designated Heritage Assets or their Settings

DM35 – Key Design Principles

6.3 Lancaster District Core Strategy Saved Policies (adopted July 2008)

SC5 – Achieving Quality in Design

SPG7 – Advertisements and shop fronts design guide

6.4 Local Planning Policy Overview – Current Position

On 15 May 2018, and in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended), Lancaster City Council submitted the following documents to the Secretary of State (Planning Inspectorate) for examination:

- (i) The Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD; and,
- (ii) (A Review of) The Development Management DPD

The Examination Hearing Sessions commenced on 9 April 2019

The **Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD** will replace the remaining policies of the Lancaster District Core Strategy (2008) and the residual 'saved' land allocation policies from the 2004 District Local Plan.

The **Review of the Development Management DPD** updates the policies that are contained within the current document, which was adopted in December 2014. As it is part of the development plan the current document is already material in terms of decision-making.

Given the current stage of both DPDs, it is considered that significant weight can be attributed to the policies contained therein where no significant objection to them has been raised.

6.5 Other Material Considerations

Listed Building and Conservations Area Act 1990

Section 7 - Restriction on Works Affecting Listed Buildings

Section 17 - Power to Impose Conditions on Grant of Listed Building Consent

Paragraph 72 - General duty as respects Conservation Areas in exercise of planning functions.

Paragraph 73 - Publicity for applications affecting Conservation Areas

Lancaster Conservation Area Appraisal – Canal Corridor North character area

**7.0 Comment and Analysis**

7.1 The key considerations arising from the advertisement proposal are:

- Amenity and impact upon the Conservation Area and setting of heritage assets; and
- Public and highway safety.

7.2 Amenity and Impact upon the Conservation Area and Setting of Heritage Assets

7.2.1 In accordance with the Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act, when considering any application that affects a Listed building, a Conservation Area or their setting, the local planning authority must pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the heritage asset or its setting. This is reiterated by policies DM30, DM31 and DM32. DM31 sets out that new buildings within Conservation Areas will only be permitted where it has been demonstrated that:

- Proposals respect the character of the surrounding built form and its wider setting in terms of design, siting, scale, massing, height and the materials used; and,
- Proposals will not result in the loss or alteration of features which contribute to the special character of the building and area; and,

- Proposed uses are sympathetic and appropriate to the character of the existing building and will not result in any detrimental impact on the visual amenity and wider setting of the Conservation Area.

- 7.2.2 The application site previously contained buildings that have since been demolished, leaving a rather neglected area of hardstanding informally used for parking before this use was prevented. It has since been fenced off with a fence erected to the perimeter of the site. Outline consent was granted to redevelop the site over a decade ago, but this development did not progress. The site is highly visible along Moor Lane, and now has a negative impact upon its surroundings through an imposing white boundary treatment around this area and the wider Mitchells Ltd Brewery site. As existing, the fencing contains modest security signage, in the visual context of highway signage and the advertisements to the adjacent public house. This existing signage is at a much reduced scale than that proposed. Whilst the existing security and highways signage is designed to provide detail and information to be read up close, the advertisements that form the subject of this application are to promote the regeneration of the Canal Quarter area, to re-shape the retail and cultural offer for the wider city centre. The proposed signage would be well positioned as relates to the regeneration of the wider area in which it would be sited. It is of a scale and design to signify the subsequent plans of this strategic site.
- 7.2.3 The site is within the setting of designated heritage assets, including Listed buildings and Lancaster Conservation Area, although its immediate environment is low grade, as acknowledged within the Conservation Area appraisal. This site detracts from these heritage assets in its current guise. Exacerbating this low grade environment is the existing imposing security boundary treatment. This is in a prominent location along Moor Gate, and it is considered that the proposed signage has the potentially to create a less imposing treatment and visual aesthetic in comparison to existing. The scale of signage is significant, and for a longer duration than the two years proposed may be considered excessive, particularly within a Conservation Area and in the setting of Listed Buildings and non-designated heritage assets. However, considering the existing condition of the site and the existing detailing of the boundary treatment, both of which currently detract from the aforementioned heritage assets, the existing harm caused by this neglected site is considered to be similar to that of the short term impact of the proposed signage. No observation has been received from the Conservation consultee to date, and this will be reported verbally at Planning Committee.
- 7.2.4 The proposal is to advertise a large scale regeneration area, and the advertisement is considered to be proportionate to this significant project, despite its substantial scale. Ultimately, it is considered that the regeneration benefits of the wider scheme outweigh the less than substantial harm to the aforementioned heritage assets through this temporary signage, which would be in situ for a period of 2 years.

### 7.3 Public and Highway safety

- 7.3.1 The proposal has raised no objection from County Highways as they consider there to be no impact on the highway. The signage location is along an existing boundary treatment, and will not impede pedestrian movements, thus have no adverse impact upon public safety.

## 8.0 Planning Obligations

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

## 9.0 Conclusion

- 9.1 The temporary and less than substantial harm upon the amenity of the area and heritage assets is considered to be outweighed by benefits of the wider scheme. The signage is considered to be proportionate and well sited to publicise the planned regeneration of the strategic Canal Corridor site. In particular, considering the benefits that any subsequent regeneration would bring to the area and heritage assets, combined with the appearance and condition of the existing site, the proposal has an acceptable impact upon amenity and public safety.

## Recommendation

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

1. Advertisement timescale (2 years)



2. Advertisements to be carried out in accordance to approved plans
3. No advertisement is to be displayed without the permission of the owner of the site
4. No advertisement shall be sited or displayed so as to obscure or hinder various transportation signs or signals
5. Any advertisement displayed, and any site used for the display of advertisements, shall be maintained in a condition that does not impair the visual amenity of the site
6. Any structure or hoarding erected or used principally for the purpose of displaying advertisements shall be maintained in a condition that does not endanger the public
7. Where an advertisement is required under the Regulations to be removed, the site shall be left in a condition that does not endanger the public or impair visual amenity

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

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

### **Background Papers**

None

## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

## LANCASTER CITY COUNCIL

APPLICATION NO	DETAILS	DECISION
18/00177/DIS	Animal Care Sanctuary, Blea Tarn Road, Scotforth Discharge of conditions 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 15 on approved application 17/01452/FUL for Animal Care (Lancaster & Morecambe) (University And Scotforth Rural Ward)	Split Decision
18/00182/DIS	Burrowbeck Grange Nursing Home, Scotforth Road, Lancaster Discharge of conditions 2 and 3 on approved application 18/01374/VCN for -- (Scotforth East Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00188/DIS	Land South Of, Low Road, Halton Discharge of conditions 3 and 8 on approved application 14/01344/OUT for Mr Warren Cadman (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00192/DIS	Luneside East, St Georges Quay, Lancaster Discharge of conditions 6,7,17 and 21 on approved application 16/00574/FUL for Luneside East Ltd (Marsh Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00458/FUL	Hawkshead Farm, 1 The Nook, Bolton Le Sands Erection of a single storey dwelling, alterations to access and creation of a car parking and garden area for D. Jackson, L. Holden, A. Jenner, P.Williams (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00459/LB	Hawkshead Farm, 1 The Nook, Bolton Le Sands Listed building application for the erection of a single storey dwelling and alterations to access for D. Jackson, L. Holden, A. Jenner, P.Williams (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/00752/FUL	Land At, Carnforth Brow, Carnforth Erection of 2 two storey detached dwellings with associated access and drainage for Loxam Riley (Carnforth And Millhead Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn
18/00858/FUL	Valley View Pets Hotel And Wolfwood, Hazelrigg Lane, Ellel Demolition of existing buildings, erection of new buildings comprising of replacement kennels, dog day care building, reception and sales building and stables, construction of a menage and wildlife pond, installation of a replacement package treatment plant and creation of a new vehicular access and car parking for Mr & Mrs Wakelin (University And Scotforth Rural Ward)	Application Permitted
18/01313/CU	Intack Farmhouse, Littledale Road, Brookhouse Change of use of agricultural land for siting of four holiday lodges with associated package treatment plant for Mr And Mrs Hey (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/01387/FUL	73 Croftlands, Warton, Carnforth Erection of a single storey rear extension and construction of front and rear dormer extensions for Mr Tony Sharp (Warton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn

## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

18/01393/FUL	Land Fronting Gotts Foods Westgate Morecambe Lancashire, 76 Westgate, Morecambe Retrospective application for the change of use of a car park used in association with office accommodation (B1) to a car wash (sui generis) and retention of a steel framed canopy, boundary fencing and gates for Mr Kywan Mohameddi (Westgate Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
18/01419/FUL	Hill Farm, Littledale Road, Brookhouse Change of use of barn to two dwellings (C3), demolition of existing modern barns and erection of two new dwellings (C3), creation of passing place and erection of bin store for Mr P Kershaw (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/01487/FUL	Stoney Brook Farm, Stoney Lane, Galgate Change of use of existing building from storage and distribution (B8) to light industrial (B1) for Mr Newhouse (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/01492/FUL	5 Well Lane, Yealand Redmayne, Carnforth Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of a part single part two storey detached dwelling, alteration to land levels, installation of a sewage treatment plant, replacement boundary wall with gates and change of use of agricultural field to domestic garden for Mr F McGee (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/01562/LB	5 First Terrace, Sunderland Point, Morecambe Listed building application for installation of replacement windows and doors and conservation rooflight, replacement of render to rear elevation and chimney stack, removal of 1st floor ceiling, alterations to internal openings and removal and installation of partition walls for Mrs Stephanie Smith (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/01585/FUL	48 Albert Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Change of use of ground floor shop (A1) to a 2-bed maisonette (C3), replacement of shop front with new frontage, installation of a window and door to the side elevation and construction of a boundary wall for Mrs Anna Hainsworth (Harbour Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/01596/REM	Land Adjacent Springfield House, Ball Lane, Caton Reserved matters application for the erection of a dwelling (C3) for Mr John Braithwaite (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/01600/FUL	Network House, Caton Road, Lancaster Erection of fencing and sliding gate, and erection of a bin and generator store for Mr Chris Wade (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/01624/FUL	4 Townley Street, Morecambe, Lancashire Installation of a new door at the second floor for Mr Jerome Wilmann (Poulton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/01625/FUL	Proposed Sculpture, The Shore, Bolton Le Sands Installation of a sculpture with information panel for Morecambe Bay Partnership (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/01630/FUL	Proposed Sculpture, Slack Lane, Thurnham Installation of a sculpture with information panel for Morecambe Bay Partnership (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

18/01640/FUL	Development Land Field 0068, Wagon Road, Dolphinholme Erection of a 2 storey dwelling with associated access and drainage for Mr John Klotz (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/01643/FUL	23 -25 North Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Change of use of retail (A1) to hot food take away (A5) and installation of a flue to the rear and louvres to the side for CityBlock (Gillows) Ltd (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/01644/LB	23 -25 North Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Listed building application for internal alternations consisting of the provision of a new entrance lobby, new stud walls and provision of ventilation ducts, and external works consisting of the provision of louvres, condenser units, provision of service compound and erection of new vents and extraction flue for CityBlock (Gillows) Ltd (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/01647/FUL	Field To The North Of , Cowdber Farm, Roman Road Construction of a menage, erection of boundary fencing and alterations to land levels for Mrs Oversby (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
19/00002/DIS	Far Waterslack, Waterslack Road, Silverdale Discharge of conditions 3 and 4 on approved application 18/00368/FUL for Mr M Holmes (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision
19/00012/DIS	Development Site, Bulk Road, Lancaster Discharge of condition 11 on approved application 17/01413/VCN for . (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision
19/00015/FUL	Former Ridge Lea Hospital, Quernmore Road, Lancaster Construction of a widened highway with footpaths to existing access road for Mr D Mahon (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
19/00018/DIS	Ellenway, Borwick Lane, Borwick Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 18/01212/FUL for Mr & Mrs D. Mosedale and A. Halhead (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00019/DIS	36 North Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Discharge of conditions 3, 4 and 5 on approved application 17/00625/FUL for BayT BayT BayT (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision
19/00026/DIS	14 Levens Way, Silverdale, Carnforth Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 18/01357/FUL for Mrs Elizabeth McGillivray (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00027/DIS	The New Bungalow, Caton Green Road, Caton Green Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 18/01121/FUL for Stephen Brown (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00030/DIS	Heron House, 67 Queen Street, Morecambe Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 19/00006/FUL for Department of Work and Pensions (Poulton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

19/00031/DIS	Land South Of Hala Carr Farm, Bowerham Road, Lancaster Discharge of part of condition 3 and condition 4 on approved application 18/01413/VCN for Mr Chris Middlebrook (Scotforth East Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision
19/00032/FUL	2 Cotton Square, Lancaster, Lancashire Change of use of landscaped area to form part of domestic curtilage and erection of a boundary wall for Mr Iain Myles (Marsh Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
19/00044/DIS	Halls Farm, Scorton Marshaw Road, Over Wyresdale Discharge of condition 4 on approved application 16/00931/CU for Elizabeth Stamford-Davis (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00046/FUL	Sofidel (UK) Limited , Lansil Industrial Estate , Lansil Way Creation of a car parking area, HGV loading bays, a new internal road layout, installation of a new weighbridge, erection of perimeter fencing, access gates and alterations to drainage for Mr Steve Oxley (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00049/FUL	The Keys, Main Road, Slyne Extension to external terrace including construction of steps and pergola and alterations to parking layout for Greene King (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00050/LB	The Keys, Main Road, Slyne Listed building application for works including replacement bar, reconfiguration of internal walls to amend the layout of kitchen and toilets, installation of replacement screens, flooring, doors and fireplace, repairs to render, construction of a pergola and ramped access to the side, repaving and extension to external terrace including construction of steps for Greene King (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00062/LB	Bailrigg House, Lancaster University, North West Drive Listed building application for external repairs to the roof, windows, render, replacement of rooflight, reconfiguration of partition walls and fire escape installation of internal doors and improvements to toilet., kitchen and access facilities for Mr Peter Thompson (University And Scotforth Rural Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00072/FUL	Woodbank, Moneyclose Lane, Heysham Erection of a single storey side and rear extension for Mr & Mrs J. Smith (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
19/00079/ADV	St Leonards House, St Leonards Gate, Lancaster Advertisement application for the display of 4 non-illuminated fascia signs for McGee Esq (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00080/LB	St Leonards House, St Leonards Gate, Lancaster Listed building application for the fitting of 4 non-illuminated fascia signs for McGee Esq (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

19/00082/LB	Outbuilding To The Rear Of , 98 Church Street, Lancaster Listed building application for new door opening and window opening to side elevations, new internal flooring and ceiling, new roof lights, replacement pointing, new timber rafters and slates to roof for Mr & Mrs Dennis (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00084/FUL	20 Hala Grove, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a single storey front, side and rear extension for Mr H Kidd and K Froggatt (Scotforth East Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00095/FUL	20 China Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Change of use of mixed use unit comprising of a shop (A1) office (B1) and cafe (A3) to student accommodation comprising 1 6-bed cluster flat (C3), construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation and installation of rooflights to the front elevation for Mr Abrol (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00098/PAS	Three One Five Health Club, Mannin Way, Lancaster Prior approval for the installation of a Solar PV system on the north and south roof elevations for James Mackinnon (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Granted
19/00102/FUL	The Cottage, Cantsfield Road, Cantsfield Relevant Demolition of part of boundary wall to enable widening of vehicular entrance and extension to driveway for Mr Beardsworth (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00107/FUL	6 Drewton Avenue, Heysham, Morecambe Erection of a single storey side extension and a detached garage and construction of dormer extensions to the front and both side elevations incorporating a balcony to the front for Mr Mariusz Balcer (Heysham Central Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision
19/00113/FUL	Coach House, Crag Road, Warton Change of use of existing garage, boat store and outbuilding to a 2 storey dwelling (C3), erection of a first floor extension with new raised roof above, relocation of existing vehicular access point and parking area. for Mr R Graveson (Warton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
19/00114/FUL	10 Main Road, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Demolition of existing single storey rear extension and erection of a two storey rear extension for Mr & Mrs Chris Malin (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00116/FUL	14 Ashford Close, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a single storey side extension, a two storey rear extension and construction of a raised terrace area to the rear and raising of roof height of existing garage for Mr Jim Currin (Scotforth West Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00117/FUL	2 Lane Head, Kiln Lane, Wray Removal of rear door and installation of replacement window for Mr Neale Perrins (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00118/FUL	Parkfield, Flats 2 & 3, Greaves Road Change of use of two 2-bed flats (C3) into student accommodation comprising one 6-bed cluster maisonette (C4) for Mr W Mayar (Scotforth West Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

19/00119/FUL	Land Adjacent To, Kirkby Lonsdale Road, Halton Retrospective application for the retention of two stables and creation of menage for Mr Daniel McGowan (Halton-with-Aughton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn
19/00121/VCN	Marina Caravan Park, Glasson Dock Road, Glasson Dock Change of use application for caravan site to have an all year round holiday occupancy (pursuant to the variation of condition 4 on planning permission 12/00492/CU to remove the need to keep up to date Council Tax bills for owners/licensees) for Mr Tom Hill (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00123/FUL	Yew Tree Cottage, Kellet Road, Over Kellet Demolition of existing rear conservatory and erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr & Mrs Carling (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn
19/00124/FUL	Woodfield House, Moorside Road, Brookhouse Erection of a two storey dwelling with detached garage, creation of a new access and installation of a package treatment plant for Joyce Nevison (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00126/FUL	8 Wyresdale Gardens, Lancaster, Lancashire Retrospective application for the retention of a detached outbuilding for Mr Stefan Vogt (John O'Gaunt Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
19/00132/FUL	14 The Cliffs, Heysham, Morecambe Erection of a replacement single storey side extension and erection of a single storey side/front extension for Mr & Mrs Alan Lingwood (Heysham Central Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00139/FUL	Marketgate Dental Practice, 1 - 7 Marketgate, Lancaster Installation of a flue for Shimmin and Associates Shimmin (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00140/FUL	1 West View, Glasson Dock, Lancaster Erection of a single storey rear extension and construction of a rear boundary wall for Ms Fletcher (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00142/OUT	Land To The Rear Of 1 And 2 Lea Lane, Heysham, Morecambe Outline application for the erection of one dwelling (C3) with associated access for Ashton Homes Lancashire Ltd (Heysham South Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00143/FUL	72 Sunnybank Road, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Erection of a two storey front extension for Mr & Mrs P. Mason (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00145/FUL	Booths, Hala Road, Lancaster Installation of 2 vehicle charging units and associated equipment in existing car park for Mr Paul Hicks (Scotforth East Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00147/FUL	42 Woodhill Lane, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr Ernie Lavender (Harbour Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

19/00148/PLDC	Quarry House Farm, Quarry Road, Brookhouse Proposed lawful development certificate for installation of 10m high monopole on concrete base, antennas, feeder cables, ductwork, and ancillary equipment for Electricity North West Ltd (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
19/00151/FUL	2 Main Road, Nether Kellet, Carnforth Erection of a two storey side extension, a single storey rear extension and construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation for Mr T Evans (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
19/00153/FUL	Capernwray Hall, Borwick Road, Capernwray Resurfacing of existing hardstanding and erection of steel railings and gates for Mr Jonathan Halsey (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00154/FUL	11 High Road, Halton, Lancaster Construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation for Mr & Mrs M Butterworth (Halton-with-Aughton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00156/FUL	72 Broadway, Morecambe, Lancashire Demolition of existing garage and erection of a single storey side and rear extension for Mr Jordan Lamb (Bare Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00157/PLDC	51 Slyne Road, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Proposed Lawful Development Certificate for the construction of a hip to gable extension and dormer extension to the rear elevation for Mr & Mrs M Preddy (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
19/00159/LB	20 Standen Park House, Lancaster, Lancashire Listed building application for the installation of an external handrail to the front steps for Mrs Barbara Nayar (John O'Gaunt Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00165/FUL	Sunningdale, Holme Lane, Brookhouse Retrospective application for the erection of a 2m fence and change of use of grass verge to domestic garden for Mr & Mrs N Whiley (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
19/00169/FUL	26 Windermere Road, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Construction of a dormer extension to the front and rear elevation, erection of single storey side extension and erection of a single storey side/rear extension adjoining the existing garage for Mr & Mrs Andrew Wilcox (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00174/FUL	Trefan, Westbourne Drive, Lancaster Erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr & Mrs Owens (Marsh Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00177/FUL	Buildings At, White Cross Industrial Estate, South Road Replacement 70 steel windows with powder coated aluminium windows and infill of two existing window openings for Ms Janet Nielsen (Scotforth West Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00179/FUL	4 Woodman Lane, Burrow, Carnforth Erection of a detached garage for Mr & Mrs Dixon and Gibson (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted



## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

19/00184/FUL	3 The Green, Silverdale, Carnforth Erection of a two storey rear extension for Mr Bennett (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00185/LB	3 The Green, Silverdale, Carnforth Listed building application for the erection of a two storey rear extension for Mr Bennett (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00193/FUL	Catshaw Hall Farm, Scorton Marshaw Road, Over Wyresdale Erection of an extension to existing agricultural building and creation of an area of hardstanding for Messers Drinkall (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00194/FUL	6 Brookside Drive, Dolphinhholme, Lancaster Erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr And Mrs Farrell (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00197/FUL	220 Lancaster Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Removal and relocation of existing outbuilding for Mr William Chates (Bare Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00201/FUL	105 Bowerham Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a porch to the side for Mr J Armer (John O'Gaunt Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00205/LB	Marketgate Dental Practice, 1 - 7 Marketgate, Lancaster Listed building consent for the removal of redundant boilers, pipework and flues, and installation of new boiler and flue for Mr Shimmin (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00223/VCN	Springfield, Bay Horse Road, Ellel Change of use of dwellinghouse (C3) to a children's care home (C2) (pursuant to the variation of conditions 2 and 4 to amend the approved plans to allow for conversion of the garage and alter the parking area) for Simon Wright (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00235/FUL	Mole End Barn, Woodman Lane, Burrow Erection of a two storey outbuilding with link extension to main dwelling for Mrs V Tittmuss (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00240/VCN	Sports Complex, University Of Cumbria, Bowerham Road Installation of a replacement roof over existing Sports Centre (pursuant to the variation of condition 2 on planning permission 17/00910/FUL to amend proposed roofing and submit substitute plans) for Mr Andrew Gravett (John O'Gaunt Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00241/FUL	Sandside Garage, Sandside, Cockerham Change of use of an existing storage building (B8) to a dwelling (C3), demolition of existing rear extension and erection of a replacement rear extension, and creation of an access for Mr & Mrs Winchester (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
19/00242/FUL	5 Hala Crescent, Lancaster, Lancashire Demolition of existing lean to and erection of a single storey side and rear extension for Mr & Mrs Braund (Scotforth East Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00259/AD	Ridgeway Park, Lindeth Road, Silverdale Agricultural Determination for the erection of a forestry building for Mr Anthony Stubbs (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Refused

## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

19/00261/FUL	1 Norton Grove, Heysham, Morecambe Erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr A. Jackson (Heysham Central Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00276/FUL	48 Nairn Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of single storey rear extension for Liz Saidi (Marsh Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00303/AD	Gibsons Farm, Bay Horse Road, Quernmore Agricultural determination for erection of a storage building for John And Richard Pye (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Not Required
19/00306/CCC	Bleasdale School, 27 Emesgate Lane, Silverdale County Council Consultation for a single storey extension to front of school to create a wheelchair store, single storey extension to rear of building to create a class base for Lancashire County Council (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Objection
19/00309/CCC	Morecambe Road School, Morecambe Road, Morecambe County Council Consultation for a single storey entrance extension and internal remodelling for Mr Paul Edmondson (Torrisholme Ward 2015 Ward)	No Objections
19/00314/NMA	Land South Of, Low Road, Halton Non material amendment to Reserved Matters consent 17/01423/REM to reduce brickwork on external elevations and replace with render, cladding or stonework for Mr Warren Cadman (Halton-with-Aughton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00328/AD	Ivah Great Hill, Lowgill Lane, Lowgill Agricultural determination for the erection of a forestry building for Mr Stocks (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Refused
19/00338/FUL	1- 3 Poulton Mews, Morecambe, Lancashire Retrospective change of use of ambulance storage garages (B8) to three 3-bed dwellings (C3) with cycle store and associated parking and landscaping for Hillcroft Nursing Homes Ltd (Poulton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn
19/00378/AD	Belmount Farm, Hasty Brow Road, Slyne Agricultural determination for the replacement of existing hardstanding area with concrete hardstanding for Mr Jonathan Hoggarth (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Not Required