



**Committee:** PLANNING REGULATORY COMMITTEE

**Date:** MONDAY, 22 JUNE 2020

**Time:** 10.30 A.M.

## PLEASE NOTE

**THIS WILL BE A 'VIRTUAL MEETING', A LINK TO WHICH WILL BE AVAILABLE ON LANCASTER CITY COUNCIL'S WEBSITE AT LEAST 24HRS BEFORE THE MEETING.**

## 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 27<sup>th</sup> April 2020 (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 | <a href="#"><u>A5 20/00019/FUL</u></a> | <b>Lower Addington Farm Birkland<br/>Barrow Road Nether Kellet</b>   | <b>Kellet Ward</b>     | <b>(Pages 4 -<br/>13)</b>  |
|   |  | Erection of an agricultural building for free range hens with associated parking.  |                        |                            |
| 6 | <a href="#"><u>A6 20/00371/VCN</u></a> | <b>B &amp; Q Superstore 48 Aldcliffe<br/>Road Lancaster</b>  | <b>Castle<br/>Ward</b> | <b>(Pages 14 -<br/>23)</b> |
|   |  | Relevant Demolition of existing retail building (A1) and associated water tank and enclosure, and the erection of a food store (A1) with associated car parking, external plant and enclosure, servicing areas and hard and soft landscaping (pursuant to the variation of condition 2 on planning application 18/01100/FUL to amend the location of plant equipment size and details of the |                        |                            |

external plant enclosure and  
acoustic fencing).

**7 Appointment to Crook O'Lune Advisory Committee (Pages 24 - 25)**

**8 Delegated List (for meeting of 1 June 2020) (Pages 26 - 32)**

**9 Delegated List (for meeting of 22 June 2020) (Pages 33 - 38)**

## **ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS**

### **(i) Membership**

Councillors Sandra Thornberry (Chair), Paul Anderton, Richard Austen-Baker, Mandy Bannon, Alan Biddulph, Dave Brookes, Abbott Bryning, Keith Budden, Roger Cleet, Tim Dant, Mel Guilding, Janice Hanson, Cary Matthews, Joyce Pritchard and Robert Redfern

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

Councillors Victoria Boyd-Power (Substitute), Kevin Frea (Substitute), Jake Goodwin (Substitute), June Greenwell (Substitute), Tim Hamilton-Cox (Substitute), Colin Hartley (Substitute) 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 9<sup>th</sup> June 2020.

Agenda Item	Committee Date	Application Number
A5	22 June 2020	20/00019/FUL

Application Site	Proposal
Lower Addington Farm Birkland Barrow Road Nether Kellet Carnforth	Erection of an agricultural building for free range hens with associated parking and installation of package treatment plant

Name of Applicant	Name of Agent
Mr Gott	HPA Chartered Architects

Decision Target Date	Reason For Delay
Extension of time until 26 June 2020	Awaiting comments from Natural England and the Lead local Flood Authority

<b>Case Officer</b>	Mrs Eleanor Fawcett
<b>Departure</b>	No
<b>Summary of Recommendation</b>	Approval

## 1.0 The Site and its Surroundings

- 1.1 The site comprises an area of agricultural land located between the settlements of Aughton, Over Kellet and Gressingham and lies between Birkland Barrow Road and Kirkby Lonsdale Road. It forms part of a larger field which rises up from the northwest boundary towards Kirby Lonsdale Road to the southeast. There is an existing access to the edge of the site off Birkland Barrow Road, approximately 280 metres to the northwest, which serves an existing poultry building. This access and building is at a slightly higher level than the lower section of the site. Along the northwest boundary is Swarth Beck, which is a partly culverted watercourse and around this there is potential for surface water flooding (1 in 30 and 1 in 100 years). To the north is land outside the applicant's ownership, part of which comprises a former quarry and contains a wooded area. To the south east of the field is a wooded area adjacent to the highway, approximately 10 and 18 metres in depth, which is covered by a Tree Protection Order (TPO).
- 1.2 The site is located within the Countryside Area, as identified on the Local Plan proposals map and is approximately 10 metres from the boundary of the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), which lies on the south eastern side of Kirkby Lonsdale Road. There is a high pressure gas pipeline crossing the field within which the development is proposed to be sited and a public footpath approximately 60 metres to the north east of the site boundary, which connects Kirkby Lonsdale Road and Birkland Barrow Road. It also links to a public footpath on the opposite side of Kirkby Lonsdale Road which extends into the AONB. The site is also located in a Mineral Safeguarding Area and an area identified as low risk from coal mining activities.
- 1.3 The nearest residential properties are a small group at Swarthdale, approximately 270 metres to the north and a detached dwelling, Oaken Head Farm, approximately 450 metres to the southwest of the site boundary. At both these locations there are existing equestrian businesses.

## 2.0 The Proposal

- 2.1 Planning permission is sought for the erection of a large agricultural building to house hens for free range egg production. It will be sited towards the northwest boundary of the field. The building is proposed to be 92 metres long, 15.25 metres wide and have a height of 3.6 metres to the eaves and 5.7 metres to the ridge. Vents are proposed in the roof which would project above the ridge height to

6.3 metres above ground level. Two feed silos are proposed towards the centre of the northwest elevation with a width of approximately 3 metres and a height of 7.8 metres. The building would be constructed in steel insulated panels, with the walls clad in vertical larch boarding and the roof, silos and doors finished in moorland green (RAL 100 60 10). The building is proposed to house 16,000 birds in a multi-tier system, with the central section housing plant. There would be pop-holes on the south east side of the building to allow the hens to enter and leave the building during the day.

2.2 The development will use the existing access off Birkland Barrow Road which serves one of the poultry buildings under the same ownership. The access will be required to be extended to reach the new development and a new access road and turning and surfacing area will be provided to the northwest of the building. Some works will be required to the land to provide a level area for the building which will include some raising and some lowering of the ground. Landscaping is proposed adjacent to the boundary in addition to along a former field boundary that runs in a north west/south east direction. A small package treatment plant is also proposed to serve the development.

**3.0 Site History**

3.1 Planning permission was refused in October 2019 by the Planning Regulatory Committee for the erection of a free-range poultry building on the application site. This was contrary to the recommendation within the Committee report. This proposed building was in a similar location to the current proposal, but measured 133.8 in length and was to be constructed of metal panels finished in green. It was refused for the following reason:

*“The development will have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the landscape, including the incongruous and urbanising impact on this rural area. The proposal is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of the Sections 12 and 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Saved Policy E4 of the Lancaster District Local Plan, and Policies DM28 and DM35 of the Development Management Development Plan Document.”*

3.2 Prior to this, planning permission has also been refused twice for the erection of an agricultural building for free-range hens and creation of a new access point on land to the south east of the current application site, close to Kirkby Lonsdale Road. An appeal was submitted in relation to the second of these applications (16/01351/FUL), and the Planning Inspectorate resolved to dismiss this and not grant planning consent for the proposal. The application was refused for the following reason:

*“By reason of the size, siting and design of the building, the topography of the land, the size, design and location of the proposed access, including the removal of a section of woodland trees, and the associated engineering operations, the development will have a detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the landscape, including the incongruous and urbanising impact on this rural road and the significant harm to the established woodland belt. As a result of this, the development would also have an adverse impact on the setting of the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The proposal is therefore contrary to the aims and objectives of the core Planning Principles and Sections 7 and 11 of the National Planning policy Framework, Saved Policies E3 and E4 of the Lancaster District Local Plan, and Policies DM28, DM29 and DM35 of the Development management Development Plan Document.”*

3.3 There are also a number of other developments in the vicinity of the site associated with the free-range poultry business. These relate to two agricultural buildings for free-range hens and an agricultural worker’s dwelling. These are all accessed from Birkland Barrow Road. The development closest to the site (09/00554/FUL), which will provide access to the proposed development, has been in operation the longest. The relevant history is set out below

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
19/00746/FUL	Erection of an agricultural building for free range hens with associated landscaping and parking	Refused
18/01287/PRETWO	Pre-application advice in relation to the construction of an Agricultural building for Free-Range Hens	Advice in relation to new building at current application site
16/01351/FUL	Erection of an agricultural building for free-range hens and creation of a new access point	Refused and appeal dismissed

#### 4.0 Consultation Responses

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

Consultee	Response
Nether Kellet Parish Council	<b>Support in principle.</b>
Over Kellet Parish Council	<b>Object.</b> Raise concerns in relation to: pollution to Swarth Beck and impacts on biodiversity; effects on residents from potential air and watercourse pollution; and potential contamination by agro-chemicals.
Environmental Health	No comments received within the statutory consultation period. However, <b>no objection</b> was raised in response to the previous application - unlikely to be adverse or noticeable noise impacts or significant impacts on air quality or as a result of odour (subject to consultation with the Environment Agency).
County Highways	<b>No objection.</b> The application will have a minimal effect on the generation of additional vehicle movements over surrounding lengths of the public highway network
Lead Local Flood Authority	<b>No objection</b> subject to conditions requiring final details of the drainage scheme.
County Council Planning	No comments received within the statutory consultation period.
Public Rights of Way Officer	No comments received within the statutory consultation period.
Ramblers Association	No comments received within the statutory consultation period.
Environment Agency (EA)	<b>No objection in principle.</b> It would be assumed under the 'aggregation of capacities' rule that the existing environmental permit would need to be varied to include the proposed unit. As such the design and management of the unit would have to meet the design and operating standards set out in the Environmental Permitting Regulation (England and Wales) 2016. The more recent layout complies with the requirements of the permit, and addresses the points raised in the response to the earlier application in relation to pollution control.
Natural England	<b>No objection</b>
Cadent Gas/National Grid	<b>No objection</b>
Forest of Bowland AONB Partnership	No comments received within the statutory consultation period.
Coal Authority	<b>Comments</b> – Consultation not required as the site does not fall with the defined development High Risk Area. Request that the Coal Authority's standing advice is attached to any consent as advice.
Health and Safety Executive (Padhi Assessment)	<b>Do not advise against development</b>

#### 5.0 Neighbour Representations

5.1 21 pieces of correspondence have been received objecting to the proposal and raise the following concerns:

- Detrimental visual impact from building, fencing and associated lorries; utilitarian design of the building which would be prominent and incongruous within the landscape; limited screening and would result in a substantial encroachment into the rolling landscape; cumulative visual impact; location adjacent to the AONB
- Question implementation of proposed screening and impacts from poultry to this surviving/ maturing  
Impact on the avenue of trees on the boundary with the AONB
- Industrialisation of the area
- Noise, odour and airborne pollution and cumulative impact with two other approved poultry buildings, and milling machine at adjacent site, and associated health implications
- Impact on users of public footpath/ Lancashire Way

- Cumulative impact with large feed silos erected at the adjacent building without consent
- Increase in large vehicle movements; impacts on narrow network of roads, including condition; impacts to walkers, runners, cyclists and horse riders
- Pollution, silt and debris to Swarth Beck from runoff and soil erosion, including during construction, and impact on wildlife and health, which could enter Morecambe Bay
- Impact and loss of wildlife including that which uses the adjacent woodland
- Increase flood risk from surface water run-off
- Increase in vermin
- Impact on high pressure gas pipeline from re-profiling of land
- Welfare of the birds
- Will not support the local community
- No evidence of use of renewable or low carbon energy
- No environmental benefits
- Inconsistencies within the submission
- Serviced by diesel tractors and lorries, is energy intensive and therefore contrary to the Council's Climate Emergency policy.
- No engagement with the local community

5.2 Correspondence has been received from County Councillor Phillipa Williamson which raises an objection to the proposal and the following concerns:

- Must consider the effect on local residents and the environment in terms of noise, odour, dust, nitrogen and ammonia on a cumulative basis (i.e. in conjunction with the existing buildings)
- Detrimental effect on the character and appearance of the landscape, incongruous and urbanising impact, lack of screening, substantial encroachment into the rolling landscape and cumulative impact with existing development
- Visual and noise impact of articulated lorries
- Concerns about re-profiling of land to create a new watercourse and potential impact on pipeline
- Visual impact of fencing
- Soil erosion
- Limited benefit to local economy

5.3 A petition containing 67 signatures has also been received, objecting to the proposal.

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

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

Paragraphs 83 and 84 – Supporting a prosperous rural economy

Paragraph 109 - 110 – Access and Transport

Paragraphs 124 and 127 – Achieving well-designed places

Paragraph 170 – Protecting valued landscapes

Paragraphs 170,175 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:

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

The Examination Hearing Sessions took place between the 9 April 2019 and the 1 May 2019. The Council has published the proposed Main Modifications to the Local Plan. An eight-week consultation into the modifications was undertaken and expired on 7 October 2019.

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

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

Given the current stage of both DPDs, it is considered that some weight can be attributed to the policies contained therein 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 Core Strategy (adopted July 2008)

SC1 – Sustainable Development  
SC5 – Achieving Quality in Design

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

E3 – Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty  
E4 – Countryside Area

### 6.5 Development Management Development Plan Document (DM DPD)

DM7 – Economic Development in Rural Areas  
DM20 – Enhancing Accessibility and Transport Linkages  
DM27 – Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity  
DM28 – Development and Landscape Impact  
DM29 – Protection of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland  
DM35 – Key Design Principles  
DM39 – Surface Water Run-Off and Sustainable Drainage

### 6.6 Other Material Considerations

The Forest of Bowland AONB Landscape Character Assessment (2009)  
A Landscape Strategy for Lancashire: Landscape Character Assessment (2000)

## 7.0 Comment and Analysis

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

- Principle of the development
- Landscape and visual impact
- Impact on residential amenity
- Impact on ecology
- Access and highway impacts
- Surface water drainage
- Impact on National Grid Infrastructure

### 7.2 Principle of the development

7.2.1 The proposal relates to the erection of a large agricultural building to house hens for free-range egg production and would be operated in association with the existing business which has two similar buildings close to the site. DM7 of the DM DPD sets out that proposals for economic development will be supported where they maintain and enhance rural vitality and character and improve the sustainability of rural communities by bringing local, economic, environmental and community benefits. Other development proposals supported in principle include essential operations for agriculture where there is a proven and justified need. The proposal will support the existing business and does relate to an agricultural enterprise and is therefore considered to be acceptable in principle in this rural area.



### 7.3 Landscape and visual impact

- 7.3.1 The building is proposed to be sited towards the north west end of a large agricultural field, at almost ninety degrees to an existing poultry building to the northwest. The land slopes gently downwards from Kirkby Lonsdale Road towards the site of the proposed development and rises slightly beyond this. The site and surrounding landscape are characterised by rolling fields created by glacial activity which have drumlins of varying heights and steepness. There are also scattered areas of mature woodland, in particular around a former quarry to the north of the site and adjacent to Kirkby Lonsdale Road which continues on the opposite side of the highway, within the AONB. The landscape in this location is classified as Drumlin Field, sub-type Docker-Kellet-Lancaster (13c), within the Lancashire Landscape Character Assessment. The landscape character sensitivity is considered to be moderate to high as a result of the pattern of landscape features, including stone walls, hedgerows and pockets of woodland. Overall, the Drumlin Field Landscape Character Type is considered to have limited capacity to accommodate change without compromising key characteristics.
- 7.3.2 The site is predominantly screened from the north and north east by the rising landform and trees. It is most visible to the east, from Kirby Lonsdale Road and a public footpath, across the adjoining fields. To the south and southeast, the site is afforded screening from the mature trees adjacent to the highway. The proposed building would be visible within the landscape from both the highway and the public footpath, although it has been sited towards the lower levels of the field which would limit the impact to some degree. At present the existing agricultural building is visible to varying degrees, depending on the viewpoint, as some screening is provided by the woodland group to the east of this. The development would be partly seen in the context of the existing building, rather than appearing as a wholly isolated structure. However, it is noted that a landscaping scheme has been previously agreed to help mitigate the visual impacts of the existing building within the landscape, with the intention that this would provide screening from the road and footpath.
- 7.3.3 The siting of the building has addressed some of the concerns raised by the previously refused applications for a building located closer to Kirkby Lonsdale Road. The impacts of a new access have been removed by utilising the one serving the existing poultry building. The new building is proposed to be sited closer to this so is more likely to be viewed in association with this, rather than as a wholly isolated structure. It would also be at a lower level of the field, would require less engineering operations reducing the amount of changes to the existing landform. The size of the building was reduced, following some pre-application discussions. It has been further reduced in length by 42 metres following the refusal of a similar proposal on this site. There is a former field boundary running up to Kirkby Lonsdale Road, identified by a relatively low mound. The building would be sited to the southwest of this boundary which would be reinstated with a hedgerow and some trees in order to break up the main views of the building from the main views from the public right of way and Kirkby Lonsdale Road to the east and northeast. This will allow the building to be better visually contained within features typical to this landscape, whilst it is unlikely that it would be wholly screened. Other additional landscaping is also proposed to help screen the building within the landscape and also in relation to the existing poultry building to the northwest.
- 7.3.4 The proposal relates to a large utilitarian building which would occupy part of the open and undulating agricultural field. Therefore, it has the potential to appear quite prominent and incongruous within the landscape, even with its positioning in the lower part of the field. The landform is not sufficient to screen the building and, whilst it would be partly seen in conjunction with the existing building, it is still quite detached from this building, would result in encroachment into the rolling landscape, and would increase the amount of development visible. However, with the reinstatement of the field boundary, the additional landscaping, and the finish of the building in timber cladding with a green roof and silo buildings, it is considered that the landscape and visual impacts can be mitigated to a large degree, although the landscaping will take time to mature. Overall, it is considered that the development would not have a significant adverse landscape and visual impact and will be seen in the context of the existing agricultural development, rather than as a more isolated building.

### 7.4 Impact on residential amenity

- 7.4.1 The nearest residential properties are a small group at Swarthdale, approximately 360 metres to the north of the proposed building. There are some other residential properties in the locality, although these are located at greater distances from the site. Given the distance, existing landform and trees,

there will be no adverse impacts on outlook, daylight or privacy to the residential properties. This building will be a similar distance from these properties than the existing one adjacent to the site.

- 7.4.2 Whilst a response is still awaited from the Environment Agency, in relation to the last proposal on this site, they advised that the two existing poultry buildings in this area are covered by an environment permit. Inspections since the permit was issued have shown compliance with permit conditions. Although the unit itself is below the threshold of 40,000 poultry places required for an environmental permit, it would be assumed under the 'aggregation of capacities' rule that the permit would need to be varied to include this proposed unit. As such the design and management of the unit would have to meet the design and operating standards set out in the Environmental Permitting Regulation (England and Wales) 2016. They raised no objections to the previous proposal which was to accommodate a lower number of birds. As such, it is unlikely that they would raise an objection to the current proposal, however, this will be updated at the Committee meeting.
- 7.4.3 Environmental Health has been consulted in relation to the application, but has not provided a response. However, the response in relation to the previous application is equally relevant to this proposal. During the previous application, it was confirmed that, whilst the existing poultry buildings have been operational, they have received one complaint about fan noise and this was received after the submission of the current application. This complaint was referred to the Environment Agency, as the regulatory authority for any nuisance related complaints for these types of premises. In relation to potential noise impacts to nearby residential properties, Environmental Health has advised that, considering the likely small number of additional vehicular movements to this site, that this is an existing regularly used rural road, accessed by all types of road traffic, including agricultural vehicles, and given separation distances between the site access area and residential properties, it is unlikely that there will be adverse or noticeable noise impacts. Furthermore, vehicle movements would have to increase substantially before resulting in a perceptible difference in sound and therefore unlikely to result in an adverse impact.
- 7.4.4 Noise has been previously considered at the site of the existing buildings by Environmental Health. In relation to the most recent building, not the one immediately adjacent to the site, it has been advised that noise was clearly audible around the perimeter of the site to areas where the fans were located, less audible along the public footpath, and was inaudible along Swarthdale Road. Whilst noise was not assessed within garden locations or from inside properties, given the property locations and separation distances to the noise source, absence of complaints and inaudibility of noise along Swarthdale Road, it is considered unlikely that noise associated with the existing buildings has had an adverse impact to nearby receptors. It was also advised that, from these monitoring locations, fan noise associated with the existing building adjacent to the site was inaudible. Any combined sound associated with the ventilation of these buildings where there is similar sound power level output, will result in insignificant sound contributions, which would be 'just perceptible' to the human ear in near proximity. Therefore it is considered that there would be 'no observed effect levels' in respect of noise associated with the proposed unit.
- 7.4.5 In relation to odour, the Air Quality Officer advised that there was one complaint in September 2017 regarding a chemical smell associated with existing poultry unit at this location, though investigation and further monitoring by the complainant did not identify the cause of this or identify any further issues. The matter was also referred to the Environment Agency (EA) as the regulating body at the time. A further complaint was investigated in August 2019 alleging issues of smoke, dust and feathers arising from existing units. A site visit did not witness the occurrence, although a photograph of a dusty vent to a unit was sent to the Environment Agency. The Environment Agency has been consulted, as set out above, and their response will be reported. However, they did not previously highlight any concerns regarding noise, odour or air quality.
- 7.4.6 The Air Quality Officer advised that for local air quality management purposes, DEFRA's technical guidance TG(16) provides advice on where air quality is likely to be a local air quality management objective exceedance consideration. Guidance indicates that releases of particulate may be a consideration for very large units (units accommodating above 400,000 birds where mechanical ventilation is used) for exposure within 100 metres. The application site, in isolation but also cumulatively with the other units, is significantly below this figure and there does not appear to be any relevant exposure within 100 metres. On this basis it is considered that the development would not lead to an exceedance of an air quality objective standard.

7.4.7 Overall it is considered that the proposal would not have a significant adverse impact to the amenities of nearby residential properties or to air quality. As set out above, the operation would be covered by an environmental permit, which will provide levels and controls for noise, odour and air quality. As set out in paragraph 183 of the NPPF, the focus of planning decisions should be on whether the development is an acceptable use of land rather than the control of processes or emissions where these are subject to separate pollution control regimes.

## 7.5 Impacts on Ecology

7.5.1 In relation to the previous application, Natural England advised that further information was required in order to fully assess any impacts on European and nationally-designated sites in relation to aerial pollutants emitted from this type of development. Additional information was provided and Natural England raised no objections to the proposal. They have confirmed that this is the case in respect of the current application.

7.5.2 An ecological appraisal has been submitted with the application. This sets out that the site comprises poor semi-improved grassland with stone walls and fences on its boundary and is enclosed by improved grassland, tall ruderal, marshy grassland and mixed deciduous woodland. The species recorded are all commonly occurring. The poor semi-improved grassland has a very low species diversity and ecological value. Whilst the assemblage of species within it is higher than improved pasture, the species are all indicative of regular grazing and disturbance, and this habitat does not constitute a BAP habitat.

7.5.3 In relation to amphibians, there is no standing water on the site and the core development area is open and exposed so is of low value. The report goes on to say that the development would not result in the permanent loss of or substantial negative effect on waterbodies or foraging areas linked to them. There is one record of badger within 2km of the site. Badger setts do not occur on site and a lack of feeding signs or runs across the site would suggest that they do not occur within 30 metres of site boundaries. The development would not impact on any existing badger runs or setts and the porosity of the surrounding fields to the passage of badgers will not be affected.

7.5.4 In relation to bats, the report sets out that the foraging habitat at the site is very poor, being open and exposed. The poor semi-improved grassland offers negligible foraging opportunities for bats and the stone walls and fences on the boundary are poor in terms of their structure, diversity and interconnectivity. The wall to the boundary does provide some habitat linkage for bats whilst the remainder of it comprises open and exposed pasture. More extensive areas of medium and high quality habitat occur locally, including the woodland and marshy grassland. To confirm that the site is not used by significant numbers of bats, a bat monitor was left on the site for 7 days in May/June 2019. Six species of bat were identified from their calls. The numbers of passes was low with 40 in total recorded over 7 nights monitoring. The report considers that the bat species identified are highly unlikely to rely on the site for feeding but may occur in the local area and roosting will not occur on the site. The poor semi-improved grassland has a low potential for use by nesting birds as the grassland is grazed and as such is usually short and trampling risks are also very high within this area of the site. Species such as Curlew have been recorded feeding on adjacent fields, which are damper. The potential for use of the wider fields by this species will not, however, be compromised by the proposal.

7.5.5 No indication of brown hares was recorded on the site and risk to this species is considered to be low. The report sets out that 100 notable invertebrates have been recorded within 2km of the site. No deadwood or vegetation on site was recorded which would provide an important resource for invertebrates in the local area. It goes on to say that the significance of the site to invertebrates is likely to be limited in the local context although the habitat on site will support invertebrate species. Mitigation can be incorporated into the design and landscaping scheme with the careful selection of plant species. There are no records of otters within 2km of the site and no indication of the presence, or past use of the site, by otter was found. The stream is considered unlikely to support fish and there are no waterbodies in proximity to the site which would be attractive to Amphibians. In relation to reptiles, the majority of the site has a very low value being devoid of significant ground cover and there are no areas of the core development area which would be particularly favourable to reptiles. There are no records of water voles within 2km of the site and no signs, such as droppings, feeding piles or footprints were present on site. The report considers that this species is likely to be absent from the site. Precautionary mitigation would be appropriate in respect of retaining or recreating soft edges to the stream.

7.5.6 The report recommends precautionary mitigation in relation to several species, some of which is mentioned above. It sets out that the stream could be fenced from the adjacent field to prevent livestock poaching of its banks and this would create a wildlife corridor. The submitted site plan shows a fence in line with the building which would prevent access to the beck which also addresses some comments from the Environment Agency to prevent pollution of the water course. A suitable drainage scheme should also ensure that any pollution to the watercourse is prevented which would include measures to ensure that dust around vents is not washed into the beck. Overall, it is considered that the development would not have an adverse impact on biodiversity and is likely to provide opportunities for improvement with fencing off the land from the watercourse and the additional planting, including hedgerow.

## 7.6 Access and highway impacts

7.6.1 The development will utilise the access serving the existing poultry building adjacent to the site. The submission sets out that the same wagon that currently services this building will service the new unit and, as such, there will be no net increase in HGVs. The building requires infrequent servicing, no more than twice a week by no more than one 40ft articulated vehicle to bring feed and to collect the eggs. There will also be a visit at the start and end of the cycle for re-stocking purposes. Car access will be daily for the member of staff looking after the birds and visitor spaces are provided for cleaning contractors who fumigate the building at the end of the 60 week cycle and for vets. A management plan currently exists which makes HGVs approach from the west, avoiding the village of Over Kellet, and following the established route of the quarry lorries through the northern fringes of Nether Kellet. The Highway Authority has advised that the application will have a minimal effect on the generation of additional vehicle movements over surrounding lengths of the public highway network and have therefore raised no concerns or objection.

## 7.7 Drainage and pollution

7.7.1 A drainage scheme has been provided to address an existing flow route across the field, due to the topography. This is not a watercourse but is just an indication of a route that surface water runoff takes, as informed by surface water flooding maps. The drainage scheme shows the re-profiling of the land to direct surface water around the building into an infiltration basin. It also shows a filter drain adjacent to the proposed hardstanding, with water from the hardstanding directed to a soakaway via a separator and water from the building directed to a soakaway. The LLFA has raised no objections to the approach put forward in the submission. They have requested a condition requiring precise details of the final drainage scheme. They have highlighted that the infiltration testing method used is not an appropriate test for major developments and that the impermeable area used in the calculations does not represent the proposal. However, this may just mean that the size of the soakaway needs to be increased, and there is scope for this within the site. This can be covered by the condition.

7.7.2 A small package treatment plant is proposed to serve the development and has been identified on the plan with an associated drainage field.

7.7.3 In addition to the above, the Environment Agency gave some recommendations in relation to pollution of the watercourse during the previous application. They have advised that the most recent drainage layout complies with the requirements of the permit and addresses the points raised in the response to the earlier application, specifically:

- The provision of a soakaway for roof drainage, and a separator to serve the drains for the vehicle parking/turnaround area;
- Wash water generated from within the unit is collected into sealed wash water/effluent tanks for removal from the site. Any external areas used for wash down activities and areas around the manure conveyors should also drain to sealed tanks. There should be diverter valves on drains on any yard area that could possibly become contaminated during mucking out and wash down. This would ensure contaminated yard run off can be diverted to the wash water/effluent tank during clean-out. Once clean-out is completed, during the period when birds are housed, these drains can be diverted back to surface water;
- There is treatment provision (soakaway and filter strip / drain) for any yard or roof area with the potential to become lightly contaminated, including roof area under extractor vents;
- The ranging area does not include Swarth Beck and therefore there is no direct pollution risk to Swarth Beck from the birds; and

- Foul drainage is to a sewage treatment plant with drainage field, with no direct discharge to the watercourse.

7.7.4 Overall it is considered that surface and foul water resulting from the development can be adequately dealt with, with measures put in place to prevent pollution of Swarth Beck.

#### 7.8 Impact on National Grid Infrastructure

7.8.1 National Grid have raised no objections to the proposal as the proposed building is outside the easement and area of interest. They will still be required to liaise with National Grid regarding works within the field, but it is considered that the development can be undertaken without impacting on the High Pressure Gas Pipeline.

### 8.0 Planning Obligations

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

### 9.0 Conclusions

9.1 The proposal will support the existing agricultural business in this location and will therefore have a positive impact on the rural economy. As a result of the reduced scale, siting close to an existing unit and proposed landscaping, it is considered that there would not be a significant adverse impact on landscape or visual amenity, although it is acknowledged that the landscaping will take some time to mature. In addition, the larch cladding should reduce the more industrial appearance of the building. It is considered that there would not be a detrimental impact to residential amenity, highway safety or biodiversity. The proposal is therefore considered to be acceptable and complies with the aims and objectives of the Development Plan as a whole.

### Recommendation

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

1. Standard three year timescale
2. Approved plans
3. Surface water drainage scheme
4. Foul water drainage scheme, pollution prevention measures, and management of manure
5. Tree protection
6. Materials: Colour and finish to walls, roof of the building, the vents and the feed silos; all external surfacing materials; details of any boundary treatments, including gates.
7. Landscaping scheme
8. Ecology mitigation
9. Operated in accordance with the delivery access route

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

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

### Background Papers

None

Agenda Item	Committee Date	Application Number
A6	22 June 2020	20/00371/VCN

Application Site	Proposal
B & Q Superstore 48 Aldcliffe Road Lancaster Lancashire	Relevant Demolition of existing retail building (A1) and associated water tank and enclosure, and the erection of a food store (A1) with associated car parking, external plant and enclosure, servicing areas and hard and soft landscaping (pursuant to the variation of condition 2 on planning application 18/01100/FUL to amend the location of plant equipment and details of the external plant enclosure and acoustic fencing)

Name of Applicant	Name of Agent
Mr Adam Robson	Miss Emily Roberts

Decision Target Date	Reason For Delay
3 July 2020	N/A

<b>Case Officer</b>	Mrs Jennifer Rehman
<b>Departure</b>	No
<b>Summary of Recommendation</b>	Approve

## 1.0 The Site and its Surroundings

- 1.1 The application site relates to a 0.59 hectare brownfield site located approximately 120 metres southwest of the city centre (and its primary shopping area), occupying an edge of centre location. Surrounding development is largely residential with some nearby commercial uses located along Queen Street and Aldcliffe Square. The rears of 25 – 49 Portland Street and the side of 50 Aldcliffe Road flank the western boundary of the site. 23 Portland Street and its rear garden, Speights warehouse (food suppliers) and 24 Queen Street and its garden border the northern boundary. Queen Street borders the north eastern corner of the site with Aldcliffe Road running along the south eastern boundary of the site.
- 1.2 Access/egress into the site is taken off Aldcliffe Road around 35m north east of the junction with Queen Street. The site has a triangular form and previously accommodated a B&Q DIY retail unit with associated car parking, serving and storage areas, water tank and landscaping. A small sub-station is located on the southern boundary. The building occupied most of the northern half of the site with the car parking dominating the southern part of the site. This former B&Q store and its associated external storage compound and garden centre enclosure have all been demolished. The site is currently under construction with the superstructure to the permitted foodstore building now erected on site.
- 1.3 The topography of the site is relatively flat with an elevation of approximately 22m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD), with a slight fall towards the southern western corner. The site sits marginally higher than Aldcliffe Road and Queen Street. Neighbouring properties on Portland Street are elevated above the site and separated by a wooded embankment that has been retained as part of the site's redevelopment.
- 1.4 The site is situated within Lancaster Conservation Area (High Street Character Area), immediately adjacent to the Aldcliffe Road Conservation Area. There are a number of Listed buildings in relatively close proximity to the site (e.g. 20-22 Queen Street and the Aldcliffe Yard buildings associated with Lancaster Canal basin), with a number of non-designated heritage assets of local importance situated immediately adjacent to the site (e.g. Portland Street/Speights Warehouse building). Trees within the site not subject to individual Tree Preservation Orders but are protected by virtue of the Conservation Area designation.

1.5 The site is outside a flood risk area (i.e. within flood zone 1) or critical drainage area. The northern boundary of the site is subject to surface water flooding (1 in 100yr and 1 in 1000yr). The city’s Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) is located approximately 160m east of the centre of the site. Lancaster Canal is a Biological Heritage Site and in the saved Local Plan enjoys ‘Green Corridor’ and ‘Informal Recreational Area’ allocations.

**2.0 The Proposal**

2.1 Planning permission was granted on the 9<sup>th</sup> July 2020 for the relevant demolition of the existing retail building, water tank and enclosure, and the erection of a new foodstore building with associated parking, external plant, enclosures, service areas and landscaping.

2.2 The applicant has implemented this planning permission and now seeks to vary the planning permission under the provisions of Section 73 of the Town and County Planning Act 1990 (herein referred to as the Act).

2.3 Section 73 of the Act relates to the determination of applications to develop land without compliance with conditions previously attached. One of the uses of a section 73 application is to seek a minor material amendment, where there is a relevant condition that can be varied. The local planning authority (LPA) must consider only the question of the conditions subject to the application. Should the LPA decide to grant permission, it can do so either unconditionally or subject to amended conditions. Should the LPA decide the permission should be granted subject to the same conditions as those subject to which the previous planning permission was granted, the LPA should refuse the application.

2.4 The applicant seeks planning permission to vary the approved plans pursuant to condition 2, specifically to amend the layout of the plant equipment, the external plant area and its enclosure. The applicant now proposes to house some of the plant equipment inside the building on a mezzanine as well as retaining some plant equipment externally.

2.5 The external plant enclosure measures 11.5m by 4.5m situated between the rear elevation of the new building and the northern stone wall boundary. The dimensions and the position of the enclosure within the site remains largely as approved. It remains approximately 9.5m from the north western corner of the new building and approximately 11.5m from the retaining wall that sits along the western boundary. The main changes relate to the finished slab level of the plant enclosure. Unlike the approved scheme where the enclosure was anticipated to be over one external level (22.2m AOD), the proposed enclosure is now over two external levels (21.9m AOD and 22.7m AOD). The external plant equipment will be positioned at the lower of the two levels. This has resulted in the need to accommodate some plant equipment internally (on a mezzanine). The enclosure shall be set in from the party wall by approximately 0.5m. The details of the enclosure fence form part of this application and comprise a 3.2m to 4m high timber acoustic fence to the north and western boundaries of the enclosure with a 3m high galvanised palisade fence to the eastern boundary.

**3.0 Site History**

3.1 The most relevant planning history is set out in the table below. This Section 73 application relates to planning permission reference 18/01100/FUL. The relevant pre-commencement conditions have been complied with under a number of discharge of condition applications.

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
19/00125/DIS	Discharge of conditions 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 18 on approved application 18/01100/FUL	Approved (safe for details of the enclosure fence)
19/00147/DIS	Discharge of conditions 17 and 20 on approved application 18/01100/FUL	Approved
19/00157/DIS	Discharge of conditions 3, 5 and 11 on approved application 18/01100/FUL	Approved
19/00166/DIS	Discharge of condition 9 on approved application 18/01100/FUL	Approved

19/00200/DIS	Discharge of condition 4 on approved application 18/01100/FUL	Approved
19/01357/ADV	Advertisement application for the display of 2 externally illuminated fascia signs, 1 non-illuminated totem sign and 1 non-illuminated window sign	Approved
19/01577/NMA	Non material amendment to planning permission 18/01100/FUL to reduce the size of the external plant enclosure	Withdrawn
18/01100/FUL	Relevant Demolition of existing retail building (A1) and associated water tank and enclosure and erection of a food store (A1) with associated external plant and enclosure, car parking, servicing areas with hard and soft landscaping	Approved and implemented
12/00917/PLDC	Lawful development certificate for proposed use as a food store	Certificate granted for unrestricted retail use.
99/00668/FUL	Erection of a 3.6 metre high galvanised weld mesh fence to form secure compound - Approved	Approved
82/01247	DIY store with car parking (Reserved Matters)	Approved
81/1196	Erection of a DIY retail unit with associated parking	Allowed at Appeal

#### 4.0 Consultation Responses

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

Consultee	Response
<b>Environmental Health Service</b>	<p><b>No objection</b> to the amended plant configuration and plant enclosure.</p> <p>Additional comments provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The amendments and supporting noise statement demonstrate that rated noise levels will meet those cited within condition 26 of the planning permission.</li> <li>No concerns about noise impacts from the plant inside the building, as the fabric of the building will provide higher levels of attenuation than the proposed acoustic enclosure.</li> <li>No need to acoustically treat all sides of the enclosure as the current mitigation sufficiently demonstrates that the noise rating levels cited within condition 26 of the planning permission can be met.</li> <li>Noise monitoring is not justified as the requirements of condition 26 will ensure that sound levels will be at 'no' or 'lowest' observed effect levels.</li> </ul>
<b>Conservation Officer</b>	<p><b>No objection</b> noting that the proposed works will not change the level of impact to the Conservation Area.</p>

#### 5.0 Neighbour Representations

5.1 At the time of compiling this report four letters of objection have been received. A summary of the main reasons for opposition are set out below:



- The external plant has been installed ahead of the determination of the application and that Aldi are operating in breach of their planning permission. Comments received stress that the proposals should not be allowed to go ahead as a 'fait accompli'. Little confidence that residents' interests will be taken onboard by Aldi once the store is up and running.
- Concerns that approval of this will pave the way for further incremental infringements and erosion of residential rights, amenities and living conditions.
- Further noise mitigation detail to secure the approved Rating level has not been submitted and agreed before the building is brought into use or the equipment is operational.
- Lack of commitment or detail to monitor noise levels once the plant is operational.
- Concerns over the validity of the noise report and questions posed in relation to the need for all boundaries of the enclosure to be acoustically treated.
- Impossible to know the level of noise from the internal refrigeration units.
- Impact on residential amenity by virtue of loss of outlook and loss of light due to the height of the acoustic fence, which will impede light through the transparent elements of the existing boundary (trellis fencing) and will visually dominate the boundary and make the garden feel "boxed in".
- The details relating to the height of the acoustic fence relative to the party boundary is vague. In particular, the party trellis fencing varies in height along the boundary, so reference to the new acoustic fencing being "equal height to the trellis" is unclear.
- The acoustic fence will put the garden into shade and alter the wind direction and turbulence affecting the growth of vegetation and climbing shrubs, which in turn will expose the barrier and its visual impact. Change to air flow will increase noise.
- The new building and the increased fence height will alter the aerodynamics around the building exacerbating noise.
- Noise from rainwater running off the roof into the guttering.
- Potential structural impacts on retaining wall from the enclosure.

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

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

Section 2 – Achieving sustainable development

Section 4 – Decision making

Section 12 – Achieving well designed places

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

Section 15 – Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Section 16 – Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

#### **6.2 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:

The Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD and (A Review of) The Development Management DPD.

The Examination Hearing Sessions took place between the 9 April 2019 and the 1 May 2019. The Council has published the proposed Main Modifications to the Local Plan. An eight-week consultation into the modifications was undertaken and expired on 7 October 2019.

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

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

Given the current stage of both DPDs, it is considered that some weight can be attributed to the policies contained therein 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 Core Strategy (Adopted July 2008)

SC1 – Sustainable Development

## 6.4 Development Management DPD

DM31 – Development affecting Conservation Areas

DM35 – Key Design Principles

## 6.5 Other Material Considerations

Noise Policy Statement for England (NPSE) March 2010

BS 8233:2014: Guidance on Sound Insulation and Noise reduction for Buildings

BS 4142:2014 Methods for Rating and Assessing Industrial and Commercial Sound

World Health Organisation (WHO) 1999: Guidelines for Community Noise

## 7.0 Comment and Analysis

7.1 There are three main issues to consider in relation to this application:

- 1) Noise considerations, specifically that the changes to the development would avoid noise giving rise to significant adverse impacts and that the development could continue to be carried out and operated in accordance with condition 26 of the original planning permission controlling noise levels.
- 2) Residential amenity, specifically in relation to the height and appearance of the acoustic fencing along the boundary of the neighbouring property.
- 3) Heritage consideration, specifically whether the height and appearance of the acoustic fencing would have harmful effects on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area.

## 7.2 Noise Considerations

7.2.1 Consideration of likely noise impacts emanating from the development and the relationship of such on neighbouring residential development was a key issue during the consideration of the original planning application. The main noise sources related to the general use and operation of the foodstore, deliveries and servicing, and noise emitting from the external fixed plant. After lengthy negotiation, the original planning permission was granted subject to several planning conditions controlling the use and operation of the foodstore and its associated infrastructure to minimise the noise effects on neighbouring residents. These conditions included the requirement for a Service Delivery Plan (condition 18), opening times and delivery hours (conditions 23 and 24) and a condition limiting the noise from external plant equipment (condition 26). This application does not seek to amend or modify any of the above conditions.

7.2.2 The proposed amendments relate solely to the housing of the plant equipment, the layout and details of the external plant area and details of the associated plant enclosure. The application seeks to modify the approved plans pursuant to condition 2 to account for these changes.

7.2.3 New issues can arise after planning permission has been granted, which requires the modifications of the approved proposals. This is not an uncommon scenario. Planning legislation and guidance recognises this with several planning mechanisms available to applicants to try and to secure amendments to existing planning permissions. Section 73 of the Act deals with modifications to a

scheme that are more than non-material but not fundamentally or substantially different from the approved scheme.

- 7.2.4 The changes have arisen because of the need to avoid altering the existing levels around the party stone boundary wall and ventilation requirements of the fixed plant (as a consequence of the changes to the slab levels). To address this the applicant proposes changes to the locations of the fixed plant, alterations to the levels of the external plant area and an increase to the height to the fixed plant enclosure.
- 7.2.5 One item of fixed plant shall be relocated inside the building on a new mezzanine. The remaining fixed plant shall remain outside abutted up against the rear elevation of the building. The slab level for the plant is narrower than the approved enclosure due to the land levels rising towards the party wall. Changes have also arisen following officer concerns (during the consideration of a recent discharge of condition application) in relation to the acoustic qualities of the originally proposed acoustic fence. Originally (within the Discharge of Condition application) the applicant proposed a mesh panel at the bottom of the proposed enclosure to provide enough air flow for the fixed plant. Officers challenged the implications of this and the effects this may have on meeting the noise limits set out in condition 26.
- 7.2.6 Before examining the modifications in more detail, it is useful at this juncture to note what the requirements of the approved noise mitigation and the requirements of the original planning permission. Condition 26 requires the development to be carried out in accordance with the noise mitigation set out in the final approved noise report. The mitigation is as follows:
- The enclosure shall extend to a height of at least 0.5m above the height of the tallest item of plant;
  - The enclosure fencing shall be solid (i.e. imperforate);
  - The enclosure shall be formed of a homogenous material with a superficial mass of at least 15kg/m<sup>2</sup>;
  - Any penetrations, junctions or doors shall be treated such that the acoustic integrity of the enclosure is maintained.
- 7.2.7 This level of mitigation demonstrated that the noise rating level (34dB) from the development should result in a 'no observed effect level' (NOEL). This is a level of noise exposure below which no effect at all on health or quality of life can be detected (i.e. no adverse noise impacts). This does not mean that the noise would not affect the acoustic character of an area but not to the extent there is a change in the quality of life. Condition 26 requires the development to comply with this noise mitigation and specifically limits the external fixed plant to a rating level of no more than 34dB within the external amenity area at the nearest residential receptor (to achieve a NOEL).
- 7.2.8 The siting of fixed plant on a new internal mezzanine raises no significant concerns. It will not be visible, and the fabric of the building will exceed the acoustic qualities of the external plant enclosure. Consequently, there are unlikely to be any significant noise impacts deriving from this change to the scheme. The changes to the external plant and the acoustic qualities, scale and appearance of the enclosure are more notable.
- 7.2.9 The remaining fixed plant shall be sited in an external enclosure to the rear of the building in the same location as previously approved. The changes to the levels within the enclosure and the effect this has on the noise emanating from the fixed plant has been remodelled. An updated Noise Statement has been provided with the application. The objective of the noise assessment, re-design of the plant and noise mitigation is to adhere to the noise limit set by condition 26 of the original planning permission.
- 7.2.10 The fixed external plant has a sound pressure of 33dB at 10m. As the neighbouring garden is closer than 10m this has been corrected resulting in a specific noise level of 35dB. In line with the original noise assessment, a further 6dB has been added to account for reflections off the façade of the store and other characteristics. This results in a rating level of the fixed plant of 41dB. This clearly identifies that noise mitigation is required to avoid adverse noise impacts on the neighbouring residents and compliance with the noise condition. The screening effect of a fence relative to the height of the existing wall would not provide enough mitigation (offering a reduction of only 5dB). The proposal now incorporates an acoustic fence measuring 3.2m from the higher of the two enclosure levels (m AOD) and 4m from the lower level. The submitted details indicate that this is just below the height of the trellis fence erected above the stone wall. It is noted that the trellis fence does not extend the full length of the northern boundary.

- 7.2.11 The proposed acoustic fence should offer a reduction of 10dB bringing it below the noise rating level specified in the noise condition. On this basis, there should be no adverse noise impacts associated with the modifications to the external plant enclosure. This also demonstrates that the noise criteria detailed in the noise condition should be achieved. The Council's Environmental Health Officer has reviewed the submission and the concerns raised by residents and raises no objections to the amendments.
- 7.2.12 Neighbouring residents are naturally concerned about the proposed modifications to the development and the effects the changes may have on noise and residential amenity. This is particularly pertinent to the residents of 23 Portland Street who are most affected by the changes, as the plant enclosure sits alongside the southern boundary of their rear garden. The position of the external plant enclosure remains similar to the approved position, though the enclosure will now be set in from the boundary by approximately 0.5 metre. Residents' concerns relate mainly to the validity and accuracy of the noise assessment, concerns over the lack of commitment to noise monitoring and the fact the developer has already commenced the works which they seek permission for via this application. Aside from the noise likely to be generated from the external plant equipment, concerns have also been raised in connection with aerodynamic effects of the building itself and the acoustic fence, which may exacerbate noise further. Similar concerns have been raised in relation to the noise from rainwater running off the new roof into the guttering.
- 7.2.13 Firstly, the methodology adopted in the noise assessment follows best practice guidance having regard to planning policy and guidance and the relevant British Standards. Wind speeds are accounted for in such assessments. The original noise assessment was scrutinised extensively during the consideration of the original application. The noise statement provided with this application has adopted the same approach to the finally approved noise assessment which was accepted by the Council's Environmental Health Officer (as our expert in this field). Subsequently, there are no substantive grounds to resist the proposal because of an inadequate assessment of noise. Secondly, the effects of noise from the development on windier days is not likely to be a concern as the wind itself is more likely to drown out the noise from the plant (which incidentally would not be harmful with the mitigation in place). Finally, it is accepted that in certain circumstances the design and layout of a development may alter the atmospheric considerations around it, such as aerodynamics. In this case, however, the effects of the scale and form of the new building (a matter that is not the subject of this application) should be an improvement to the former B&Q building, which stood taller to the rear than the approved (and now constructed) building.
- 7.2.14 With regard to noise monitoring, the evidence submitted with the application demonstrates that with mitigation the noise emanating from the external fixed plant should not have an adverse impact. Condition 26 sets a noise rating limit for the plant (not to exceed at 34dB). The requirements of this condition are enough to control noise levels and ensure the development does not adversely impact residents. It is not possible (nor reasonable) to impose additional requirements, such as noise monitoring, unless such meets the six tests for imposing conditions. The proposed noise mitigation demonstrates there would be at 'lowest' or 'no' observed effect level. As such imposing noise monitoring would not be reasonable or necessary. The Council's Environmental Health Officer's comments echo this point. It is well rehearsed that planning should not duplicate controls which are the statutory responsibility of other bodies. However, it is also recognised that an integrated approach helps achieve more sustainable outcomes. The point here is that the development has been designed to avoid adverse noise impacts on surrounding residential development and that such is already controlled by the planning permission. Should the local authority receive justifiable complaints about unreasonable noise levels or that noise levels were giving rise to adverse impacts, the Council's Environmental Protection team would investigate as part of their statutory function.
- 7.2.15 Having regard to the details of the submission, planning policy and guidance and the comments raised by neighbouring residents, on balance the proposed amendments and noise mitigation are considered acceptable and do not conflict with the requirements of paragraphs 127 and 180 of the National Planning Policy Framework and DM35 of the DM DPD, which seeks to avoid adverse noise impacts and to secure an acceptable standard of amenity for all. The Council's Environmental Health Officer has reviewed the submission and the concerns raised by residents and raises no objections to the proposals from a noise perspective.

### 7.3 Residential Amenity

- 7.3.1 Policy DM35 states that the Council will expect development to have no significant detrimental impact on amenity in relation to overshadowing, visual amenity, privacy, overlooking, massing and pollution. Securing a high standard of amenity for existing and future users is also a requirement of the NPF (Section 12). The previously approved plant enclosure assumed a slab level of 22metres Above Ordnance Datum (AOD) abutting the stone boundary wall. In front of this existing stone wall a 3.2m high fence was proposed, which was originally designed to sit no higher than the top of the stone wall. The outlook for this neighbour was previously considered acceptable, subject to conditions controlling the precise position, appearance and design of the enclosure.
- 7.3.2 There is approximately 8 metres between the furthest rear elevation of the neighbouring property to the closest part of the enclosure. The enclosure extends 11.5m along the side of the neighbouring garden. The neighbouring property is positioned higher than the proposed site, although their garden level falls slightly to the east. The neighbouring property has a set of French doors (habitable window) overlooking their garden immediately adjacent to the site boundary. As noted earlier the party boundary comprises a historic stone wall with trellis fencing erected above on the neighbour's side. The full extent of the northern party boundary does vary with trellis in some sections and not in others. The amount of trellis exposed above the stone wall varies along the boundary too. There is also domestic planting along the boundary that is more established along certain sections of the wall than others.
- 7.3.3 From within the garden the outlook and light differs along the boundary as a consequence of the coverage of vegetation and the extent of transparent trellis fencing. The main concerns raised relate to the loss of outlook and light because of the acoustic fence now sitting at a height equivalent to the top of the trellis opposed to the top of the wall, thus blocking light and views through the trellis fencing. To be clear, the acoustic fence will be 3.2m tall (from the higher of the two slab levels of the enclosure). It will be visible from the neighbour's garden and property. The first circa 8m of the party boundary from the rear of the property to the enclosure will remain open (this is the section of the boundary with the most trellis). From there the boundary mainly consists of the stone wall and mature domestic planting, which currently overhangs the boundary (in parts). Along some sections of the boundary the existing garden vegetation may screen the acoustic fence. It is noted that the neighbour has concerns that the acoustic fence will threaten the growing conditions of existing plants potentially reducing any screening potential of the garden plants. There is no dispute that the acoustic enclosure fence will be visible from the rear of the property and from the garden and that the outlook will be different from what was originally approved. The issue is whether such would significantly adversely affect the residential amenity of the adjoining property.
- 7.3.4 Whilst the acoustic fence is taller than originally envisaged and will now be visible above the stone wall, the height is not such that it would have a significantly overbearing effect or result in a significant loss of light. The acoustic fence, which shall be set away from the stone wall by approximately 0.5m, will extend above the stone wall by between 0.6 and 0.8m (it will vary along the boundary). It will also be screened by some existing vegetation (on the neighbour's side) and is of a design and appearance that is judged relatively sympathetic against the backdrop of the new, lower building (compared to the height of the former B&Q building).
- 7.3.5 The acoustic fence is set around 8m from the rear elevation of the house and therefore leaves a suitable degree of openness between the neighbouring dwelling and the external plant enclosure. The fence would not adversely affect light to the rear habitable room of the dwellinghouse. The fact the property is elevated assists in this regard.
- 7.3.6 In terms of outlook, the neighbour will experience a change in their outlook as a consequence of the taller acoustic fence. It is accepted this is a backward step from what was originally envisaged when assessing the earlier application. However, the outlook from the property was and remains onto a large retail site with a single large building sitting alongside the property boundary. The provision of the acoustic fence, despite sitting closer to the party boundary than the building, will not exceed the tallest (and transparent) sections of the existing boundary treatment to have a significantly overbearing impact to render the property unsuitable for habitation or such that the garden area would be unusable. Having obtained measurements from the neighbour (due to Officers being unable to enter property during the pandemic), the height of the existing boundary stone wall ranges between 1.4m and 1.55m and 2.09m and 2.3m including the trellis above (taken from their garden levels). The transparent element of the boundary ranges between 0.6m and 0.8m above the stone wall. The acoustic fence would block the transparent sections of the boundary treatment for 11.5m of the boundary (albeit set away by 0.5m).

- 7.3.7 The neighbour's boundary treatment (including trellis) sits just above 2m high from their own garden levels. A 2m high boundary treatment to a domestic property is typical and is usually a solid 1.8 to 2m high fence/boundary. Solid 2m high fences/boundary treatments are (subject to some exemptions) permitted development suggesting such a height is not likely to be harmful. Whilst the impact of the fence has not improved as a consequence of the proposed modifications and the neighbour will be affected by the solid fence siting behind the transparent sections of their boundary treatment, the height of the acoustic fence is judged not to significantly adversely affect residential amenity.
- 7.3.8 Officers recognise that the proposed change to the plant enclosure is not ideal and that the earlier proposals would have been preferable. Unfortunately, the changes have arisen because of the need to secure suitable noise mitigation to protect the same neighbours against noise from the external plant. Officers have asked if there is flexibility to lower the proposed fence given the anticipated rating level from the plant (with mitigation) is 31dB (3dB lower than the noise limit set out in the condition). Unfortunately, there is very little head room. Small incremental changes to the height of the acoustic fence make a big difference in the amount of attenuation afforded to the barrier. A very marginal lowering of the fence would have to be balanced against increased noise. Any marginal drop is not going to be to the extent originally envisaged during the determination of the original planning permission and therefore the same visual effects of the acoustic fence would remain. On balance, it is contended that securing the highest level of mitigation against noise outweighs the change in outlook and the visual impacts the barrier will have when viewed from the neighbouring property. Overall, the amendments are considered acceptable and would conform with policy DM35 of the DM DPD and the NPPF.

#### 7.4 Heritage Considerations

- 7.4.1 DM31 emphasis that development should preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. To achieve this, proposals should respect the character of the surrounding built form and its wider setting and should not result in the loss or alterations of features which contribute to the special character of a building or area. The proposed changes to the scheme do not affect the quality of the design and appearance of the development. The enclosure position remains unaffected (i.e. as previously approved) with the only major modifications relating to the height of the acoustic fence.
- 7.4.2 Whilst this has an effect on neighbouring residential amenity, the modifications would have a neutral impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area. The rear of the building and the proposed enclosure will not be highly visible from within the wider Conservation Area. The proposed materials and design of the acoustic fence is complementary to the design of the building. The Council's Conservation Officer has considered the proposals and has raised no objections. The proposal does not conflict with the statutory duty of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990 (to give special attention to the desirability of preserving and enhancing the character of the Conservation Area) or DM31 of the DM DPD and Section 16 of the NPPF.

#### 7.5 Planning conditions

- 7.5.1 An approval under Section 73 of the Act effectively results in the grant of a new stand-alone planning permission. Therefore, all the original planning conditions have been reviewed to ensure they remain necessary and relevant. Where such conditions continue to meet the tests for imposing conditions, the conditions will be replicated. Following the grant of planning permission, the applicant has submitted various discharge of condition applications to satisfy those conditions requiring details to be agreed ahead of certain triggers throughout the development phases. Condition 1 of the original planning permission relates to the time limit to which the development must commence. Condition 4 (archaeological investigation) has been fully discharged in consultation with the County Archaeologist. These conditions have been satisfactorily met and do not need to be re-imposed should this proposal be accepted. Conditions 3, 5 to 18 and 20 of the original approval shall be retained but reworded to reflect the details agreed by condition. Conditions 19 and 21 to 28 shall remain as originally drafted.

### 8.0 Planning Obligations

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

### 9.0 Conclusions

9.1 The proposed modifications to the plant enclosure were not anticipated and to a certain extent are unfortunate. However, the applicant has demonstrated that the changes would not compromise the ability to comply with the noise condition, which is the forefront of the planning considerations. The amendments to the plant layout and enclosure, together with the mitigation, would provide mitigation to secure no adverse noise impacts from the development. The unfortunate knock-on effect has been the visual effects from the taller acoustic enclosure that would sit alongside the garden boundary of the neighbouring property. Whilst the taller fence is not as preferable to the earlier enclosure detail, it would not significantly adversely affect the residential amenity (outlook, loss of light) of the neighbouring property to substantiate a refusal of this application. Its design and appearance is sympathetic and complementary to the new building, which will form the main view from the neighbouring dwelling and garden. On balance, the proposal is considered compliant with the Development Plan and the NPPF and can therefore be supported.

**Recommendation**

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

1. Approved plans list (amended to reflect the proposed modifications)
2. Implementation of Tree Protection Plan and Arboricultural Method Statement
3. Implementation of approved Employment Skills Plan
4. Implementation of approved site access and off-site highway improvement scheme
5. Land contamination remediation
6. Implementation of approved drainage scheme
7. Surface water maintenance plan
8. Implementation of approved ventilation/ducts details
9. Implementation of approved recommendations set out in original ecological appraisal
10. Construct development in accordance with approved material, architectural detailing, surfacing and boundary details
11. Construct development in accordance with approved lighting and security scheme
12. Construct development in accordance with approved refuse provision
13. Implementation of approved electric charging facilities and cycle storage
14. Implementation of approved habitat creation
15. Implementation of approved car parking management strategy
16. Implementation of approved service delivery and waste management strategy
17. Provision of parking
18. Implementation of approved Travel Plan
19. Separate drainage systems
20. Net sales shall not exceed 1,300 sqm. No more than 20% of the net sales floorspace shall be used for the display and sale of comparison goods
21. Hours of operation limited to 08:00 – 22:00 Monday – Saturday and 09:00 – 17:00 Sundays and Bank Holidays
22. Hours of deliveries limited to 07:00 – 22:00 Monday – Saturday and 09:00 – 17:00 Sundays and Bank Holidays
23. Landscaping condition to be implemented and maintained
24. Noise mitigation and noise levels for plant to be secured and maintained

**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****22nd June 2020****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 18<sup>th</sup> May 2020, full Council re-confirmed 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.

<p><b>CONCLUSION OF IMPACT ASSESSMENT</b>                  (including Diversity, Human Rights, Community Safety, Sustainability and Rural Proofing)</p> <p>None</p>	
<p><b>FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS</b></p> <p>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</p>	
<p><b>LEGAL IMPLICATIONS</b></p> <p>None</p>	
<p><b>SECTION 151 OFFICER'S COMMENTS</b></p> <p>The Section 151 Officer has been consulted and has no further comments.</p>	
<p><b>MONITORING OFFICER'S COMMENTS</b></p> <p>The Monitoring Officer has been consulted and has no further comments.</p>	
<p><b>BACKGROUND PAPERS</b></p> <p>Representation on Outside Bodies File.</p>	<p><b>Contact Officer:</b> Jenny Kay  <b>Telephone:</b> 01524 582065  <b>E-mail:</b> jkay@lancaster.gov.uk</p>

## LANCASTER CITY COUNCIL

APPLICATION NO	DETAILS	DECISION
18/00983/FUL	Old Hall Caravan Park, Capernwray Road, Capernwray Erection of caravan reception/office building with warden accommodation with associated car parking for Mr James Whiteman (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00898/FUL	3 Mary Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Partially retrospective application for the change of use of print works (B1) to student accommodation comprising 1 5-bed cluster flat (C4) and installation of replacement windows to the front and side elevations for Sutton (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/00950/FUL	Hill Croft, Quernmore Brow, Quernmore Demolition of existing garage and erection of a two-storey outbuilding for Mr Hoad (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/01455/FUL	English Hardwood Design Ltd, Unit 10, Boundary Lane Erection of a single storey rear extension and associated earthworks for Mr Paul Anderson (Carnforth And Millhead Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
19/01488/FUL	1 - 7 Euston Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Change of use of shop (A1) to cafe (A3), installation of a new shop front, replacement windows and doors and installation of glass balustrades to create external seating area for Mr Walden (Poulton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/01507/FUL	Canal Cottage, School Lane, Glasson Dock Erection of a part single part two storey extension to the south elevation and a single storey detached outbuilding for Janet Reid (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/01519/FUL	10 Carr House Lane, Lancaster, Lancashire Retrospective application for the installation of replacement bay windows to front elevation for Mr Richard Fusco (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/01555/FUL	The Willows, Moor Close Lane, Over Kellet Change of use of agricultural land to domestic garden, demolition of existing dwelling and erection of a part single storey and part two storey replacement dwelling incorporating terrace and installation of a package treatment plant for Mr & Mrs Simon Whiley (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/01580/FUL	Archbishop Huttons Primary School, Back Lane, Warton Relevant demolition of a barn and creation of community garden. for Mrs Sarah Watson (Warton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00001/FUL	Balmullo, Bay Horse Road, Ellel Erection of a two-storey extension to the front, side and rear and construction of two dormer extensions to the front for Mr & Mrs Boswell (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

20/00003/DIS	Ellel Hall, Ellel Hall Gardens, Galgate Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 19/00413/FUL for Mr & Mrs Smith & Hewitt-Smith (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision
20/00006/DIS	Ellel Hall, Ellel Hall Gardens, Galgate Discharge of conditions 3 and 4 on approved application 19/00414/LB for Mr & Mrs Smith & Hewitt-Smith (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision
20/00006/LB	Cawthorne's Endowed School, The Rake, Abbeystead Listed building consent for installation of a replacement non-illuminated wall mounted sign for Mrs M Lee (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00018/DIS	Harren House, Woodman Lane, Cowan Bridge Discharge of conditions 3 and 4 on approved application 19/00958/FUL for Mr Andrew Barker & Mrs Louise Barker (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision
20/00027/DIS	Slaters Amusements, 267 - 268 Marine Road Central, Morecambe Discharge of conditions 4,5 and 6 on approved application 12/01088/CU for Mr Jason Slater (Poulton Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision
20/00030/DIS	Intack Farm, Littledale Road, Littledale Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 18/01313/CU for Mrs Kelly Hey (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
20/00032/DIS	Brooklands Buildings, Addington Road, Halton Discharge of conditions 3,4 and 5 on approved application 19/00877/FUL for Mr Peter Gott (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00036/DIS	Land For Proposed Bailrigg Business Park, Bailrigg Lane, Lancaster Discharge of condition 2 on approved application 19/00942/FUL for BAM Construction (University And Scotforth Rural Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00037/DIS	Land To The Rear Of 1 And 2 Lea Lane, Heysham, Morecambe Discharge of conditions 3 and 4 on approved application 19/01292/REM for Ashton Homes Lancashire Ltd (Heysham South Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00038/FUL	19 Townsfield, Silverdale, Carnforth Demolition of conservatory and outbuilding and erection of a 2 storey dwelling and installation of a package sewage treatment plant for Mrs Sandra Mayer (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00048/DIS	5 Borwick Court, Borwick, Carnforth Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 19/01303/FUL for Mrs Jeanette Morrell (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00056/ELDC	Freshfield House, Pasture Lane, Bolton Le Sands Existing Lawful development certificate for the use of the building known as Freshfield House as single residential dwelling (falling within Use Class C3) in breach of conditions 3 and 5 of planning permission 1/78/1147 for Mrs Janet McDougall (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
20/00076/FUL	30 Main Road, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Erection of a single storey side extension, replacement of existing conservatory with a single storey rear extension, installation of a raised	Application Refused

## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

roof with front and rear gables, installation of a new shop front and the installation of 2 new ducts on the side elevation for Mr C Oktem (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)

20/00084/ELDC	Dene Cottage & Wayside Cottage, Main Street, Whittington Existing lawful development certificate for the use of Wayside Cottage as a separate independent dwellinghouse for Mr Richard Skelton (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
20/00091/FUL	16 Greenwood Drive, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Demolition of existing two storey side extension and erection of 2 storey side extension and front porch for Mr & Mrs Richard and Charlotte Lowe (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00097/FUL	34 Cavendish Road, Heysham, Lancashire Change of use of part of ground floor and first and second floors from house in multiple occupation (sui generis) to 2 2-bed maisonettes (C3) and erection of a part single storey and part two storey front extension for Mr M. Taylor (Heysham North Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn
20/00102/FUL	Hole Of Ellel, Saltoake Road, Bay Horse Erection of extension to existing agricultural storage building and creation of an area of hardstanding for Mr Richard Gorst (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00122/FUL	The Conifers, Church Brow, Halton Retrospective application for the retention of a single storey rear extension with terrace, balcony above and steps to the side for Mr Andrew Peacock (Halton-with-Aughton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00128/FUL	Regent Park Filling Station, Regent Road, Morecambe Erection of a single storey rear extension and bin store for Miss Rebecca Yates (Harbour Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00133/VCN	Yealand Hall, Silverdale Road, Yealand Redmayne Change of use and erection of single storey extension to the side elevation of annexe building to create holiday accommodation(pursuant to variation of condition 2 on planning permission 18/01464/CU to amend the approved plans and include the installation of a flue) for Mr & Mrs Lock (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00135/ADV	The Canal Turn, Lancaster Road, Carnforth Advertisement application for the display of 1 free standing externally illuminated totem sign, 4 non illuminated fascia signs, 4 externally illuminated fascia signs and 3 poster cases for Mr Hunt (Carnforth And Millhead Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00145/FUL	Old Church House, Littledale Road, Littledale Installation of two replacement rooflights to the front elevation and two rooflights to the rear elevation for David Merritt (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00146/LB	Old Church House, Littledale Road, Littledale Listed building application for the installation of two replacement rooflights to the front elevation and two rooflights to the rear elevation for David Merritt (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00166/FUL	Barrow Greaves Farm, Barrow Greaves, Ellel Erection of an	Application Permitted

## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

	agricultural building for Mr William Rhodes (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	
20/00185/FUL	Lane Foot House, Kirkby Lonsdale Road, Newton Erection of a carport and replacement porch to the west elevation and construction of a balcony to the east elevation for Mr & Mrs Hugh Redmayne (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00197/PLDC	Greendales, Carr Lane, Middleton Proposed Lawful Development Certificate for the change of use of dwellinghouse (C3) to a children's care home for Mr D Mason (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Refused
20/00204/FUL	1 Dykes Lane, Yealand Conyers, Carnforth Relevant Demolition of part of existing outbuilding and erection of a two storey rear extension and construction of a patio to the rear for Mr Benjamin Thompson (Warton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00205/FUL	Oak Lee, Procter Moss Road, Abbeystead Retrospective application for the installation of a sewage treatment plant for Mrs Rebecca Raby (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00207/FUL	13 Slyne Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of a boundary fence to the rear for Mr Michael Baldwin (Torrisholme Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00208/PLDC	29 Beaufort Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a single storey side and rear extension for Mr Vincent Vity (Bare Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn
20/00209/FUL	6 Trent Close, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of a single storey front and side extension for Mr & Mrs G. Hicks (Skerton West Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
20/00212/FUL	Allotment Gardens, Sunnyside Lane, Lancaster Erection of a detached storage unit for C/o John Lambert (Marsh Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00215/FUL	3 Arna Wood Barn, Arna Wood Lane, Aldcliffe Installation of replacement windows and door to front elevation for Mr Peter Wilson (Scotforth West Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
20/00216/PLDC	149 Fairfield Road, Heysham, Morecambe Proposed lawful Development Certificate for the change of use of two semi-detached properties into one 6 bedroom dwelling for Mr Patrick O'Mahoney (Heysham Central Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
20/00221/FUL	56 Pottery Gardens, Lancaster, Lancashire Conversion of existing garage into additional living accommodation and replacement of existing garage doors with window and door for Dr Syed Kenvan Ahmed (John O'Gaunt Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00222/ADV	Jack Scout, Lindeth Road, Silverdale Advertisement application for the display of a non-illuminated freestanding sign for Mrs Nancy Burditt (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00223/ADV	Eaves Wood, Chapel Lane, Silverdale Advertisement application for the display of a non-illuminated freestanding sign for Mrs Nancy Burditt (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

20/00232/FUL	27 Knowlys Avenue, Heysham, Morecambe Removal of existing terrace and construction of a raised terrace to the rear for Mr Philip Cheeseman (Heysham Central Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00246/FUL	Brooklands Buildings, Addington Road, Halton Part retrospective application for the demolition of 3 dwellings (C3) and erection of 3 replacement dwellings (C3) for Mr Peter Gott (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00247/FUL	Ireby Green, Woodman Lane, Ireby Retrospective application for the change of use of agricultural building to a mixed use for agriculture and caravan storage for Mr John Welbank (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00248/FUL	Lancaster Vintage And Classic Spares, Lord Street, Morecambe Installation of replacement windows and garage doors, rendering, installation of rooflights and the erection of replacement gate, gateposts and wall for Mr Colin Swift (Poulton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00250/ELDC	Barn South Of, Abbeystead Road, Abbeystead Existing Lawful Development Certificate for the retention of an agricultural building for Mr Robert Pye (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
20/00252/VCN	5 Well Lane, Yealand Redmayne, Carnforth Demolition of existing bungalow and erection of a part single part two storey detached dwelling, alteration to land levels, installation of a sewage treatment plant, replacement boundary wall with gates and change of use of agricultural field to domestic garden (pursuant to the variation of condition 2 on planning permission 19/01355/VCN to amend the render type) for Mr F Mcgee (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00255/ADV	130 Lancaster Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Advertisement application for the display of an internally illuminated wall mounted electronic advertisement screen for Clear Channel UK (Bare Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
20/00266/FUL	60 Coulston Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Demolition of existing store and erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr Peter Charnley (John O'Gaunt Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
20/00267/FUL	9 Church Bank, Over Kellet, Carnforth Erection of a single storey rear extension to existing annex accommodation for Mr & Mrs P Sharples (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00271/PAH	73 Kayswell Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of a 3.35 metre deep, single storey rear extension with a maximum roof height of 3.17 metres and a maximum eaves height of 2.63 metres for Mr & Mrs T. Bray (Torrisholme Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Not Required
20/00272/FUL	32 Lister Grove, Heysham, Morecambe Erection of a safety balustrade and construction of an external staircase to form a balcony for Mr & Mrs A. Biggs (Heysham South Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
20/00273/FUL	10 Lindeth Close, Silverdale, Carnforth Demolition of existing	Application Refused

## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

porch and garage and erection of a single storey front, side and rear extension for Mrs M. Gillies (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)

20/00279/FUL	22 Peacock Lane, Hest Bank, Lancaster Erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr & Mrs R. Jardine (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00290/PLDC	18 Cove Road, Silverdale, Carnforth Proposed Lawful Development Certificate for the installation of rooflights to the front and rear elevations for Mr S Laws And Mr A Pollard (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
20/00294/FUL	66 Gloucester Avenue, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of an attached garage to side elevation for Mr Paul Mortimer (Scotforth East Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00295/NMA	14 Damside Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Non-material amendment to planning permission 17/01563/FUL to remove 2 windows at the first and second floor in the rear elevation, re-site ground floor rear door, insert external ground floor door, amend the third floor layout, and alter the sizes of the dormer windows for AHB Property Holdings Ltd (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00299/FUL	28 Main Road, Nether Kellet, Carnforth Relevant Demolition of part boundary wall and erection of a porch to rear elevation for Mr & Mrs Dillon (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00301/FUL	2 Ousby Avenue, Morecambe, Lancashire Part retrospective application for the change of use of open space to residential land in association with 2 Ousby Avenue and erection of a boundary fence for Miss Lora Donald (Westgate Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
20/00308/FUL	15 Eskrigge Court, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a single storey side extension for Mr & Mrs A. Johnson (Skerton East Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00309/ADV	Superdrug, 10 Lancaster Gate, St Nicholas Arcade Advertisement application for the display of an internally illuminated fascia sign and an internally illuminated projecting sign for Superdrug Stores Plc (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00315/FUL	4 Winder Garth, Over Kellet, Carnforth Erection of a part single part two storey rear extension and construction of a dormer extension to the front elevation and a raised rear terrace for Mr R Barton (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00326/FUL	4 Shortlands Drive, Heysham, Morecambe Demolition of existing single storey rear and side extensions and erection of single storey rear and side extensions for Mr & Ms Stewart & Stanford (Heysham Central Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00336/PLDC	56 Pottery Gardens, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a single storey rear extension for Dr Ahmed (John O'Gaunt Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
20/00340/FUL	4 Buckingham Place, Morecambe, Lancashire Demolition of	Application Refused

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

	existing garage and erection of a single storey outbuilding for Mr Jake Fern (Harbour Ward 2015 Ward)	
20/00347/FUL	Claverton, Low Lane, Claughton Demolition of existing porch and erection of a replacement porch to front elevation for Nicola Fillingham (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00354/PLDC	3 Broadstone Court, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr B Ammar (John O'Gaunt Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00389/NMA	2 Prospect Drive, Hest Bank, Lancaster Non material amendment to planning permission 19/01391/FUL to change the finish from painted brickwork to render finished white for Mr and Mrs Bains (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00407/NMA	Ashton Manor, Scotforth Road, Lancaster Non-material amendment to approved application 19/01029/VCN to remove rooflights to stairwell, raise the cill height to ground floor windows in the front elevation, and alter the proposed cladding material for Mr Mark Stubbs (Scotforth East Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00408/PAD	Unit 125, 125R And 126, Paragon Way, Lune Business Park Prior approval for demolition of industrial buildings for Mr Ashworth (Marsh Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Refused
20/00445/NMA	Land South Of, Low Road, Halton Non material amendment to planning permission 17/01423/REM to amend the roof design and elevations on plots 19, 20 and 21 for Mr Warren Cadman (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted



## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

## LANCASTER CITY COUNCIL

APPLICATION NO	DETAILS	DECISION
19/00125/DIS	B And Q Superstore, Aldcliffe Road, Lancaster Discharge of conditions 6, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 18 on approved application 18/01100/FUL for Adam Robson (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/01376/FUL	2 Main Street, Overton, Morecambe Relevant demolition of single storey rear and side extension, erection of single storey rear and side extension, construction of 2 dormer extensions on the rear elevation and installation of an external staircase to existing outbuilding for Mr & Mrs Williams (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/01377/LB	2 Main Street, Overton, Morecambe Listed building application for the demolition of existing and erection of a replacement single storey side and rear extensions, demolition of structural walls, construction of 2 dormers to the rear elevation, installation of 3 rooflights, re-pointing of external walls and chimneys with lime mortar, replacement of lead flashing and rainwater goods, new timber rafters to roof, repositioning of doorways, relocation of internal walls, installation of new staircase and internal doors, replacement of loft floor and works to outbuilding to include installation of mezzanine floor, rooflights, internal walls, external and internal staircases, flue, external and internal doors and windows, including the creation of new openings for Mr & Mrs Williams (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/01472/OUT	Land To The Rear Of 87 White Lund Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Outline application for the erection of 4 detached dwellings and associated access for Mr D Gates (Westgate Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
19/01515/FUL	Cantsfield Grange, Cantsfield Road, Cantsfield Construction of a menage, installation of flood lights, erection of an agricultural shed and associated hardstanding for Mr Adrian Cresswell (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

19/01534/LB	Ellel Hall, Ellel Hall Gardens, Galgate Listed building application for the installation of a replacement roof, removal of existing roof lantern, installation of new windows, removal of internal walls, formation of new openings, installation of partition walls, removal of timber floor boards, installation of lift, replacement of rain water goods and soil drain pipes, existing basement wall section removed, installation of lintels, demolition of single storey front extension, removal of bay window to the south elevation, existing walkway removed, erection of a rear basement extension and creation of terrace above, construction of external steps and walls, removal of existing balcony, erection of two storey side extension, erection of single storey rear extension with balcony above, installation of rooflights, alterations and extensions to existing garden walls, installation of replacement double entrance gates and removal of railing to install pedestrian gate for Mr & Mrs Smith & Hewitt-Smith (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00009/FUL	Ellel Hall, Ellel Hall Gardens, Galgate Demolition of single storey front extension, removal of bay window to the south elevation, erection of a rear basement extension and creation of terrace above, construction of external steps, erection of two storey side extension, erection of single storey rear extension with balcony above, erection of a detached 2-storey outbuilding, construction of piers and gates and creation of a pool for Mr & Mrs Smith & Hewitt-Smith (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00022/DIS	Former Filter House, Kellet Road, Carnforth Discharge of conditions 2,3,4 and 5 on approved application 19/00495/VCN for Mr John Carter (Carnforth And Millhead Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision
20/00026/DIS	Site Of Former Garden Centre And Tearoom, Lindeth Road, Silverdale Discharge of conditions 3,4,5,6 and 7 on approved application 19/00488/FUL for Mr & Mrs J. Wilkinson & H. Morwood (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision
20/00038/DIS	Development Site, Bulk Road, Lancaster Part discharge of condition 8 on approved application 18/00820/FUL for Hines (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00042/DIS	17 Towpath Walk, Carnforth, Lancashire Discharge of conditon 3 on approved application 19/00954/VCN for Ms Susan Hardman (Carnforth And Millhead Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00049/FUL	Guys Farm Outdoor Centre, Gleaves Hill Lane, Bay Horse Construction of a raised roof to existing shop and creation of an access ramp to the front elevation for Mr Kevin Greene (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00051/FUL	West End And Heysham North Allotments, Osborne Road, Morecambe Erection of a cabin and siting of a portaloos for communal purposes for Allotment seretary (Heysham North Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

20/00053/DIS	Far Lodge, Postern Gate Road, Quernmore Discharge of conditions 3 and 4 on approved application 19/00682/FUL for Mr & Mrs Tim Parkinson (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision
20/00068/FUL	Meadow View Caravan Park, Long Dales Lane, Nether Kellet Siting of a timber lodge for use as an office for Andrew Ward (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00079/FUL	Halton Training Camp, Halton Road, Halton Erection of a single storey building for sleeping accommodation and a single storey building for office/stores with associated excavation of land, installation of new windows and doors in existing activity centre, erection of a pumping station and creation of parking areas for Defence Infrastructure Organisation (Halton-with-Aughton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00131/CU	Waterslack Farm, Waterslack Road, Silverdale Retrospective application for the change of use of farm shop (A1) to part of dwellinghouse (C3) for Mr & Mrs Thornton (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00138/FUL	28 New Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Change of use of shop (A1) to cafe (A3) for Mr Jeff Marshall (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00139/LB	28 New Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Listed building application for the insertion of an internal dwarf wall and internal door at ground floor level and the insertion of internal doors at first floor level for Mr Jeff Marshall (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00153/FUL	Barn South Of, Abbeystead Road, Abbeystead Change of use of agricultural barn to holiday accommodation, installation of windows and doors, creation of parking and garden areas and installation of a sewage treatment plant for Mr & Mrs Pye (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00210/LB	Flat 2, 11 Cable Street, Lancaster Listed building application for the removal of partition walls and installation of new internal partition walls and doors for Mr Peter Mercer (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00230/VCN	Purple Property Group, 10 Thornton Road, Morecambe Change of use of ground floor from property management and sales (A2) to mixed use sandwich shop and cafe (A1,A3)(pursuant to the variation of condition 4 on planning permission 19/00209/FUL to allow hot food to be taken away from the premises) for Mrs Linda McGuire (Poulton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

20/00258/PLDC	Stud Farm Park Homes, Oxcliffe Road, Heysham Proposed lawful development certificate for the use of land as a caravan park (redesigned layout) for all-year-round occupancy subject to the caravans being occupied for holiday purposes only, not being occupied as a person's sole, or main place of residence; and the site licence holder maintaining an up-to-date Council Tax bill (or alternative means of identification of main residence) and shall make this information available at all reasonable times to the Local Planning Authority for Mr James Robb (Westgate Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
20/00282/ELDC	Hall Garth, Main Road, Galgate Existing lawful development certificate for the use of a dwellinghouse with unfettered residential occupancy for Mr Sayer (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
20/00296/NMA	Cinderbarrow Picnic Site, Tarn Lane, Yealand Redmayne Non-material amendment to approved application 19/00370/FUL for Mr David Wilson (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00300/ELDC	2 Lythe Brow Barn, Quernmore Road, Quernmore Existing lawful development certificate for the use of land as a garden used in association with 2 Lythe Brow Barn for Mr Ross Brevitt And Miss Vanessa Edwards (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
20/00313/FUL	Parkside Farm, Russell Road, Tatham Part change of use of detached outbuilding to ancillary living accommodation for Mr Paul Taylor (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00327/FUL	Orchard Cottage, Waterslack Road, Silverdale Erection of single storey side extension, front porch and construction of a raised terrace to the front, side and rear for Mr & Mrs David Broadhurst (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00328/FUL	39 Borwick Lane, Warton, Carnforth Erection of a single storey side and rear extension for Mr & Mrs Chris and Peta Heron (Warton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00332/FUL	24 Moor Platt, Caton, Lancaster Erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr C. Mellor (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00337/FUL	4 Warley Drive, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of a single storey side and rear extension for Mrs Kelly Foster (Torrisholme Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00339/ELDC	Office 4, 46 Northgate, White Lund Industrial Estate Existing lawful development certificate for the continued use of the premises as a business (B1) for Mr Vinodkanna Seshadri (Westgate Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
20/00345/FUL	Old Hall Farm, Kirkby Lonsdale Road, Over Kellet Change of use of agricultural barn to 3-bed dwelling (C3), relevant demolition of outrigger and erection of single storey rear extension, erection of detached garage and creation of parking area for Mr Mark Drinkall (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused

## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

20/00346/LB	Old Hall Farm, Kirkby Lonsdale Road, Over Kellet Listed building application for the demolition of rear outrigger, erection of single storey rear extension, re-roofing, replacement lead flashings, re-pointing of stonework, installation of rooflights to the rear, removal of external staircase, installation of doors and windows, replacement floors, removal of an internal wall, installation of new internal partition walls and installation of insulation for Mr Mark Drinkall (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
20/00365/PLDC	4 Milking Stile Lane, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the demolition of existing store, erection of a single storey rear extension and construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation for Student Cribs (Marsh Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
20/00370/FUL	Lakeland Fells View, Kirkby Lonsdale Road, Over Kellet Removal of existing steel container and erection of a summer house for Mr and Mrs Colin Nichol (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00381/FUL	1 Orchard Close, Shore Road, Silverdale Erection of a single storey side/front/rear extension, re-cladding of existing elevations, construction of a raised terrace to front for Mr & Mrs Fitch (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00384/FUL	4 Castle Bank, Silverdale, Carnforth Erection of replacement detached garage for Mrs Fleur McCarten (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00392/FUL	Bond Gate Farm, Abbeystead Road, Dolphinholme Erection of two single storey rear extensions and construction of balcony to side and rear for Mr Iain Collinson (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00398/VCN	15 The Row, Silverdale, Carnforth Demolition of existing porch, removal of bay window, erection of bay window and porch to the front elevation, construction of a canopy, and installation of raised roof to existing rear extension (Pursuant to the variation of condition 2 on planning permission 19/01218/FUL to amend the approved plans) for Mr David Lilley (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00401/FUL	Eskrigge Barn, Eskrigge Lane, Gressingham Erection of a mixed use building comprising agriculture and agricultural contracting (sui generis), alterations of land levels, creation of an access road and hardstanding for Mr John Lumb (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn
20/00412/FUL	Higher Caw House, Abbeystead Road, Abbeystead Demolition of existing kennel and outbuilding and erection of replacement kennels for Mr. Declan Hoare (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00414/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
20/00416/FUL	Phillips House, Woodman Lane, Cowan Bridge Erection of a single storey side extension for Mr and Mrs Philip Armstrong (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

## LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

20/00422/FUL	10 The Green, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of a single storey extension to the north west elevation for Mrs Frances Ash (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00428/FUL	4 Farmdale Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Demolition of existing conservatory, erection of a single storey rear extension, recladding of existing dormers and elevations and construction of a raised terrace to rear/side for Mr M Skelland (John O'Gaunt Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn
20/00473/AD	Restarigg Farm, Kirkby Lonsdale Road, Arkholme Agricultural Determination for the erection of a feed preparation building and 4 feed bins and associated hardstanding for Martin Mulligan (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Refused