



**Committee:** PLANNING REGULATORY COMMITTEE

**Date:** MONDAY, 19 AUGUST 2019

**Venue:** LANCASTER TOWN HALL

**Time:** 10.30 A.M.

## A G E N D A

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

### 1 Apologies for Absence

### 2 Minutes

Minutes of meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2019 (previously circulated).

### 3 Items of Urgent Business authorised by the Chair

### 4 Declarations of Interest

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

Councillors 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, Councillors 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, Councillors 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 <a href="#">19/00567/CCC</a></b>	<b>Imperial Road, Morecambe</b>	<b>Overton Ward</b>	<b>(Pages 1 - 12)</b>
		The development of an energy recovery facility comprising: the erection and operation of an energy from waste building including offices, workshop and visitor/education facilities; air cooled condensers; internal access roads; car, cycle and coach parking; perimeter fencing; electricity sub-stations; weighbridges; weighbridge office; contractors office; water and diesel tanks; lighting; heat offtake pipe; hardstandings; earthworks; landscaping and other ancillary infrastructure		
6	<b>A6 <a href="#">18/00380/FUL</a></b>	<b>The Corner House, Woodwell Lane, Silverdale</b>	<b>Silverdale Ward</b>	<b>(Pages 13 - 21)</b>
		Demolition of existing property and outbuilding, erection of replacement detached dwelling, alteration to vehicular access and associated landscaping		
7	<b>A7 <a href="#">19/00788/FUL</a></b>	<b>Dallas Road Gardens, Dallas Road, Lancaster</b>	<b>Castle Ward</b>	<b>(Pages 22 - 24)</b>
		Erection of a 2.5m wooden peace pole		

- |   |                                 |  |                              |                    |
|---|---------------------------------|--|------------------------------|--------------------|
| 8 | A8 <a href="#">19/00831/FUL</a> | 6 Ingleton Drive, Lancaster  | Scotforth<br>East Ward       | (Pages 25 -<br>27) |
|   |                                 | Erection of a single storey rear extension and creation of a ramp to front garden  |                              |                    |
| 9 | A9 <a href="#">19/00901/FUL</a> | 3 Moorside, Melling, Carnforth   | Upper Lune<br>Valley<br>Ward | (Pages 28 -<br>31) |
|   |                                 | Alterations to windows and doors on front and rear elevations, re-rendering of the front, side and rear elevations and erection of a detached garage |                              |                    |
- 10     **Appointment to Crook O'Lune Advisory Committee (Pages 32 - 34)**
- 11     **Delegated Planning List (Pages 35 - 45)**

## **ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS**

### **(i)        Membership**

Councillors   Sandra Thornberry   (Chair),   Dave Brookes   (Vice-Chair),   Paul Anderton, Richard Austen-Baker,   Mandy Bannon,   Alan Biddulph,   Victoria Boyd-Power, Abbott Bryning,   Keith Budden,   Tim Dant,   Janice Hanson,   Cary Matthews, Michael Mumford, Robert Redfern and Malcolm Thomas

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

Councillors   Kevin Frea,   Jake Goodwin,   Mike Greenall,   Mel Guilding   (Substitute), Tim Hamilton-Cox, Colin Hartley, Joyce Pritchard   and David Whitworth (Substitute)

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

Please contact Democratic Services: telephone (01524) 582656 or email [democracy@lancaster.gov.uk](mailto:democracy@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 Tuesday 6<sup>th</sup> August 2019.

Agenda Item	Committee Date	Application Number
A5	19 August 2019	19/00567/CCC

Application Site	Proposal
Imperial Road Morecambe Lancashire	The development of an energy recovery facility comprising: the erection and operation of an energy from waste building including offices, workshop and visitor/education facilities; air cooled condensers; internal access roads; car, cycle and coach parking; perimeter fencing; electricity sub-stations; weighbridges; weighbridge office; contractors office; water and diesel tanks; lighting; heat offtake pipe; hardstandings; earthworks; landscaping and other ancillary infrastructure

Name of Applicant	Name of Agent
Mr Jon Woodhall	Mr Andrew Russell

Decision Target Date	Reason For Delay
28 May 2019	Awaiting further information

Case Officer	Mrs Eleanor Fawcett
Departure	No
Summary of Recommendation	No objection in principle, subject to conditions.

i) **Procedural Matter**

Lancaster City Council has been consulted in relation to a planning application which has been submitted to the Lancashire County Council as they are the determining Authority for applications relating to the disposal of waste (ref. LCC/2019/0021). Therefore this is not an application which the City Council will determine, but will provide a response as a consultee. As a result, the only consultation that has been undertaken, in order to inform the response, is within this Authority. All other consultations, including neighbouring properties, will be undertaken and considered by the County Council in the consideration and determination of that application.

**1.0 The Site and its Surroundings**

1.1 The site covers an area of approximately 4 hectares of previously developed land (former chemical works) located to the north of the small settlement of Middleton and approximately 1 km to southeast of the edge of Heysham. It is within an allocated employment site, Lancaster West Business Park, and is accessed via Imperial Road, which is unadopted and joins the Lancaster Morecambe Bypass at a roundabout to the north. The site is currently vacant and consists largely of areas of rough grassland, with some groups of trees to the southwest and a raised bund along the eastern boundary which contains some scattered trees and shrubs. There is a drainage pond/lagoon located adjacent to the southern boundary and one adjacent to the northern boundary. The site is located within Flood Zone 1, although Flood Zone 3 abuts the eastern boundary.

1.2 Immediately to the south is Middleton Waste Transfer Station, which is accessed from the same road. Beyond this is further industrial development before the start of the residential area of Middleton; the closest dwelling being about 230 metres from the site. There is one Grade II Listed building, The Old Roof Tree Inn, located on the northern edge of the village. To the east is relatively flat, low lying and undeveloped agricultural land containing some dispersed farm groups and several large wind turbines. Approximately 360 metres to the south east is a farm group, Downy Field Farm, and the two dwellings and a large barn are Grade II Listed. To the immediate north are fields, and beyond the bypass there is a large substation development. There is a further large substation to the north west and large pylons

cross the land to the north in an west/east direction. Between the site and this substation, approximately 400 metres to the north west, is a residential caravan park.

- 1.3 Approximately 30 metres to the west of the site boundary, on the opposite side of the existing access road, is Middleton Marsh Biological Heritage Site (BHS). There are two further BHSs near the site, comprising Middleton Former Refinery Site, around 360 metres to the west, and Heysham Moss approximately 900 metres to the north. The latter lies adjacent to Heysham Moss Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). The site is located approximately 1.5 kilometres from the Lune Estuary SSSI and Morecambe Bay Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Ramsar site. There is also the relatively recently designated Wyre-Lune Marine Conservation Zone at a similar distance from the site.
- 1.4 The nearest Conservation Areas to the site are Overton, approximately 1.5 kilometres to the south east, and Heysham, approximately 2 kilometres to the north. There are no public rights of way in the immediate vicinity of the site, the nearest located around 430 metres to the northwest and 600 metres to the east. The site is located approximately 8 kilometres from the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) and approximately 12 kilometres from the Arnside and Silverdale AONB.

## **2.0 The Proposal**

- 2.1 Planning permission is sought from Lancashire County Council for the erection of an energy from waste facility and associated infrastructure. The principal processes to be carried out at the plant include the receipt, storage and combustion of non-hazardous residual waste and the generation of electricity and heat. The facility would have an installed electricity generating capacity of approximately 34 Megawatts (MW). Approximately 30 MW of electricity would be exported to the local electricity grid with the remainder being used in the operation of the facility. It would also be capable of exporting heat to local heat users, and the application includes a heat offtake link along Imperial Road to facilitate this.
- 2.2 The proposed development would be based around a main building which would contain the waste reception hall, the main thermal treatment process, a turbine hall, ash handling facility, flue gas treatment facility, offices, a workshop, stores and staff welfare facilities. This would measure approximately 140 metres in length, and between 55 and 100 metres in width. The building would be divided into the various process areas with the height of the structure varying depending on the process that it houses. The highest section of the building, towards the eastern end, would house the boiler hall and the flue gas treatment facility. At its highest point, in the boiler hall, the building would be 49.1 metres in height. Connected to the main building would be two 90 metre high emissions stacks and an air cooled condenser. An education/visitor centre and office space would form an integrated element of the main building and would be located on the northern façade.
- 2.3 In addition to the main elements listed above, the scheme also includes a range of ancillary infrastructure including:
  - A two storey maintenance contractors' offices;
  - A weighbridge office and weighbridges;
  - Transformer and sub-station enclosure;
  - Fire water tank and water treatment facility;
  - Vehicle access and internal site circulation roads;
  - Car parking and a cycle store;
  - Silos for consumables;
  - Utilities and services;
  - Lighting and CCTV;
  - Drainage infrastructure; and
  - Security fencing, gates and landscaping.
- 2.4 Once commissioned, the facility would operate on a continuous (24 hour/7-day per week) basis. However, the bulk of deliveries and visits would be made during the normal working day (i.e. 07.00 – 19.00). The submission sets out that it would provide employment for approximately 40-45 people with a peak day-time staffing level of approximately 27, supplemented by shift workers to maintain 24-hour plant operation.

**3.0 Site History**

3.1 The site has a long planning history and was first developed during WWII as a factory for the production of aviation fuel and ammonium nitrate for use in explosives. The use of the site as a chemical works then continued until 1986, mainly for the production of fertilizers. These uses were subject to a certificate of lawful use in 1994. In 1994, planning permission was granted for the construction of a waste water treatment works. In 1996 planning permission was granted for construction of an access road from the A683 Heysham bypass. In 2000 planning permission was granted for the erection of buildings connected with general industrial and storage/distribution uses. It is understood that none of these historical permissions were implemented.

More recently, planning permission was granted by Lancashire County Council in 2005 for the development of a waste technology park comprising mechanical and biological treatment plant, in-vessel green waste composting plant and recyclate handling plant. It is understood that the consent was implemented, albeit only in part, with the construction of the new access south of the A683 and a waste transfer station. The most recent history is listed below.

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
01/07/1416	Variation of conditions 9, 17 and 19 of planning permission 01/05/0254 relating to highways, noise control, landscape and ecology	Approved
01/05/0254	Development of waste technology park, ancillary buildings, landscaping works and modification of existing junction and new access road	Approved

**4.0 Consultation Responses**

4.1 The following responses have been received from internal consultees:

Consultee	Response
<b>Contaminated Land Officer</b>	In agreement with the proposed extensive site investigations. Recommend conditions in relation to the investigation and remediation of contamination.
<b>Air Quality Officer</b>	Initial comments raise a number of queries.
<b>Environmental Health Officer (noise)</b>	With mitigation in place, the submitted assessment satisfactorily demonstrates that there will be no observed effect levels and lowest observed adverse effect level in respect of noise both during the construction and operational phases of the development.

**5.0 Neighbour Representations**

5.1 None. Notifications will be carried out and considered by the County Council.

**6.0 Principal National and Development Plan Policies**

6.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Paragraph 11 – The presumption in favour of sustainable development

Paragraph 80 – Supporting economic growth

Paragraph 108 – Access and transport

Paragraphs 124 and 127 – Achieving well-designed places

Paragraph 148, 153 and 154 – Low carbon and renewable energy

Paragraph 165 – Sustainable drainage systems

Paragraphs 170 – Protecting valued landscapes

Paragraphs 170, 175 and 176 – Protecting and enhancing biodiversity

Paragraph 178 and 179 – Risks from contamination

Paragraph 180 – Impacts from noise

Paragraph 183 – Pollution control regimes

Paragraphs 185, 192, 193-197 – Conserving and enhancing the historic 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 significant weight can be attributed to the policies contained therein subject to the extent to which there are unresolved objections to the relevant policies and their consistency with the National Planning Policy Framework.

## 6.3 Lancaster District Local Plan Saved Policies

EC5 – Allocated employment sites

## 6.4 Lancaster District Core Strategy

SC1 – Sustainable development  
SC5 – Achieving quality in design

## 6.5 Development Management Development Plan Document

DM15 – Proposals involving employment land and premises  
DM17 – Renewable energy generation  
DM20 – Enhancing accessibility and transport linkages  
DM21 – Walking and cycling  
DM22 – Vehicle parking provision  
DM27 – The protection and enhancement of biodiversity  
DM28 – Development and Landscape Impact  
DM29 – Protection of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland  
DM30 – Development affecting Listed buildings  
DM31 – Development affecting Conservation Areas  
DM32 – The setting of designated heritage assets  
DM35 – Key design principles  
DM39 – Surface water run-off and sustainable drainage  
DM48 – Community Infrastructure

## 6.6 Supplementary Planning Documents

Employment and Skills Plan

## 6.7 Emerging Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD

EC1 – Established Employment Areas  
SG15 – Heysham Gateway

## 6.8 Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan

WM2 – Large Scale Built Waste Management Facilities

## 6.9 Other Material Planning Considerations

The Government Review of Waste Policy in England (2011)

National Planning Policy for Waste (October 2014)

Energy from Waste: A guide to the debate' (revised edition February 2014) – Defra

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

## 7.0 Comment and Analysis

7.1 The main issues to be considered as part of this consultation are:

- Principle of the development
- Scale, design and landscape and visual impact
- Impacts on heritage assets
- Impacts on trees (and ecology)
- Impacts on the amenities of neighbouring properties
- Impacts on air quality
- Contamination

### 7.2 Principle of the development

7.2.1 The proposal relates to the erection of a large energy from waste facility to help meet the waste management needs of Lancashire. It is anticipated that the significant majority of the waste managed would be municipal waste. Municipal waste is that waste collected and managed by, or on behalf of, local authorities. A lesser proportion of the waste treated at the facility would be commercial and industrial wastes similar in composition to the municipal waste. Energy from waste involves taking waste and turning it into a useable form of energy and can include electricity, heat and transport fuels (e.g. diesel). This can be done in a range of ways, including incineration. In the case of this proposal, waste would be burned to produce electricity with the capability to export heat to local heat users. The energy generation process is founded upon hot gases from the furnace passing to a boiler which converts the energy from the gases into steam to power a turbine. The submission sets out that this would involve up to 330,000 tonnes of non-hazardous residual waste per year. Residual waste is defined as waste that is left over when all the recycling possible has been done. This generally means the environmental or economic costs of further separating and cleaning the waste are bigger than any potential benefit of doing so. The energy generated from the recently grown materials in the mixture is considered as renewable. Energy from residual waste is therefore considered to be a partially renewable energy source, sometimes referred to as a low carbon energy source.

7.2.2 The site is located within the Lancaster West Business Park which is allocated for employment purposes under both the adopted and emerging Local Plan. This permits for a range of B1, B2 and B8 uses within the estate. Whilst the proposal does not directly fall into one of these specific use-classes there is little doubt that such a proposed use would be better served on an employment site which has good access to the surrounding road network. It is therefore considered that this proposal would be consistent with the land-use in both the adopted and emerging plan.

7.2.3 The submission sets out that the plant would provide employment for approximately 40-45 people with a peak day-time staffing level of approximately 27, supplemented by shift workers to maintain 24-hour plant operation. The majority of the employees would be skilled operatives (electricians/fitters/crane operatives) or technical engineers (control and plant). Temporary employment would also be generated through the construction period with peak construction staff numbers occurring during the plant installation and fit out, requiring around 350 skilled and non-skilled workers. New development can contribute towards providing training and employment opportunities for local residents. In accordance with Policy DM48 and the associated Supplementary Planning Document, this is a development of a scale that would be expected to produce an employment and skills plan to ensure that opportunities are made available for local people. The agent has agreed to this in principle and it would be expected that they liaise with the council's advisors in relation to the precise details of this and how it is delivered.



7.2.4 In terms of the need for this type of development, the National Planning Policy for Waste (NPPW) only expects a market need to be demonstrated where proposals are not consistent with an up to date development plan. Lancashire County Council will consider their adopted policies in more detail when determining the application, but it is worth highlighting that policy WM3 of the Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan (adopted September 2013) identifies land at Lancaster West Business Park as a site where large scale built waste management facilities, including thermal treatment/energy from waste, would be supported. This does set a catchment area of Lancaster/Morecambe and a capacity of 160,000 tonnes for this particular site, which would be exceeded by the proposed development, as set out above. The submission contends that the policies of the plan and objectives are largely up to date, but that the capacity figure is not. It sets out that this figure was based on waste management solutions that were being promoted through the waste management strategy and municipal waste contracts at the time and does not reflect the current situation. The County Council would need to take this into account when assessing and determining the proposal.

7.2.5 By their nature, energy from waste proposals bridge two sectors. They have their roots in waste management, but also provide energy generation. Paragraph 208 of the Government Review of Waste Policy (2011) sets out the reasons for the Government's support for energy from waste, stating that:

*"The benefits of recovery include preventing some of the negative greenhouse gas impacts of waste in landfill. Preventing these emissions offers a considerable climate change benefit, with the energy generated from the biodegradable fraction of this waste also offsetting fossil fuel power generation, and contributing towards our renewable energy targets providing comparative fuel security, provided it can be recovered efficiently."*

7.2.6 Whilst there are clearly some conflicts with the adopted Minerals and Waste Local Plan, in terms of the scale and catchment of the proposal, this would be for the County Council to assess through the determination of the application. However, the principle of this type of development is considered to be acceptable in planning policy terms and would be considered as an appropriate land use in this location.

### 7.3 Scale, design and landscape and visual impact

7.3.1 Visually, the site is located on the south eastern edge of the built up area of Heysham, although actually located within the Parish of Middleton. The immediate vicinity is predominantly characterised, and to some extent dominated, by energy infrastructure. This includes large electricity substations, large scale pylons, wind turbines and, at a further distance, Heysham Power Station. There are also a number of industrial estates in the general area of Heysham and Middleton. However, immediately to the west, the landscape mostly comprises low lying agricultural land interspersed by small farm groups which extend up to the River Lune, approximately 3 kilometres to the east. Around 900 metres to the northwest starts the residential area of Heysham.

7.3.2 The main part of the proposal comprises a very large building which would have several distinct elements. There are also ancillary structures and hardstanding which have been detailed in paragraph 2.3 above. The highest part of the building would be the section which is roughly in the centre when viewed from the north or south. This would be rectangular in shape with a flat roof and measure 45 metres by 74 metres and be 49.1 metres in height. The building would then lower at either side, on the east and west elevations, to around 38 metres, with the roof at one side being slightly sloping, before lowering again on the eastern elevation to 19.9 metres. The total length of the building (east to west) would be approximately 140 metres. Two stacks are proposed projecting from the roof of part of the building, and would reach a height of 90 metres above ground level. The sections discussed would vary in width and some lower projections are proposed on the north and south elevations. The overall width of the building would vary between approximately 55 and 100 metres. In addition, a slightly detached structure, containing the air cooled condenser, is proposed to the south of the site which would be 21 metres in height and viewed in the context of the building. The originally submitted drawings show the building to be finished in a mix of different greys and a copper coloured cladding.

7.3.3 A document has been submitted with the application which shows the design progression. From this, it is clear that the approach has been to break up the overall bulk and massing of the building, with the separate sections linked together by copper coloured elements providing a roughly curved shape across the whole building in order to respond to the landscape. However, there are particular concerns about the large scale and rectangular appearance of several elements of the building which are likely

to appear as the dominant features in some views, particularly given the light grey colour. Given the relatively flat and low lying nature of the surrounding landscape, and large areas of trees and hedgerows which line the main highways, local views of the building would be relatively limited, and most would likely focus on the larger sections of the building. Therefore, it is more likely that views of the whole building would be gained from more distant and elevated viewpoints and there were concerns that this had not been fully considered. It was queried whether the flat roofs would be visible and there were concerns that this would add to the overall mass of the central section in terms of how this is viewed. The site is located on the fringe of the urban area, in the context of low lying agricultural land, and it is therefore considered that it should respond appropriately to this and not just the existing industrial development.

- 7.3.4 Following these concerns, discussions were undertaken with the agent and the County Council, and a slightly different approach has now been proposed with regards the finish of the building, whilst the rest of the design has not change. In addition, further visualisations were undertaken from more distant viewpoints to help support the written assessment of the landscape and visual impact, including from both the Arnsdale and Silverdale and Forest of Bowland Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). These have also helped to inform alterations to the finish of the building. To help break up the bulk of the central section in particular, the use of a graduated grey colour was investigated and this did appear to soften the overall building and reduce the prominence of this highest part of the building. However, there were still some concerns regarding the grey colour and more natural colours were considered in order to complement the more earthy tones of the lower copper coloured sections. As a result, a further document has been produced which has incorporated green tones into the central section of the building, which gradually fade towards the top. Another large section of the building, which was proposed as a relatively light grey, has also been proposed in green so that there would be more cohesion in the more visible elements, although some of the lower sections have been retained in grey.
- 7.3.5 It needs to be acknowledged that the proposal relates to a very large building and, as such, the visual impacts cannot be fully mitigated, particularly from the closer viewpoints. This means that it could never fully relate to the scale and massing of all nearby development in the vicinity, particularly smaller scale residential properties and farm groups. Given its scale, landscaping would do little to provide screening, so it is therefore important that the design and finish of the building is of a high quality and contains visual interest, and aims to respond to both local and more distant views. It is considered that the amended approach to the finish of the building would allow the building to sit more subtly within the landscape and reduce its overall prominence, whilst also providing some visual interest, complementing that already proposed by the copper coloured material. Care will need to be taken in relation to the final tones of the building and the graduated pattern. However, it is considered that the amended approach provides an appropriate solution in order to help mitigate the visual impacts of the building, particularly when it is viewed from more distant locations, such as Ashton Memorial and Jubilee Tower.
- 7.3.6 In terms of the overall landscape and visual impact, as discussed above, the building would be located on the edge of a relatively industrial landscape, which includes some taller structures including pylons, wind turbines and the more distant Heysham Power Station buildings. Therefore, it is considered that the building would be appropriate in this context and not have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the immediate built up area. However, it is also on the edge of a low lying agricultural landscape and there are some local views in the context of this, although vegetation and landform provides screening from most of the nearby settlements. There is a key local view in the context of a Listed farm group, and this will be discussed in more detail in relation to heritage assets. However, most of the more immediate views of the building are broken up by landform and vegetation and will be more transient views from the highway network.
- 7.3.7 The further visualisations provided show that the building would be seen from more distant and elevated views, but that this would be in the context of other large structures and the built up area around Heysham. Taking into account the alternative elevational treatments proposed, which provide more muted and natural colours which soften the appearance and should reduce prominence within the landscape, it is considered that the development would not have a significant adverse landscape and visual impact. This is very much dependent on the design approach shown in the recently submitted document and, as such, it would be expected that the materials would be based on this. It is considered that this could be adequately covered by a condition, rather than requiring an amendment to the original plans, providing that it is appropriately worded.

7.3.8 It is likely that views of the building could be gained from both AONBs within Lancaster District. However, these will be very distant and also in the context of other development, as discussed above. As such, and based on the visualisations submitted to support the application, it is considered that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on views into or out of the protected landscapes. The scheme also proposes external lighting for safe movement of vehicles and pedestrians, for any external amenity areas, and for the security of employees and visitors which would likely be on a 24 hour basis. Given its context, with the existing industrial development, this is unlikely to result in a significant adverse impact to the visual amenity of the area. However, it would be expected that this is sensitively designed to avoid excessive light spill to the more rural area and to habitats around the site, including in relation to bats.

#### 7.4 Impacts on Heritage Assets

7.4.1 The application submission includes an assessment in relation to heritage assets. As discussed above, the immediate vicinity is predominantly energy infrastructure and industrial in nature and, as such, heritage assets in close proximity are limited. Within Middleton, there is one Grade II Listed building, the Old Roof Tree Inn, located approximately 370 metres to the south of the site. Approximately 360 metres to the south east is a farm group, Downy Field Farm, and the two dwellings and a large barn are Grade II Listed. The nearest Conservation Areas are Overton, approximately 1.5 kilometres to the south east, and Heysham, approximately 2 kilometres to the north. Views of the site will also be gained from Ashton Memorial which is Grade I Listed, and is located within a Grade II Registered Park and Garden located approximately 6.5 kilometres to the north east.

7.4.2 As a result of the combination of gentle undulations in the landscape, groups of trees, the distance and some intervening development, the proposal is unlikely to have an adverse impact to the setting of either of these Conservation Areas. Immediately to the north of the Listed building in Middleton, on the opposite side of Middleton Road, is a relatively thick group of trees and a banking which effectively prevent views towards the site to the north. It is considered that the building does not form part of the setting of the building in which it is perceived and as such should not cause harm to this. Whilst the building may be visible from elevated areas within Williamson Park and the Ashton Memorial, it will be viewed as a distant structure in combination with other tall and large structures within the low lying landscape. The measures proposed in terms of the finish of the building, as discussed above, would reduce its visual prominence within the landscape and therefore also in views from these heritage assets. As such, it is considered that there would not be a detrimental impact on the setting of, including views from, these heritage assets.

7.4.3 The development would be viewed in the context of the Listed buildings at Downy Field Farm and this has been demonstrated in the viewpoint from the edge of Overton, although closer views would be gained from Downy Field Lane to the front of the farm group. It is acknowledged that the large turbines, the treatment works adjacent to the site, and to a lesser extent the large pylons, can be viewed in the context of this group at present. The group does still retain some of its historic agricultural setting, although it has been eroded to some degree by the existing industrial development. However, the proposed building will be of a much larger scale than any of the existing buildings in the immediate context of the farm complex and it is considered that this would be quite dominant in close views of the Listed buildings. The visualisation shows that the power station is also visible but this is much more distant and more in the context of the existing urban area.

7.4.4 Whilst it is considered that existing industrial structures cause harm to the setting of the Listed farm group at present, this does not justify more harm. However, it does reduce the sensitivity of the group to change and this would still be viewed in the context of its low lying agricultural landscape. It is clear that harm would be caused to the setting of the Listed buildings given the proximity and large scale of the building and that it would impact in views of the Listed group in particular.

7.4.5 The NPPF sets out that when considering the impacts of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation, irrespective of whether any harm amounts to substantial harm, total loss or less than substantial harm to its significance and any harm requires clear and convincing justification. However, the NPPF puts a less stringent test on development when harm is considered to be less than substantial and sets out that this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal.

7.4.6 The submission has assessed the harm to the significance of these buildings as less than substantial in terms of the tests in the NPPF. As discussed above, from the viewpoint provided, the proposed building would appear to dominate the group of Listed buildings, in a much greater way than the existing structures particularly given the scale, bulk and massing of the proposal. The nature of the development has obviously lead to the scale of the building proposed, and any large building on the site would likely harm the setting of this group of Listed buildings, as it is out of scale with any other buildings in the area and diminishes its agricultural context as well as dominating the group in general. There were concerns that the level of harm had been underestimated. However, as set out above the agricultural context of the listed buildings has already been lost to some degree in the direction of the site. It was advised that changes to the design of the building were considered in order to mitigate the impacts on views as much as possible as it would be difficult to screen the building, as discussed above. It is considered that the proposed changes to the finish of the building, providing more muted and natural colours, although not altering the scale, massing and bulk of the building, will mitigate the harm to some degree. This should allow the building to sit more subtly within the landscape and hopefully reduce the visual prominence and dominance of the building in the context of the Listed farm group to the point that it may be considered to be less than substantial.

7.4.7 There are clearly benefits of the proposal that can be weighed against the harm caused to the setting of the Listed buildings. This will be for the County Council, in determining the application, to carry out this assessment and reach a view as to whether the public benefits outweigh the harm. However, it needs to be acknowledged that Listed buildings and their settings are also covered by legislation and therefore regard must be had to Section 66 of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (as amended), which states that the local planning authority shall have regard to the desirability of preserving a listed building or its setting or any features of special architectural or historic interest which it possesses. This will need to be fully considered by the County Council in the determination of the application.

#### 7.5 Impacts on ecology and trees

7.5.1 As set out in section 1, the site is in relative close proximity to a number of designated ecological sites, the impact on which will need to be fully considered in the determination of the application. The County Council will consult Natural England in relation to the impacts on the designated sites and will take into account any comments that they make in determining the application. They will also seek advice from specialists to allow them to fully assess the impacts on biodiversity, including in relation to the application site itself. Therefore, it is not the intention to provide a detailed assessment or advice in this regard to the County Council. However, as discussed above in relation to design, it is considered that the lighting scheme should ensure that it is designed to prevent impacts on important habitats, including features such as trees and hedgerow that may be used by bats. It is also considered that the development should enhance the existing ecological value of the site. One way is through additional landscaping and it should be ensured that this comprises native species that will establish and mature in this location. The site plan does show indicative landscaping and this could be covered by a condition.

7.5.2 An arboricultural implications assessment has been submitted with the application. However, this just provides an assessment of the trees within and in close proximity of the site, and not in relation to the proposed development. However, confirmation has been provided in relation to what is proposed to be removed as a result of the development. Trees are limited within the site, with two groups located towards the southwest corner, one of which is relatively large, and one group close to the northeast boundary outside the site. There are also other trees and shrubs close to the pond, which is just outside the southern boundary of the site, and along the bund on the eastern boundary. Ideally the scheme should seek to retain any trees that are within the site in the interests of the amenity and biodiversity of the area.

7.5.3 Unfortunately, the main group within the site is likely to be removed as part of the proposal. It does appear to be mostly outside the developed part of the site. However, it has been confirmed that this area would likely be used as compound areas during construction, and therefore this could not be retained in its current state. The site is relatively constrained so it does appear that it would be difficult to avoid this area, and it is adjacent to the proposed site access. The arboricultural report sets out that this is predominantly goat willow with some alder, with stem diameters of less than 10cm and has been categorised as C2, which are defined as trees of low quality.

7.5.4 Given that it is unlikely that these trees could be retained and allow the site to be constructed as proposed, and that they have been categorised as being of low quality, their loss is considered to be acceptable providing that they are adequately compensated. A ratio of 3 trees for every 1 tree that is lost would usually be expected. In addition, it is considered that other trees along the boundaries and adjacent to the site should be adequately protected during the course of construction, through appropriate barrier fencing which should be agreed prior to any work commencing on the site. However, it is considered that this could be adequately covered by a condition.

#### 7.6 Impacts on the amenities of neighbouring properties

7.6.1 There are no residential properties in the immediate vicinity of the site, the closest located at a distance of approximately 240 metres. Therefore, there would not be a loss of light or outlook to any residential properties, and the most likely impact would be as a result of noise and vibration. The planning submission includes a chapter in relation to this, which has been reviewed by the Council's Environmental Health Officer. Given the nature and scale of the proposal, its operation would be covered by a permit issued by the Environment Agency. However, the impacts from noise and vibration are still a material planning consideration and it needs to be ensured that any potential impacts could be adequately mitigated. In addition, the construction period would not be covered by the permitting regime.

7.6.2 The information submitted specifically assesses impacts associated with plant operational impacts, noise during the construction phase and future impacts upon the existing noise climate. This has been assessed using the appropriate methodology contained within BS4142:2014 ( 'Methods for rating and assessing industrial and commercial sound', BS5228-1:2009 Code of Practice for Noise and Vibration Control on Construction and Open Site, Institute of Environmental Management and Assessment (IEMA) 'Guidelines for Environmental Noise Impact Assessment' and the 'Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB). Appropriate monitoring locations were selected to form baseline data, and the survey was undertaken over a sufficient time period to provide representative sound level information. Background Sound Levels were derived using the methodology described within BS4142:2014 and are considered representative for the selected monitoring locations.

7.6.3 The Environmental Health Officer has advised that predictions would satisfactorily demonstrate that construction noise will fall well below the threshold values normally indicating significant effects, demonstrating that there will be 'lowest observed adverse effect levels' in respect of noise. Predictions in respect of vibration indicate that vibration levels during the construction phase are unlikely to give rise to 'adverse comment' as they will be well below perceptible levels, at the nearest sensitive receptor location.

7.6.4 In relation to the operation of plant the assessment satisfactorily demonstrates that during normal day-time operations there will be 'no observed effect levels' in respect of noise at nearest sensitive receptors. However, during night-time operations there is the potential of an indication of adverse impact at residential receptors 1 & 2 (Downy Field Farm and Middleton Road) although the impact could be considered negligible. However, to negate any uncertainty, this can be addressed with additional mitigation measures described within the submitted report (section 7.5.3) which would effectively reduce the Rating Level so that there will be a negligible impact or 'No observed effect levels'. This includes restricting noise levels from various plant within the building and buildings to be clad with a double skin to meet specific noise levels with ventilation louvres attenuated to match this. This will also significantly reduce any day-time operational noise associated with the proposed development. It is not clear if this would be covered in an Environmental Permit and it is therefore recommended that this be a condition on any consent if it would not be otherwise controlled.

7.6.5 With the mitigation in place, as described above, the assessment satisfactorily demonstrates that there will be 'no observed effect Levels' and lowest observed adverse effect levels' in respect of noise both during the construction and operational phases of this development. It is therefore considered that there would not be a significant adverse impact to the amenities of nearby residential properties as a result of noise or vibration.

#### 7.7 Air quality and sustainable transport measures

7.7.1 As with noise, emissions would be covered by an Environmental Permit. However, the likely impacts have been considered by the Air Quality Officer. In the first instance a number of queries were raised and much of this was to gain a better understanding of how the facility would operate and how this impacts on emissions. Following the submission of further information, it is considered that the

assessment has been appropriately undertaken and that emissions can be adequately controlled and covered by an Environmental Permit so that there would not be an adverse impact to air quality. It should be noted that paragraph 183 of the NPPF sets out that the focus of planning policies and decisions should be on whether proposed development is an acceptable use of land, rather than the control of processes or emissions where these are subject to separate pollution control regimes. There are also potential impacts from emissions on nearby designated ecological sites, which will be considered as a separate issue by the County Council in consultation with Natural England.

- 7.7.2 The permitting regime would not cover construction and there are also other potential impacts from the development on air quality, such as from transport. In terms of during construction, the submitted report sets out that measures to prevent dust would be covered by a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). The Air Quality Officer has identified that there could be air quality issues as a result of contamination that may be found on the site. In response, it has been set out that any such issues could be covered within the remediation strategy for contamination. Given the distance from the nearest sensitive receptors, it is considered that no further additional measures are required in relation to this. The report proposes the provision of a staff bus to minimise vehicle trips during construction and measures such as this could be included within the CEMP. The Air Quality Officer suggested the use of electric buses, and advised that electric vehicle charging facilities should shortly be available at the Caton Road Park and Ride. In response, the agent has advised that the suggestion of the use of the Caton Road Park and Ride facility may be a useful pick up point for construction staff accessing the site and the use of electric fleet vehicles could be investigated.
- 7.7.3 Queries were raised in relation to any potential impact on the Lancaster Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). Most heavy goods vehicles (HGVs) transport would utilise the M6 and the Bay Gateway so would avoid this. As such, it is unlikely that there would be a significant impact on air quality in this area.
- 7.7.4 As the County Council is the Highway Authority, they will consider matters in relation to highway safety. However, it is considered important to consider sustainable transport measures which would help to reduce any impacts to air quality. The nearest bus stops to the site are located on Middleton Road, but Imperial Road ends just short of this, and there is no formal connection through for pedestrians or cyclists. As such, it is proposed that a link would be created for cycling and walking which would provide a safer route than the bypass road and would likely encourage people to walk, cycle or use public transport where possible. It is considered that it is important that this is secured as part of the scheme and could also benefit other future economic development in the area.
- 7.7.5 The submission sets out that 51 car parking spaces would be provided on site, including 5 to disabled standard provision and 5 with electric parking charging facilities. A shelter would be provided for bicycles and there would be dedicated bays for motorcycles. It should be ensured that the cycle storage in particular is covered and secure, and shower and changing facilities are made available within the building to encourage this mode of transport. The Air Quality Officer has advised that given the electricity generation output of the proposed development, there is an opportunity for the facility to serve as an electric vehicle charging hub for the wider district/other businesses. The agent has advised that the operator would be open to discussions with nearby businesses to supply private wire electricity supplies, which could include electric vehicle charging facilities. It has also been indicated that charging for HGVs could be investigated as there could be a move towards this in the future. However, the level of charging facilities proposed is considered to be acceptable to serve the development proposed, and it is not the intention that this became a hub for charging vehicles and the site constraints would likely make this difficult.
- 7.7.6 Overall it is considered that the proposal is unlikely to result in a significant adverse impact to air quality and measures can be put in place to encourage sustainable modes of transport both during construction and operation of the development.
- 7.8 Contamination
- 7.8.1 An initial assessment has been carried out relation to ground conditions and potential risks from contamination. The site is previously developed and it is anticipated that it would have been subject to levels of contamination. A detailed site assessment is proposed which would include a remediation strategy. It is considered that this could adequately be covered by a condition if consent is granted.

## 8.0 Planning Obligations

- 8.1 There are no planning obligations to consider as part of this request for a consultation response to the planning application. There will potentially be obligations which are identified by Lancashire County Council as necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

## 9.0 Conclusions

- 9.1 The principle of this type of development is considered to be acceptable in planning policy terms and would be considered as an appropriate land use in this location. Whilst there are clearly some conflicts with the adopted Minerals and Waste Local Plan, in terms of the scale and catchment of the proposal, this would be for the County Council to assess through the determination of the application. The proposal does relate to a very large structure that would be visible within the landscape from both local and more distant elevated viewpoints. However, given the context of existing industrial structures and energy related development, the low lying nature of the site which means that trees and hedges break up views from lower areas nearer the site, and the amendments that are proposed to the elevations to soften the appearance of the building, it is considered that the building would not have a significant landscape or visual impact.
- 9.2 As outlined above, it is considered that any potential impacts to residential properties could be adequately mitigated and contamination remediated and there is unlikely to be a significant impact on air quality. Harm has been identified to the significance of Listed buildings close to the site, given the location of the building within their setting. There are clearly benefits of the proposal that can be weighed against the harm caused to the setting of the Listed buildings. This will be for the County Council, in determining the application, to carry out this assessment and reach a view as to whether the public benefits outweigh the harm. However, it must also be ensured that they have full regard to Section 66 of The Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990.
- 9.3 The consideration of other planning issues, such as the impacts on ecology, including nearby designated sites, drainage and transport and highway safety involves consultations with specialist statutory consultees which, Lancashire County Council will undertake as the determining authority. They will be required to consider all relevant planning issues in detail in determining the application. The potential impacts to the historic and natural environment must be carefully balanced against any wider benefits which the scheme may have in terms of energy generation, regeneration and local employment.

## Recommendation

That the City Council has **NO OBJECTIONS** to the application subject to the following suggested conditions:

1. Employment skills plan
2. Construction and Environmental Management Plan, including a Travel Plan
3. Assessment and remediation of contamination
4. Tree protection during construction
5. Noise mitigation based on paragraph 7.5.3 of the Environmental Statement (if not otherwise included within an Environmental Permit)
6. Materials/ colours/ finishes to be agreed (based on the conclusions of the addendum design document)
7. Lighting scheme (may be included with other ecology mitigation)
8. Landscaping scheme
9. Creation of cycle/ footpath link to Middleton road
10. Electric vehicle charging points (with the consideration of facilities for HGVs), secure cycle storage and shower and changing facilities

## Background Papers

None

Agenda Item	Committee Date	Application Number
A6	19 August 2019	18/00380/FUL

Application Site	Proposal
The Corner House Woodwell Lane Silverdale Carnforth	Demolition of existing property and outbuilding, erection of replacement detached dwelling, alteration to vehicular access and associated landscaping

Name of Applicant	Name of Agent
Mrs Adele Higham	Michael Harrison

Decision Target Date	Reason For Delay
12 July 2018	Seeking revised plans to address concerns regarding scale and design

Case Officer	Mrs Petra Williams
Departure	No
Summary of Recommendation	Approval subject to conditions

#### (i) Procedural Matters

This form of development would normally be dealt with under the Scheme of Delegation but was previously referred to the Planning Regulatory Committee by the former Ward Councillor, Cllr Goodrich. The report for Committee was written up with recommendation of refusal, primarily due to the scale and design of the proposal. However, revised plans were submitted before the application was heard at June's Planning Regulatory Committee. As it was necessary to re-consult on the revised plans the application was deferred from the meeting to allow time for this. Although Cllr Goodrich has now been replaced by Cllr Greenwell it is appropriate to bring the revised scheme to the Planning Regulatory Committee for consideration by Councillors.

### 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 &amp; Silverdale AONB</b>	<p><b>Comments raise concerns</b> – Comments made in respect of the original plans make the point that 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.</p> <p>Following consideration of the revised plans the Arnside and Silverdale AONB consultee welcomes the inclusion of limestone cladding and the lowering of the front porch but previous concerns regarding the scale and design of this proposal remain as per original comments.</p>
<b>Natural England</b>	<b>No objections</b> - considers that the proposed development will not have significant adverse impacts on statutorily protected nature conservation sites or landscapes.
<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>County Highways</b>	<b>No objections</b> –Suggests consideration of the installation of a length of kerb line along the sites frontage with Woodwell Lane.
<b>Ramblers Association</b>	<b>No comments received</b>
<b>Parish Council</b>	<p><b>Neither objects nor supports</b> but comments made in respect of the original plans highlight the following concerns:</p> <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. 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> <p>Following consideration of the revised plans the Parish Council made the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Considers the removal of the veranda/balcony on the second floor to be an improvement because it begins to simplify the external features of the structure.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• With regards the garage amendment, which involves the inclusion of a carport, as this element remains almost as wide as the original proposal the impact of the view from Woodwell Lane would be virtually the same as that of the original plans. Concerned that if this revised proposal is permitted, infill of the car port area to form an enclosed garage would be a likely future change.</li> <li>• Tree planting is welcomed and will help replace some of the trees on site, felled before the original application was made.</li> <li>• It is noted the submitted plans shows amendments to the existing trackway from the boundary of the property to join Woodwell Lane. Whilst possible alterations have been discussed with the Parish Council, agreement has not yet been formally reached on this matter. Protection of the wide verge at the side of Woodwell lane, up to the trackway, is important and it is requested this forms part of the mandated protection arrangement for the protected trees and their root areas in the verge.</li> <li>• The scale and form of the proposal is still too large, dominant and insensitive for this location unacceptable and as such would have an unacceptable impact.</li> </ul>
--	---

## 5.0 **Neighbour Representations**

5.1 Original Plans - A total of 8 items of public comments were received in respect of the original plans. Six of the items raises objections as follows:

- Concerns regarding the potential visual impacts of the scale, height, design with excessive glazing on some elevations and a complex mix of roof pitches and balconies.
- No objection to redevelopment of the site in principle but the development will be prominent and intrusive and out of keeping with the area.
- The house as proposed would visually dominate the immediate area in a way that no other houses do.
- Although there is no local vernacular in this part of the village, houses do sit modestly in their plots. The current proposal would not.
- The development would not conserve or enhance the landscape.
- No detailed landscape plan provided.
- If landscaping is provided it would not be sufficient to mitigate the impact of the development.
- Reiterates objections relating to the scale and design with excessive glazing on some elevations, a complex mix of roof pitches and balconies.
- The garage 'complex' is excessive.
- The proposal has failed to make considerate use of the plot available to them.
- Concerns regarding scale of the building which would effectively be 3 storeys high with at least half the frontage comprising doors to the garages not sympathetic to the frontage to Woodwell Lane.
- The plot is situated on a highly visible corner and the development should be designed to give a less urban appearance and of a lesser scale.

In addition to the concerns raised within the 6 letters of objection, an additional item of comment queried the differences in height between the existing and proposed dwellings.

The final item of comment raised the point that part of the access 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 contractors' vehicles. It is noted that Notice has been served on the Parish Council in this regard.

Amended Plans - Three items of public comment have been received in respect of the amended plans. Two of these items maintain objections and one neither objects nor supports but raises concerns regarding the introduction of a roof light window and possible overlooking. With regards the two objections the following points are raised:

- The revisions are very minor and appear to consist of: the removal of a dormer window; removal of the apex of the roof; the removal of some garage doors, and replacement of stone facing on some elevations with render. Neither the size nor the impression of size has been significantly reduced, and the impression is still very urban.
- Queries if there is a reduction in height and details of materials for forecourt, gating, external lighting or changes to the south facing boundary wall.

## 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

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 subject to the extent to which there are unresolved objections to the relevant policies and their consistency with the National Planning Policy Framework.

### 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

## 7.0 **Comment and Analysis**

7.1 The key considerations arising from the proposal are:

- 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 Arnside 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.

7.2.2 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. Policy 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. However, given that the plot is occupied by a single dwelling and the application seeks a replacement unit the development would not result in a net gain. Therefore it is considered difficult to argue non-compliance with Policy AS03. Furthermore, the number of bedrooms at the existing dwelling could be increased by extensions to the property under permitted development rights without the imposition of Policy AS03. It is therefore considered inappropriate to apply this policy to a proposal for a replacement dwelling.

7.2.3 The principle of a replacement dwelling on this site is considered acceptable subject to other matters which will be discussed below.

### 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 which is to conserve and enhance the local landscape and settlement character. Policy AS02 also requires development proposals to demonstrate how they will conserve and enhance the landscape and natural beauty of the area, respect visual amenity and reflect the rural nature and local distinctiveness 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.

7.3.3 There is a mix of design, styles and materials evident in relation to other dwellings in the vicinity of the site. This includes large detached dwellings, a range of bungalows as well as traditional terraces. The existing property is well set back from Lindeth Road but due to its position within the plot it is more visible from Woodwell Lane. The replacement dwelling would occupy a slightly larger footprint than the existing property. There were significant concerns regarding the scale and design of the original scheme. However, the following amendments have now been made to the scheme:

- Overall ridge height lowered by introduction of flat top roof (previously 1.8 metres higher than original dwelling; now 1 metre higher);
- Dormer window removed and replaced with roof windows to west and east elevations;
- Full height bay over main entrance removed allowing for a simplified continuous gutter line to the main roof;
- Entrance porch cheeks to be formed of natural stone under a pitched roof with gable formed at right angles to the Woodwell Road elevation providing a visual target for visitors on arrival;
- Garage elevation redesigned to a single garage door, window and open car port with feature stone column support at external corner reducing overall impact of single storey elevation element; and
- Lindeth Road and Woodwell Road elevations to be formed entirely of natural stone.

7.3.4 It is considered that the reduction in height goes some way to address the previous concerns regarding scale and the removal of the dormer and full height entrance bay serve to simplify the design somewhat. The omission of one of the garage doors and creation of a carport minimises the bulk and visual impacts of this element of the scheme. The inclusion of natural stone to the Woodwell Lane and Lindeth Road elevations is a welcome improvement and would be conditioned to fit in with the natural vernacular of the Silverdale area, which is predominantly limestone. While the catslide roof projection and integral balcony remains part of the scheme it is considered that the inclusion of natural stone will create an overall more cohesive appearance than previously proposed. While a significant amount of glazing is still proposed within the Lindeth Road elevation it has been reduced somewhat with the omission of the large dormer. Again, the natural stone will provide a more unified appearance to this elevation when viewed from Lindeth Road. Roof treatment will be natural slate.

7.3.5 On balance, and taking into account the range of property types in the vicinity of the site it is considered that due to the collective amendments the scheme is now acceptable in terms of scale and design and subject to the conditioning of appropriate materials, would not adversely impact the character of the AONB. However, to ensure that the unacceptable details that have been removed as part of the negotiations are not introduced at a later date under the General Permitted Development Order, it is appropriate to remove permitted development rights.

#### 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. In addition the revised plans include a small roof light within the northern roof plane within its lowest point being approximately 1.6 metres above floor level within the study. Again, due to the distances involved and intervening planting this is considered to not be a point of concern. The proposed balcony within the front (Lindeth Road) elevation would be set into the catslide roof with 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 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. 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.
- 7.5.3 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.
- 7.5.4 Policy DM27 considers the safeguarding of protected species from development proposals and this approach is echoed within the provisions of policy AS04 of the Arnsdale 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.
- 7.5.5 A Bat Survey has been received and considered. The survey states that bats were observed/recorded using the building for roosting. The survey found that two small day roosts of low conservation value are located on the north side of the house roof. A brown long eared bat roost is located between roof slates and the breathable membrane on the north eastern aspect of the house. Consequently the demolition of this building would result in loss of this roost and so will require a European Protected Species (EPS) licence to proceed lawfully. The survey sets out proposed mitigation, which would be put forward as part of an EPS application. This includes timing of the works, with demolition to be carried out between October and March when bats are less likely to be present and soft demolition of the roof area around the roosts and replacement roosts.
- 7.5.6 Due to the identified presence of bats it is important to have regard to the three derogation tests that would be applied when determining whether a licence can be issued must be considered. These are:
1. *The proposed development must meet a purpose of "preserving public health or public safety or other imperative reasons of overriding public interest including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequences of primary importance for the environment" Regulation 53(2)(e).*
  2. *The competent authority must be satisfied "that there is no satisfactory alternative" Regulation 53(9)(a), and:*
  3. *"That the action authorised will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range" Regulation 53(9)(b).*
- 7.5.7 In terms of the first test it is considered that the replacement dwelling would be more eco-efficient than the existing property, which would make a small contribution to environmental benefits. This along with the revisions to design and scale would lead to an on balance conclusion that the first test can be passed.
- 7.5.8 The second test relates to there being no satisfactory alternatives. In the guidance it sets out that there are always going to be alternatives to a proposal and, in terms of licensing decisions, it is for Natural England to determine that a reasonable level of effort has been expended in the search for alternative means of achieving the development whilst minimising the impact on the Protected Species. The Planning Statement sets out that the existing dwelling is in a poor state of repair and this is certainly evident on site. The statement identifies that the existing building requires a replacement roof and

windows along with other structural defects. Although the applicant has looked at various options for renovating, extending, updating and altering the existing dwelling all considered options resulted in an unsatisfactory compromise with a large carbon footprint. As such the Local Planning Authority is satisfied that the second test could be passed.

- 7.5.9 The third test sets out that the action authorised will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the population of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range. The property is located in close proximity to deciduous woodland which provides good connectivity into a wider area of woodlands to the east of the site. Overall foraging potential for bats can be considered good in the vicinity of the site. Therefore it is considered that the proposal will not be detrimental to the maintenance of the bat population in this locality.
- 7.5.10 It is considered that all three derogation tests could be passed in order to obtain the licence necessary from Natural England.

## 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 sewer. 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.

## 7.7 Other Matters

- 7.7.1 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 Obligation

- 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 (AONB) 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. The principle of a replacement dwelling is acceptable, given the location of the site within the AONB and adjacent to a Public Right of Way. The applicant has provided revised plans which on balance address the previous concerns regarding design scale and appearance. Subject to appropriate conditions regarding materials, landscaping and ecological mitigation overall it is considered that the proposal would comply with both local and national planning policy and would not impact adversely on the landscape character of the AONB.

## Recommendation

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

1. Standard three year timescale
2. In accordance with amended plans
3. Submission of a foul and surface water drainage scheme (prior to the commencement of development)
4. Materials – details and samples including elevational treatment (natural stone and render), slate, eaves verge and ridge details, rainwater goods, windows (including rooflights) and doors (including garage),

surfacing (including access between Woodwell Lane and the site) and boundary treatments, external lighting- to be submitted and approved.

5. Development in accordance with AIA including tree protection
6. Landscaping scheme
7. Ecological mitigation
8. Providing of parking and turning areas prior to occupation
9. Obscure glazing to first floor en-suite within northern elevation
10. Privacy screen to balcony – details, implementation and retention
11. Removal of Permitted Development rights – roof, windows and doors alterations (including garage doors), extensions and outbuildings and boundary treatments.
12. Garage use restriction

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

Lancaster City Council has made the recommendation in a positive and proactive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development, working proactively with the applicant to secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area. The recommendation has been taken having had regard to the impact of development, and in particular to the relevant policies contained in the Development Plan, as presented in full in the 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
A7	19 August 2019	19/00788/FUL

Application Site	Proposal
Dallas Road Gardens Dallas Road Lancaster Lancashire	Erection of a 2.5m wooden peace pole

Name of Applicant	Name of Agent
Lancaster Quakers	Mo Kelly

Decision Target Date	Reason For Delay
14 August 2019	Committee Cycle

Case Officer	Mrs Kim Ireland
Departure	No
Summary of Recommendation	Approval

## (i) Procedural Matters

This form of development would normally be determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, the land is in the ownership of Lancaster City Council and as such the application is referred to the Planning Regulatory Committee.

### 1.0 The Site and its Surroundings

- 1.1 The application site is located to the south east of the road junction of Dallas Road and High Street, situated in close proximity to the city centre of Lancaster. The site is known as Dallas Road Gardens, which is designated as an area of open space in the Council's Open Space Audit, specifically as a park and garden. To the east of the site is Lancaster Girls Grammar School, to the north of the site is Dallas Road County Primary School and to the west and south of the site are residential properties.
- 1.2 Dallas Road Gardens is characterised with an established hedgerow along the Dallas Road boundary and a low stone wall to the High Street and Regent Street boundary. The garden is split into three grassed areas with a path separating the areas with numerous trees and park benches located within.
- 1.3 The site is situated within Lancaster Conservation Area.

### 2.0 The Proposal

- 2.1 The application seeks consent to erect a wooden pole that is proposed to be sited to the north east of the site. It is to be 2.5m in height and will be secured into the ground with a concrete base. The pole will have four sides and each side will have the words "May Peace Prevail on Earth" in the four languages of English, Urdu, Gujarati and Arabic. This is to represent the languages used by the local community.

### 3.0 Site History

- 3.1 There is no relevant planning history.

#### 4.0 Consultation Responses

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

Consultee	Response
Conservation Officer	No comments received during the statutory consultation period.
Property Services	<b>No objection</b> – subject to the applicant entering into a suitable agreement for the installation and future maintenance and management of the artwork.
Public Realm Officer	No comments received during the statutory consultation period.

#### 5.0 Neighbour Representations

5.1 No comments received during the statutory consultation period.

#### 6.0 Principal National and Development Plan Policies

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

Paragraphs **124** and **127** – Requiring Good Design  
Section **16** - Conserving and enhancing the historic 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 significant weight can be attributed to the policies contained therein.

##### 6.3 Development Management DPD

**DM25** – Green Infrastructure  
**DM31** – Development affecting Conservation Areas  
**DM35** – Key Design Principles

#### 7.0 Comment and Analysis

7.1 The key considerations arising from the proposal are:

- Principle of Development; and
- Design and Impact on Character of the Conservation Area

##### 7.2 Principle of Development

7.2.1 The site is currently used as an open public garden space. The proposed wooden pole is seen to be in keeping with retaining the open public space, whilst adding a new focal point within this park and garden.

- 7.2.2 Policy DM25 states that the Council will retain a presumption towards the protection of green spaces and green assets, particularly where it can be demonstrated that they provide value, either economically, environmentally or socially, to the community they serve.
- 7.2.3 Therefore the principle of the proposed wooden pole is looked upon favourably, as the proposed scheme is retaining the green space, whilst providing an art piece that represents the languages used by the local community in which it serves.
- 7.3 Design and Impact on Character of the Conservation Area
- 7.3.1 In accordance with the Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act, when considering any application that affects a Listed building, a Conservation Area or their setting, the local planning authority must pay special attention to the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of the heritage asset or its setting. This is reiterated by policies DM31.
- 7.3.2 The proposed wooden pole will not have a significant impact on the Conservation Area, particularly as the pole and the associated concrete base are relatively small in the context of the surrounding trees and benches that are within the garden space. The proposal is seen to have a neutral impact upon the character and appearance of the area.

## **8.0 Planning Obligations**

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

## **9.0 Conclusions**

- 9.1 The proposed wooden pole is seen to retain the open public space, whilst adding a new focal point that represents the languages used by the local community in which it serves.
- 9.2 The proposed wooden pole is seen to have a neutral impact upon the character and appearance of the site and the surrounding Conservation Area.

## **Recommendation**

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

1. Standard 3 year timescale
2. Development to accord to approved plans

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

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

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

## **Background Papers**

None

Agenda Item	Committee Date	Application Number
A8	19 August 2019	19/00831/FUL

Application Site	Proposal
6 Ingleton Drive Lancaster Lancashire LA1 4RA	Erection of a single storey rear extension and creation of a ramp to front garden

Name of Applicant	Name of Agent
Lancaster City Council	Mr Chris Potts

Decision Target Date	Reason For Delay
23 August 2019	N/A

Case Officer	Mr Sam Robinson
Departure	No
Summary of Recommendation	Approval

(i) **Procedural Matters**

This form of development would normally be determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, the property is in the ownership of Lancaster City Council and as such the application is referred to the Planning Regulatory Committee.

**1.0 The Site and its Surroundings**

- 1.1 6 Ingleton Drive is an end terrace property located in Hala in south Lancaster. The property features rendered walls under a concrete tiled roof with white uPVC windows and doors. To the rear is a split level garden measuring approximately 115m<sup>2</sup> with timber fencing surrounding the site and a single storey outrigger along the southern boundary. To the front is a small sloping front garden.
- 1.2 The surrounding area is residential in nature and there is a large open playing field to the south of the site.

**2.0 The Proposal**

- 2.1 The application seeks consent for a single storey rear extension and access ramp to the front.
- 2.2 The extension measures approximately 3.65m in depth, 6.85m in width under a flat roof height of 2.7m and is proposed to be finished with render and windows to match and a glass reinforced plastic (GRP) flat roof. The access ramp will be attached to the existing steps and will provide access to the pathway which runs parallel to the north elevation of the property.

**3.0 Site History**

- 3.1 There is no relevant planning history.

#### 4.0 **Consultation Responses**

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

Consultee	Response
Property Services	No comments received within the statutory consultation period

#### 5.0 **Neighbour Representations**

5.1 No comments received within the statutory consultation period.

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

6.1 National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)

Paragraphs 124, 127 & 130 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.

6.3 Development Management DPD

**DM35** – Key design principles

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

7.1 The key considerations arising from the proposal are:

- General design; and
- Impacts upon residential amenity

7.2 General Design

7.2.1 In terms of design, the scale of the extension is relatively modest but will provide additional accessible living space for the residents. The proposal remains subservient to the main dwelling in terms of height and footprint and is sited to the rear and will be attached to the existing outrigger. The rendered finish and uPVC windows will match the existing dwelling and tie in well with the existing dwelling and is appropriate for this residential area.

7.2.2 The access ramp and associated handrails will occupy a section of the front garden and while this will slightly alter the appearance of the property and garden area, there are a number of footpaths and railings

in the vicinity and as such, the proposal will not be out of keeping within the immediate area. While there may be a small amount of visual harm associated with the development, the railings and ramp are relatively small scale structures and it is considered that this harm is outweighed by providing a better standard of living and support which is required for the occupiers. Ensuring accessibility to all sectors of the community is a key principle of DM35. This harm can be reduced by some sensitive landscaping, which can be covered by condition.

- 7.2.3 The matching materials of the rear extension are considered acceptable and the proposal is considered to be built to an appropriate scale. As it is contained to the rear, there will have no impact on the street scene. The ramp and railings while altering the appearance of the site, will be similar to other access paths in the area whilst providing improved and needed access to the residents.

### 7.3 Impacts on Residential Amenity

- 7.3.1 Openings will be restricted to the rear elevation of the extension overlooking the applicant's own garden at ground floor level. To the south, the extension will be sited behind the existing shared outrigger and will have little impact on the adjoining neighbours at no.4. The extension will be set in from the northern boundary with a significant proportion screened behind the timber fencing. Combined with the modest height and depth, this will ensure that it does not appear overbearing to the occupiers at no.8 and while there may be a small impact on the ground floor patio doors, this is considered to be limited and will not have a significant impact upon the residential amenity for the occupiers. The ramp raises no residential amenity concerns.

## 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 without having any detrimental impacts on residential amenity. The application is seen to comply with DM35 and consequently is recommended for approval.

## Recommendation

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

1. Standard 3 year timescale
2. Development in accordance with plans
3. Submission of a landscaping scheme and its subsequent implementation and retention/maintenance

## 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
A9	19 August 2019	19/00901/FUL

Application Site	Proposal
3 Moorside Melling Carnforth Lancashire	Alterations to windows and doors on front and rear elevations, re-rendering of the front, side and rear elevations and erection of a detached garage

Name of Applicant	Name of Agent
Miss S. Thompson	Mr Miles Manley

Decision Target Date	Reason For Delay
6 September 2019	N/A

Case Officer	Mr Sam Robinson
Departure	No
Summary of Recommendation	Approval

## (i) Procedural Matters

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

## 1.0 The Site and its Surroundings

- 1.1 3 Moorside is an end terraced property located on the edge of Melling, which is also within the Melling Conservation Area. The dwelling comprises rendered walls under a slate roof with white uPVC windows and doors throughout. The site occupies a corner plot and features a good sized rear garden measuring approximately 400m<sup>2</sup> with a detached garage/outbuilding running parallel to the highway.
- 1.2 The property is sited within a cul-de-sac, which is detached from the main centre of Melling approximately 350m to the west. In the immediate area, the land levels rise sharply when travelling from north to south. Both Moorside and Moorside Close are a more modern form of development, built approximately in the mid 20<sup>th</sup> century.

## 2.0 The Proposal

- 2.1 The application seeks consent for a detached garage, re-render to all elevations of the property with new windows and doors to the rear.
- 2.2 The garage measures 4m x 6m with a wall height of 2.1m and maximum height of 3.1m under a slate pitched roof with a grey alloy door. The windows and doors are to be replaced with similar uPVC but in anthracite grey. Discussions regarding the render to find a more muted finish is still ongoing with the agent and a verbal update will be provided to Councillors at the meeting.
- 2.3 There is no new access or landscaping proposed as part of this application.

## 3.0 Site History

- 3.1 There is no relevant planning history.

#### 4.0 **Consultation Responses**

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

Consultee	Response
Parish Council	No comments
County Highways	<b>No objection</b>
Conservation	<b>No objection (subject to an alternative render colour)</b>

#### 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 124, 127, 130 - Achieving well-designed places  
Paragraph 193 - Conserving and enhancing the historic 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 significant weight can be attributed to the policies contained therein.

##### 6.3 Development Management DPD Policies

DM31 – Development affecting Conservation Areas  
DM35 – Key design principles

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

7.1 The key considerations in the assessment are:

- General design;
- Impact upon residential amenity; and
- Impact upon the designated heritage asset

##### 7.2 General Design

7.2.1 While relatively close to the highway, the proposed garage will occupy the area where the existing outbuilding is located, so the principle of a building in this location has already been established. There are also a number of domestic garages to the south west of the site in a similar proximity to the highway.



The scale is modest in size and is no larger than a typical domestic garage. The pitched slate roof and suitable choice of render is considered appropriate in this residential area.

- 7.2.2 As stated above, discussions regarding the render on both the property and garage are ongoing with the agent to find a suitable finish rather than the proposed off-white, which would look rather obtrusive given the muted finish of the surrounding buildings and prominent positioning of the dwelling within the street. However, it is considered that a rendered finish, subject to final colours/details, would be acceptable in this location. The insertion of grey bi-fold doors and windows to the property are considered relatively minor alterations and will not affect the character of the property or wider area.

### 7.3 Impacts upon Residential Amenity

- 7.3.1 As stated above, the outbuilding is located relatively close to the highway but is set far away from any of the nearby residential properties. While the first floor window to the rear will be slightly larger than existing, outlook will be similar and will primarily overlook the applicant's own garden. As such, the application raises no residential amenity concerns and is considered to comply with DM35.

### 7.4 Impacts Upon the Designated Heritage Asset

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

- 7.4.2 As the site occupies a prominent plot within a Conservation Area and given the visibility of the garage from the highway, the impact on the wider area needs to be assessed. The site is separated from the wider and more historical area of Melling and is screened by a large number of mature trees, which run alongside Lodge Lane to the north. With the exception of The School House at the entrance to Moorside, the properties in the immediate vicinity offer little historic or architectural value. The garage will be located behind the dwelling and obscured from view along Lodge Lane and will be seen in the context of the surrounding mid 20<sup>th</sup> century buildings.

- 7.4.3 Given that the key views of the Conservation Area are along Lodge Lane and that the proposal is in keeping with that of the immediate area, it is thought that the replacement garage will not cause any substantial harm to the Melling Conservation Area and therefore complies with DM31 and associated legislation.

## 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 is in keeping with the surrounding area. Without any detrimental impacts on residential amenity or upon the wider Conservation Area, the application is seen to comply with DM31 and DM35 and 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
3. Details of materials

## 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

**PLANNING REGULATORY COMMITTEE**

**Appointment to Crook O'Lune Advisory Committee  
19<sup>th</sup> August 2019**

**Report of Democratic Services Manager**

**PURPOSE OF REPORT**

To consider an appointment of a Council representative on the Crook O'Lune Advisory Committee.

This report is public

**RECOMMENDATIONS**

- (1) **That nominations be made and voted upon at this meeting and an appointment be made to the Crook O'Lune Advisory Committee.**

**1.0 Proposal**

- 1.1 At its meeting on 20<sup>th</sup> May 2019, full Council considered the basis on which appointments should be made to a number of outside bodies, partnerships and boards.
- 1.2 The Crook O'Lune Advisory Committee is one of a number of outside bodies to which Councillors are appointed. Council appoints three Councillors to the Committee; 1 representative of each of the Halton-with-Aughton and Lower Lune Valley Wards and a representative of the Planning Regulatory Committee.
- 1.3 The Planning Regulatory Committee is therefore requested to appoint a representative to serve on this body.

**2.0 Background**

- 2.1 Some background information about the role has been provided below to assist Councillors:
- The Crook O'Lune Advisory Committee meets rarely and is known to conduct most business via email. Its primary function is to look after the 'Hermitage Field' which was gifted to the Council in perpetuity many decades ago.
  - The Hermitage Field, was once owned by the Halton Park Estate and sold to the owner of the Hermitage Hotel during the 1930's to provide fresh produce for the hotel and its guests.
  - The hotel fell into financial difficulties and as a result the field was purchased by a group of private subscribers and the local authorities namely: Lunesdale Rural District, Lancaster City, Morecambe & Heysham Borough, and Lancashire County

Council. The field was to be retained by the local authority, currently Lancaster City Council, and administered by the Crook O'Lune Advisory Committee.

- Historically the site has been managed as a grazed field, with a local farmer paying the Council a small fee for the grazing rights. However, over time public access has increased at the site along with the number of dog walkers. Given the issues of sheep worrying and dog fouling, the arrangement with the grazier has become problematical and as a result the Council has recently reassessed how the land is managed. A new approach is currently being adopted which involves a not-for-profit organisation 'Life for a Life', to create a memorial woodland on part of the site. The Council will retain ownership of the site and allows 'Life for a Life' to manage the site under the terms of a license. It is proposed that the remaining part of the site will be managed as a wild flower meadow. It is an approach which mirrors that on County Council land to the south east of the Crook O' Lune.
- The benefits to the future management of the site are significant:-
  - public access to the site will remain
  - the management of the site will be self-financing
  - improves the sites ecological value by creating new woodland and meadow habitats
- Once legal agreements have been finalised it is proposed that a formal handover/presentation takes place on the site involving the Advisory Committee.

### 3.0 Conclusion

- 3.1 Councillors are asked to appoint a Member of the Planning Regulatory Committee to the Crook O'Lune Advisory Committee.

#### **CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

**(including Diversity, Human Rights, Community Safety, Sustainability and Rural Proofing)**

None

#### **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Members of outside bodies are entitled to travel expenses. Cost resulting from this appointment should be minimal and would be met from existing democratic representation budgets

#### **LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Legal Services should be consulted with regards to the drafting of legal agreements on this matter.

#### **SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS**

The Section 151 Officer has been consulted and has no further comments.

#### **MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS**

The Monitoring Officer has been consulted and has no further comments.

**BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Representation on Outside Bodies File.

**Contact Officer:** Sarah Moorghen

**Telephone:** 01524 582132

**E-mail:** [smoorghen@lancaster.gov.uk](mailto:smoorghen@lancaster.gov.uk)

## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

## LANCASTER CITY COUNCIL

APPLICATION NO	DETAILS	DECISION
18/00129/DIS	Land At Aikengill, Scotforth Road, Lancaster Discharge of conditions 4, 6, 7, and 8 on approved application 17/00073/FUL. for Mr Lee Ogley (Scotforth East Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision
18/00902/FUL	Victoria Hotel, Victoria Terrace, Glasson Dock Change of use of pub (A4) to mixed use unit comprising of bar (A4) at ground floor, 2 holiday flats on the first floor and 2 residential flats on the second floor, and change of use of barn and outbuilding to form 4 2-bed dwellings (C3), construction of dormer extensions to the front elevation, erection of an external staircase to the rear, replacement of 2 second floor windows with 1 window, and infilling of existing ground floor openings on rear wall, demolition of rear link, and installation of new roof, windows, doors and balconies to the outbuilding for Mr Graham Cass (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn
18/00903/LB	Victoria Hotel, Victoria Terrace, Glasson Dock Listed Building application for construction of dormer extensions to the front elevation, erection of an external staircase to the rear, relocation of internal walls, removal of internal staircase and replacement with new, replacement of 2 second floor windows with 1 window, and infilling of existing ground floor openings on rear wall, demolition of rear link, and installation of new roof, windows, doors and balconies to the outbuilding for Mr Graham Cass (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn
18/01189/VCN	Pony Wood, Aldcliffe Road, Lancaster Construction of a footpath through agricultural land (from 'Long Pads' footpath to Aldcliffe Road) (Pursuant to the variation of condition 2 and 3 on planning permission 15/01440/FUL for the inclusion of a culvert, removal of one noticeboard and removal of pedestrian access) for Mrs Hilary Short (Marsh Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
18/01330/FUL	Morecambe Bay Wines And Spirits Co, Newgate, White Lund Industrial Estate Retrospective application for the change of use of 2 industrial units (B8) to 2 mixed use units; 1 comprising of a warehouse (B8) with associated shop and office (A1/B2) and 1 comprising of a warehouse (B8), brewery (B2) and bar/shop (A4/A1) and erection of a smoking hut and a fence to form beer garden area for Cross Bay Brewery (Westgate Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
19/00025/DIS	Land Along The East Bank Of The River Lune Between The A683 Viaduct And Skerton Bridge And Land Along The West Bank Of The River Lune East Off Halton Road/Main Street, , Discharge of condition 6, 9 and 11 on approved application 18/00751/FUL for Lancaster City Council (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision

## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

19/00035/DIS	Melling Farm, Melling Road, Melling Discharge of conditions 3, 4 and 5 on approved application 18/00022/CU for Mr Michael Griffiths (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision
19/00054/DIS	85-89 Penny Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Discharge of condition 8 on approved application 18/00588/FUL for Mr John Clarke (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00061/DIS	Development Site, Bulk Road, Lancaster Discharge of condition 5 on approved application 17/01413/VCN for . (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00072/DIS	Development Site, Bulk Road, Lancaster Discharge of conditions 20,21,22 and 23 on approved application 17/01413/VCN for Eric Wright Construction (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision
19/00075/DIS	Falcon House, 4 Queen Square, Lancaster Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 17/01443/LB for Mr Jonathan Whitford-Bartle (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00077/DIS	Street Record, Chapel Lane, Galgate Discharge of condition 3, 4 and 7 on approved application 18/00335/FUL for Mr Dave Devine (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00079/DIS	8 Sulyard Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 18/00689/FUL for Mr Houghton (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00080/DIS	8 Sulyard Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 18/00690/LB for Mr Houghton (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00083/DIS	Land Adjacent To , Bulk Road, Lancaster Discharge of conditions 9 and 10 on approved application 17/01413/VCN for . (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00086/DIS	26 Station Road, Hornby, Lancaster Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 18/00831/FUL for Mr Mark Norris (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00087/DIS	Development Site, Bulk Road, Lancaster Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 17/01413/VCN for . (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
19/00089/DIS	98 Church Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Part discharge of condition 3 on approved application 19/00082/LB for Mr & Mrs A Dennis (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00091/DIS	The Sports Centre, Bigforth Drive, Bailrigg Discharge of condition 3 and 5 on approved application 19/00163/FUL for Mr Frank McCabe (University And Scotforth Rural Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00092/DIS	Pennys Hospital, King Street, Lancaster Discharge of condition 3, 4 and 5 on approved application 18/01240/LB for Lancaster Charity (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

19/00093/DIS	St Leonards House, St Leonards Gate, Lancaster Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 18/00958/LB for Mr Ian McGee (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00094/DIS	St Leonards House, St Leonards Gate, Lancaster Discharge of condition 2 on approved application 18/00885/VCN for Mr Ian McGee (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00095/DIS	Cottages, Long Level, Cowan Bridge Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 18/01616/FUL for Mr Matthew Howson (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00096/DIS	11 First Terrace, Sunderland Point, Morecambe Part discharge of condition 3 on approved application 19/00415/LB for Mr & Mrs W Morris (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00098/DIS	The Sports Centre, Bigforth Drive, Bailrigg Discharge of condition 6 and 11 on approved application 19/00163/FUL for Mr Frank McCabe (University And Scotforth Rural Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00103/DIS	Deep Dene, 95 Hest Bank Lane, Slyne Discharge of condition 4 on approved application 17/00771/FUL for Miss L Northcott (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00105/DIS	Land Adjacent To , Bulk Road, Lancaster Discharge of conditions 4 and 31 on approved application 18/01363/VCN for . (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision
19/00117/DIS	Site Of Former Ridge Hotel, Patterdale Road, Lancaster Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 17/01572/FUL for Mr Gerard Tromp (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00199/ELDC	Wellington View Farm, Bay Horse Road, Ellel Existing lawful development certificate for the retention of an agricultural building for Mr Russell Sanderson (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
19/00247/VCN	The Travellers Choice, Coach And Travel Centre, Scotland Road Erection of a two storey side extension to accommodate maintenance and MOT facilities (pursuant to the variation of condition 2 on planning permission 16/01245/FUL in relation to amended plans to show the increase in width to the annex to new maintenance and MOT bay) for Mr John Shaw (Carnforth And Millhead Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
19/00311/FUL	White Cross Rubber Products, Units 17 And 18, Hightown White Cross Industrial Estate Extension of existing ventilation system including the installation of two vertical flue stacks for Mrs Karen Bax (Scotforth West Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00346/FUL	135 Balmoral Road, Heysham, Morecambe Change of use of Dwellinghouse (C3) to supported living accommodation (C3b) and conversion of garage to create ancillary office space for Mrs Sabe Connor (Heysham North Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn



## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

19/00364/VCN	Melling Farm, Melling Road, Melling Change of use of barn and land to create one residential dwelling (C3) with associated domestic garden (pursuant to the variation of condition 2 and removal of condition 11 on planning permission 18/00022/CU to amend the plans and remove the garage use restriction) for Mr Michael Griffiths (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00410/FUL	Riverside Cottage, Bazil Lane, Overton Erection of a part two, part single storey side extension, single storey rear extension and construction of a canopy to the front and a dormer extension to the rear for Mr Andrew Jarvis (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00422/FUL	Keer Holme, Keer Holme Lane, Priest Hutton Change of use of agricultural building to dwelling(C3), agricultural workshop and land to domestic workshop/stable and equine land in association with farmhouse and agricultural land to residential land in association with barn, installation of package sewage treatment tank and demolition of agricultural buildings for Mr T Askew (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00433/CU	Grand Car Centre, Whitegate, White Lund Industrial Estate Retrospective application for the change of use of car sales forecourt for the siting of a mobile catering van (A5) for Ms Susan Kay (Westgate Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
19/00435/FUL	Land Adjacent Bond Gate Farm, Abbeystead Road, Dolphinhholme Erection of a dwelling (C3), creation of a new access and associated landscaping for Mr Iain Collinson (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00446/FUL	45 Wennington Road, Wray, Lancaster Erection of a detached bungalow and 2.05 metre high boundary wall for Mr & Mrs Robert and Carol Emmett (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00465/FUL	Ridgeway Park, Lindeth Road, Silverdale Erection of a forestry building for Mr Anthony Stubbs (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00469/FUL	1 Cherry Tree Close, Heysham, Morecambe Erection of a single storey side extension and construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation for Mr Paul Brown (Heysham South Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00511/FUL	56 Albert Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Change of use and subdivision of dwelling (C3) to one 1-bed flat and two 2-bed flats (C3), installation of replacement basement window to the front elevation and installation of steel railings to the existing front boundary wall for Mr D. Ivy (Harbour Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00514/FUL	112 Kellet Road, Carnforth, Lancashire Creation of a vehicular access and installation of railings to the existing front boundary wall for Mr D. Wright (Carnforth And Millhead Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused

## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

19/00530/FUL	5 Levens Way, Silverdale, Carnforth Erection of a single storey front and side extension, demolition of existing conservatory and erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr Webster (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00547/FUL	4 St Michaels Place, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Construction of a 2 dormer extensions to the front elevation and construction of dormer extension to the rear elevation for Mr Paul Trusler (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00574/FUL	59 Broadacre, Caton, Lancaster Construction of a dormer extension to the front elevation and alteration to existing access for Mr And Mrs Halse (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00581/FUL	13 Coastal Road, Hest Bank, Lancaster Erection of a double garage, widening of an existing access and creation of a dropped kerb for Mr & Mrs Lee & Laura Fisher (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00583/FUL	The Spinney, Haverbreaks Road, Lancaster Erection of single storey side and rear extension for Mr & Mrs J. Sumsion (Scotforth West Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00585/FUL	45 Dutton Drive, Lancaster, Lancashire Construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation for Mr Martin Lancaster (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn
19/00586/FUL	112 St Leonards Gate, Lancaster, Lancashire Retrospective application for the change of use of the lower ground floor from storage to 3 studios for student accommodation (C3), the reconfiguration of the ground, first and second floor layout, installation of new window openings to the side of the outrigger and removal of steps at the rear for H Ahmed (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00602/FUL	Kellet Lane Bridge, Kellet Lane, Over Kellet Construction of a canal mooring, creation of an associated car park and alterations to existing access for Mr Kevin Woodhouse (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn
19/00611/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 7-bed cluster flat (C3), construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation and installation of rooflights to the front elevation for Mr R Abrol (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00617/FUL	Damas Barn, Abbeystead Road, Abbeystead Installation of an air source heat pump for Ms Mary McMurran (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00618/FUL	Cranewood, Tarnwater Lane, Ashton With Stodday Construction of dormer extension to front elevation, first floor balcony to the side and creation of raised decking to the rear for Mr & Mrs Howick (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

19/00626/ELDC	Unit 2C, Southgate, White Lund Industrial Estate Existing lawful development certificate for the erection of a single storey extension for Mr Russell Sanderson (Westgate Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
19/00631/REM	Stonehaven, Bay Horse Lane, Bay Horse Reserved matters application for the erection of 2 dwellings (C3) for Mr & Mrs Armer (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
19/00633/FUL	45 Beaufort Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of a replacement rear extension for Mr James Friedman (Bare Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00639/FUL	Gibraltar Farmhouse, Lindeth Road, Silverdale Change of use of attached garage and workshop to form holiday accommodation, erection of a first floor extension and creation of associated parking spaces and garden. for Mr Karl Greenall (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00640/LB	Gibraltar Farmhouse, Lindeth Road, Silverdale Listed building application for the erection of a first floor extension, installation of a new roof, rainwater goods, door and windows, construction of new window and door openings to the front, removal of internal wall and installation of partition walls for Mr Karl Greenall (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00647/ADV	23 North Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Advertisement application for the display of 1 non-illuminated hanging sign and 1 externally illuminated fascia sign for Mr Jonathan Cawthorn (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00648/PLDC	Unit 2C, Southgate, White Lund Industrial Estate Proposed lawful development certificate for the demolition of existing extensions and erection of a single storey side extension for Mr Russell Sanderson (Westgate Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
19/00650/FUL	7 Trumacar Lane, Heysham, Morecambe Erection of a porch to the front elevation for Mr M. Peel-Robinson (Heysham South Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00657/FUL	Grosvenor Apartments, Sandylands Promenade, Heysham Installation of replacement brickwork to all elevations for Mr Jon Gould (Heysham North Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00658/FUL	6 Gillison Close, Melling, Carnforth Erection of a first floor extension over existing garage for Mr And Mrs Howson (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00662/FUL	8 Heron Mews, Heysham, Morecambe Retrospective application for the conversion of existing garage to create ancillary accommodation, removal of existing garage door and installation of window to the front elevation for Heather Holgen (Heysham South Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
19/00663/FUL	Land West Of Mill Houses, Tatham, Lancashire Erection of a new building and polytunnel, relocation of existing entrance gate and creation of new access track for Mr & Mrs Clapp (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused

## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

19/00664/FUL	6 The Cliffs, Heysham, Morecambe Erection of a single storey side and front extension incorporating a decked area to the front elevation for Mr Brian Robinson (Heysham Central Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00667/LB	Nether Highfield, Park Lane, Halton Listed building application for the replacement of existing windows with colour coated aluminium windows for Mr T. G. & Mr. D. Bowring (Halton-with-Aughton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00668/LB	Nether Highfield, Park Lane, Halton Listed building application for the retention of a single storey side extension for Mr T. G. & Mr. D. Bowring (Halton-with-Aughton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00669/FUL	42 Eagle Close, Heysham, Morecambe Conversion of existing garage to create ancillary accommodation, removal of existing garage door and installation of window to the front elevation for Mr & Mrs Carmon (Heysham South Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00676/FUL	46 Silverdale Road, Yealand Redmayne, Carnforth Retrospective application for the retention of fence posts and reduction of a boundary fence for Mrs S Emery (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
19/00677/FUL	2 Main Road, Nether Kellet, Carnforth Erection of a two storey side extension, single storey rear extension, first floor rear extension and construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation for Mr T Evans (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00679/FUL	5 Salisbury Close, Heaton With Oxcliffe, Morecambe Erection of a two storey rear extension with a single storey link to garage for Mr Alex Howard (Westgate Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00680/FUL	30 Westbourne Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Conversion of existing garage to create ancillary accommodation, removal of existing garage door and installation of window to the front elevation for Mr Hitesh Mistry (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00687/REM	Woodside, Ashton Road, Ashton With Stodday Reserved matters application for the erection of 1 residential dwelling for Mr Michael Blackwell (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
19/00692/FUL	The Lodge, Westbourne Road, Lancaster Erection of a single storey side/rear extension and conversion of existing outbuilding into ancillary accommodation for Ms A. Granger (Marsh Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00693/FUL	Green Gables, Whams Lane, Bay Horse Erection of a two storey side extension and single storey rear extension for Mr & Mrs D. Brown (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00694/FUL	11 Seathwaite Avenue, Heysham, Morecambe Erection of a part single, part two storey rear extension for Mr Mike Casson (Heysham North Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

19/00696/FUL	Brunstow, Scriffen Lane, Galgate Extension to existing agricultural building to provide covered midden and creation of an area of hardstanding for Mr Hayhurst (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00698/FUL	2 Derwent Avenue, Morecambe, Lancashire Change of use of dwelling (C3) to supported living accommodation (C2) for Sandcastle Care Ltd Sandcastle Care Ltd (Poulton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00699/FUL	10 Hutton Gardens, Warton, Carnforth Demolition of conservatory and erection of a replacement single storey rear extension for Mr & Mrs A. Boyd (Warton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00700/PLDC	15 Hatlex Hill, Hest Bank, Lancaster Proposed Lawful Development Certificate for the construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation for Mr J. Clough (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
19/00701/PLDC	11 Gardner Road, Warton, Carnforth Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a single storey rear extension and construction of a hip to gable extension incorporating a dormer to the rear for Mr & Mrs C. Corless (Warton Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
19/00702/FUL	11 Gardner Road, Warton, Carnforth Erection of a single storey link extension to the side and rear for Mr & Mrs C. Corless (Warton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00703/FUL	1 Thistle Break, Heysham, Morecambe Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr R. Powell (Heysham South Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00704/PLDC	5 Goodwood Avenue, Slyne, Lancaster Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a single storey rear extension and construction of a dormer extension to the rear for Mr P. Bartle (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
19/00705/PLDC	228 Lancaster Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Proposed Lawful Development Certificate for the construction of a hip to gable extension and dormer extension to the rear elevation for Mr & Mrs Phelps (Bare Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
19/00714/FUL	9 Sizergh Court, Lancaster, Lancashire Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of a replacement single storey rear extension and erection of a single storey side and front extension for Mr Andre and John Dohnalek (Marsh Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00715/FUL	34A Pedder Street, Morecambe, Lancashire Change of use of mixed use unit comprising a shop at ground floor level (A1) with accommodation above (C3) to a shop at ground floor level (A1) with one 2 bed flat and one 3-bed flat above (C3) for Mr G. Broadley (Poulton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00718/LB	23 North Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Listed building application for the installation of 1 non-illuminated hanging sign and 1 externally illuminated fascia sign for Mr Jonathan Cawthorn (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

19/00719/FUL	South Farm, 18 Main Street, Overton Erection of a single storey side/rear extension for Mrs Karen Dinsdale (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00721/FUL	Clear Water Fisheries, Kellet Lane, Over Kellet Partially retrospective application for the erection of otter protection fencing for Mr Alex Mollart (Warton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00723/ADV	Keyline Builders Merchants Marsh Point, New Quay Road, Lancaster Advertisement application for the display of 1 non-illuminated fascia sign and 1 non-illuminated wall sign for Mr David Gardner (Marsh Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00725/PLDC	28 Queens Drive, Morecambe, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the construction of dormer extensions to the side and rear elevations for Mr & Mrs Lewis (Bare Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
19/00727/PLDC	7 Hyndburn Close, Morecambe, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the conversion of existing garage to living room and the replacement of existing garage door with window and brickwork for Mr Wayne Gallagher (Skerton West Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
19/00729/FUL	26 St Austell Place, Carnforth, Lancashire Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr & Mrs Walters (Carnforth And Millhead Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00734/FUL	Town House, Whitebeck Lane, Priest Hutton Erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr & Mrs E+L Hodgson (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00735/FUL	25 Toll Bar Crescent, Lancaster, Lancashire Demolition of conservatory and garage and erection of single storey rear and side extension, construction of a hip to gable roof and dormer extension to rear elevation and creation of a raised terrace to the rear for Mr And Mrs Gornall (Scotforth West Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00736/FUL	54 Park Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr & Mrs P. Bass and S. Hall (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00738/LB	Poplar House, Main Street, Wray Listed building consent for installation of new partition walls, staircase and doors, replacement rooflights to east roof pitch and an extractor fan to east roof pitch, replacement timber window to the north elevation and installation of a cast iron soil vent pipe to the south elevation for Dr Ian Parkinson (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00741/PLDC	4 Alan Grove, Heysham, Morecambe Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a single storey rear extension for Mrs G. Knowles (Heysham South Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted

## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

19/00752/PLDC	1 Elkin Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Proposed Lawful Development Certificate for the construction of a hip to gable roof and construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation for Mr & Mrs Briggs (Bare Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
19/00764/FUL	1 Pinewood Avenue, Morecambe, Lancashire Construction of a hip to gable extension and dormer extension to the rear elevation for Mrs C. Taylor (Bare Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00774/AD	Arna Wood Farm East, Arna Wood Lane, Aldcliffe Agricultural determination for the erection of an agricultural building for Mr Bennett (Scotforth West Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Not Required
19/00784/FUL	28 Tithebarn Hill, Glasson Dock, Lancaster Erection of a first floor rear extension and installation of a pitched roof to existing single storey rear extension for Mr Price (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00787/FUL	10 Peel Crescent, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of single storey rear and side extension and installation of a ramp to rear for Mr Kevin Harwood (Marsh Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00790/FUL	11 Mill Lane, Warton, Carnforth Demolition of existing front porch and erection of a front porch for Mr & Mrs Stephenson (Carnforth And Millhead Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00799/ELDC	Galgate Cricket Club Pavilion, Main Road, Galgate Existing Lawful Development Certificate for the siting of a cricket pavilion and community rooms for Mrs Gill Mason (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
19/00813/PLDC	24 Norfolk Avenue, Heysham, Morecambe Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a single storey rear extension for Ms A Bochenek (Heysham North Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
19/00818/PLDC	19 Ingleton Drive, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a single storey side extension for Mr & Mrs P. Wilkinson (Scotforth East Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
19/00835/AD	Lower Langthwaite Farm, Littlefell Lane, Lancaster Agricultural determination for the resurfacing of existing farm yard for Mr Philip Wood (University And Scotforth Rural Ward)	Prior Approval Not Required
19/00845/OUT	Cannondale, Westbourne Road, Lancaster Outline application for demolition of existing garage, erection of replacement garage and erection of 2 single storey dwellings(C3) for Mrs Marjorie Vaughan-Jones (Marsh Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn
19/00847/PLDC	20 Chapel Lane, Overton, Morecambe Proposed lawful development certificate for the construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation for Mr & Mrs Keefe (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
19/00851/FUL	Littledale Hall, Littledale Road, Littledale Change of use of agricultural buildings to storage units (B8) for Mr Fred Leigh (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn

## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

19/00859/NMA	Broadway One, Dallam Avenue, Morecambe Non material amendment to planning permission 17/00311/VCN to raise the height of part of the boundary wall to the side elevation adjacent to Strathmore Hotel for Mr Michael Stainton (Poulton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00893/NMA	Land At Grid Reference 351057 464848, Low Road, Halton Non material amendment to planning permission 17/01423/REM to re-orientate the garden/garage to plot 45 for Mr Warren Cadman (Halton-with-Aughton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00919/HLDC	Lancaster Railway Station, Westbourne Road, Lancaster Application for a certificate of lawfulness for proposed refurbishment of railway station platform canopies for Network Rail (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted