



Committee: PLANNING REGULATORY COMMITTEE

Date: MONDAY, 13 SEPTEMBER 2021

Venue: MORECAMBE TOWN HALL

Time: 10.30 A.M.

A G E N D A

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

1 Apologies for Absence

2 Minutes

Minutes of meeting held on 19th July 2021 (previously circulated).

The meeting scheduled for 16th August 2021 was cancelled.

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	A5 20/00305/OUT	Land at Ashton Road, Lancaster, Lancashire	Scotforth West Ward	(Pages 4 - 18)
		Outline planning application for up to 55 residential units and creation of a new access.		
6	A6 20/01072/REM	Land South East Of Church Bank, Church Bank, Over Kellet, Lancashire	Kellet Ward	(Pages 19 - 30)
		Reserved matters applications for the erection of 15 dwellings.		
7	A7 20/01073/FUL	Land South East Of Church Bank, Church Bank, Over Kellet, Lancashire	Kellet Ward	(Pages 31 - 43)
		Erection of 7 dwellings and associated access road.		
8	A8 21/00290/FUL	Land East of Forest Heights, Halton, Lancashire	Halton-with-Aughton Ward	(Pages 44 - 57)
		Erection of 7 dwellings (C3) with associated access, parking and landscaping.		

9	A9 21/00126/FUL	Marsh United Football Club, Willow Lane, Lancaster, Lancashire	Marsh Ward	(Pages 58 - 61)
---	---------------------------------	---	-----------------------	----------------------------

Temporary siting of two cabin buildings for use as toilet block and welfare facilities.

10 Delegated List (Pages 62 - 82)

ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

(i) Membership

Councillors Keith Budden (Chair), Sandra Thornberry (Vice-Chair), Paul Anderton, Victoria Boyd-Power, Dave Brookes, Abbott Bryning, Roger Cleet, Tim Dant, Kevin Frea, Mel Guilding, Janice Hanson, Cary Matthews, Joyce Pritchard, Robert Redfern and Malcolm Thomas

(ii) Substitute Membership

Councillors Alan Biddulph (Substitute), Mandy Bannon (Substitute), June Greenwell (Substitute), Tim Hamilton-Cox (Substitute), Colin Hartley (Substitute), John Reynolds (Substitute) and Peter Yates (Substitute)

(iii) Queries regarding this Agenda

Please contact Eric Marsden - Democratic Services: email emarsden@lancaster.gov.uk.

(iv) Changes to Membership, substitutions or apologies

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

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

Published on 27th August 2021.

Agenda Item	A5
Application Number	20/00305/OUT
Proposal	Outline planning application for up to 55 residential units and creation of a new access
Application site	Land at Ashton Road, Lancaster, Lancashire
Applicant	Story Homes Ltd
Agent	Mr Paul Nellist
Case Officer	Mr Mark Potts
Departure	No
Summary of Recommendation	Approval (subject to no objection from the Arboricultural Officer)

(i) Procedural Matters

The scheme was presented to Planning Committee in July 2021, however was deferred by Councillors to allow consideration of the legal mechanism for securing an offsite footway adjacent to Scotforth Cemetery along Ashford Road. Following legal advice, there is certainty that the footway can be secured by means of Legal Agreement, and with this the scheme is being presented to Planning Committee.

1.0 Application Site and Setting

1.1 The application site is approximately 1.9 hectares and comprises an agricultural field used for the growing of crops, which gently undulates, falling slightly from the south and north. The site is bound by a significant tree belt to the north and east, which separates the site from the Lancaster Canal. To the west there is a substantial hedgerow that borders the site with Ashton Road, and moving south are some substantial mature trees which offer some screening to the residential properties along Pinewood Close (which comprises a small cluster of residential properties).

1.2 The site is relatively free of major constraints, but the application site falls within the *Lancaster South Broad Location for Growth -Including Bailrigg Garden Village Policy* SG1 allocation. The site is not positioned within a flood risk area; it is not protected by any landscape designation; it is not within an area recognised as a designated heritage asset (such as Conservation Area/Scheduled Ancient Monument); and the land is not constrained by any underground infrastructure (such as gas pipelines etc). The site does, however, fall within a Mineral Consultation Zone, and the grouping of trees to the east (adjacent to the Lancaster canal) are protected under Tree Preservation Order No.565 (2015). The site immediately abuts the Lancaster Canal Biological Heritage Site. There are no other statutory nature conservation designations affecting the site.

2.0 Proposal

2.1 The applicant seeks outline planning permission for residential development comprising up to 55 dwellings with an associated access onto Ashton Road (A588). The layout, appearance, scale and landscaping of the development are matters reserved for subsequent approval (herein referred to

as the “reserved matters”). The access is made in full, and comprises a single point of access into the site which includes a right turn pocket for vehicles accessing the site from the south (so heading towards Lancaster). The applicants have provided a refuge island complete with dropped kerbs and tactile paving and the applicants have proposed visibility splays in the region of 2.4m x 43m to the north and south and lies within their control.

2.2 The layout of the scheme and general appearance of the development is not a matter for councillors to consider as this would be determined at the reserved matters stage, but the principle of a development of 55 units on this site is a matter for your consideration, as is the provision of the access (given this has been made in full) Notwithstanding this, the submission includes an Illustrative Development Framework Plan to demonstrate how the site could accommodate the proposed development. This plan shows the site’s public open space situated largely to the western fringes of the site and the development proposal is 4 development parcels.

3.0 Site History

3.1 A similar scheme was put forward in 2015 (15/01342/OUT) which encompassed fields to the north and south of Pinewood Close. The scheme was refused in 2016 and the reasons for refusal of that application are noted below:

1. There is insufficient information to demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Local Highway Authority that the existing highway network, particularly at the Pointer Roundabout and Boot and Shoe Junctions can accommodate the movements generated as part of the scheme, and therefore the residual cumulative impacts of the development may be severe. The proposal therefore fails to conform to Policies DM20 and DM35 of the Development Management DPD and Paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposed development by virtue of its location and access to services renders the site unattractive to walk and travel by other sustainable means of transport between workplaces, shops, schools, health care centres, recreation, leisure and community facilities and therefore it is not considered the proposal represents sustainable development and fails to conform to Policy SC1 and E2 of the Lancaster Core Strategy, Policies DM20, DM21, DM28 and DM35 of the Development Management DPD, and Paragraphs 7 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework.
3. The creation of the sites access (in particular the southern-most access) would have an adverse impact on the intrinsic landscape and historic qualities of the area therefore creating an urbanising effect in the Open Countryside which fails to conform to overarching principles of sustainable development and therefore fails to conform to Policy E4 of the Lancaster District Local Plan, Policy SC1 of the Lancaster District Core Strategy, Policies DM27, DM28 and DM29 of the Development Management DPD and Paragraphs 7 and 14 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
19/01242/PRE3	Residential development comprising approximately 140 dwellings	Advice Provided
15/01342/OUT	Outline application for the development of up to 125 dwellings with associated accesses	Refused April 2016 – No appeal was made

4.0 Consultation Responses

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

Consultee	Response
Highways England (HE)	Initially objected due to impact that the increased volume of traffic may have had on the Galgate crossroads. Following further dialogue, now raise no objection and agree that in isolation, the impact of traffic generated solely by this application at the Galgate junction will be minimal (and therefore HE does not object to this application)

	on traffic impact grounds). They do raise wider transport issues associated with South Lancaster, and how a well planned infrastructure strategy is essential.
County Highways	<p>Initially raised concerns associated with sustainable credentials of the scheme and the impact on the Galgate Crossroads.</p> <p>Following dialogue with the applicant's transportation consultants and the City Council, the County raises no objection to the development on the strict provision that the following is secured:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A financial contribution of £100,000 towards the No.89 bus service • A financial contribution of £35,000 towards the MOVA at the Boot and Shoe junction in Hala • Relocation of the bus stop relocation at the Boot and Shoe at a cost of £15,000 • The provision of a newly constructed footway on land at the cemetery along Ashford Road from Caspian Way and Improved footway along Ashton Road.
Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA)	No objection , though the LLFA has raised some concern that the infiltration results are sporadic, and when designing the layout at reserved matters this would need special consideration. Recommend conditions associated with development in accordance with the FRA, final drainage scheme to be submitted, management and maintenance plan
Environment Agency	No observations received
Cadent Gas	No observations received
Canal and Rivers Trust (CRT)	No objection in principle but suggest conditions with surface water drainage proposals, ecological mitigation, control on boundary treatments, a construction environmental management plan and a condition associated with development within 20 metres of the top of the canal cutting. The CRT has also suggested improvements to the canal towpath at a cost of circa £150,000 per km.
Natural England	No objection subject to the provision of homeowner packs being included by means of planning condition.
Public Rights of Way	No observations received
Ramblers Association	No observations received
Lancaster Canal Trust	No formal observations, simply concurring with those made by the Canal and Rivers Trust
Lancashire Police	No objection , though recommend secured by design standards are incorporated into the development.
Aldcliffe with Stodday Parish Council	<p>Objection on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic and road safety issues; • Ecological impacts; • Loss of privacy; and • Lack of community engagement by Story Homes.
Environmental Health	<p>No objection, though recommend the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electric vehicle charging points; • Dust management plan; and • Noise mitigation to be in-line with the submitted noise assessment.
Lancashire County Council (Schools Planning)	No objection but recommends the applicant provides for 8 secondary school places at a cost of £200,647.20 . There are a number of applications that are pending a decision and therefore there could be a requirement for a primary contribution of £349,545.21
Planning and Housing Policy Team	Raise no objection in principle though the decision maker has to be satisfied that the proposal represents sustainable development

Conservation Officer	No objection
Engineering Team	No observations received
Tree Officer	Objection on the basis of lack of information within the submitted AIA
Public Realm Team	No objection in principle assuming 1091m ² of amenity space on site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An onsite play area; and • An off-site contribution of an amount of approximately £123,000 would also be required.
C Step	No objection but an Employment and Skills Plan will be required for this application.
United Utilities	No objection though recommends conditions associated with surface water drainage, foul water drainage provision and ensuring the drainage systems are managed and maintained in perpetuity
Citizens of Lancaster opposed to un-necessary development (CLOUD)	Object to the development on the basis of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transportation and sustainability grounds; • Air Quality Management concerns given the passing of vehicles through Lancaster and Galgate (both defined AQMAs); • Surface water management issues; and • Conflicts with the wider garden village allocation
Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	No objection in principle. However, recommends conditions associated with a Construction Environmental Management Plan, a scheme for lighting, pre-commencement surveys for invasive species, badgers and otters. They have questioned the applicant's biodiversity net gain calculation.
South Lancaster Flood Action Group	Objection on the following grounds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • FRA contradicts assertions made at pre-application member engagement and application form • Inappropriate cross-catchment discharge • Proposed discharge rate 72% higher than pre-development • No impact assessment on Burrow Beck • 1.5km connection increases flood risk to the development • There is no Drainage Management Strategy • Unclear management of SUDS • Ashton Road Flooding
DYNAMO	Objection on the basis of lack of infrastructure to support a modal shift in transportation. Recommends the developer should utilise some of the application site to have a shared use path along the frontage of the site.
Lancaster Civic Society	Objection as the scheme represents piecemeal development and suffers from congestion and is not befitting of sustainable development.
County Archaeology	No objection but recommends a condition associated with post permission archaeological assessment of the site.

4.2 **Twenty seven (27)** letters of objection based on the reasons below have been received:

Landscape and Visual Impacts: The site has landscape qualities on the fringes of Lancaster and should be protected. It is considered that the proposed development would lead to a lack of privacy and overlook Deep Cutting Farm cottages and those residencies on Pinewood Close.

Highways and Sustainability: The site is removed from the main urban form and given the lack of footways, private car use is the only option. This will lead to increasing problems in Galgate, the Hala junction and the Pointer roundabout. The scheme will be detrimental to cyclists who use Ashton Road at present and no proposals to aide this have been proposed as part of the scheme. There is concern that the vehicle speeds along Ashton Road have not been calculated correctly.

Air Quality – No proposals have been submitted to assist with the problems of the AQMA management areas in Lancaster and Galgate.

Ecology – There is an abundance of wildlife including deer that utilise the field and birds and bats are frequently seen by the local community.

Housing Mix and Tenure – Concerns on the size and type of properties that are proposed on the site.

Water Management: There are concerns that there is not the infrastructure in place to cope with foul and surface water, this is evidenced by the recent flooding on Ashton Road;

Education Provision: The nearest primary school (Scotforth St Pauls Church of England) is fully subscribed and the secondary schools are selective.

House Prices locally would fall (not a material planning consideration).

Use of land: The site is good quality farmland with a good yield potential for maize and given population projections will increase this should be saved.

4.3 **Councillor Abi Mills** objects to the development for the following reasons:

- Sustainable transport/highway issues;
- Ecological impacts; and
- Site is isolated and there is a lack of local amenities.

5.0 Analysis

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

- Principal of residential development and housing;
- Highway matters;
- Design and open space;
- Flood risk and drainage;
- Biodiversity;
- Amenity, landscape character and visual effects; and
- Other Matters

5.1 **Consideration 1 - Principle of Residential Development and Housing** NPPF paragraph 7 – 12: Achieving Sustainable Development, paragraph 15: Plan-making, paragraph 16, 20-23: Strategic Policies, paragraph 47: Determining applications, paragraphs 54-57: planning conditions and obligations, Chapter 5: Delivering a Sufficient Supply of Homes; Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policies SP1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development, SP2: Lancaster District Settlement Hierarchy, SP3: Development Strategy for Lancaster District, SP6: The Delivery of New Homes, SG1: Lancaster South Broad Area of Growth, SG3: Infrastructure Delivery for Growth in South Lancaster, and H1: Residential development in Urban Areas and Development Management (DM) DPD policies, DM1: New Residential Development and Meeting Housing Needs, DM2: Housing standards and DM3: Delivery of Affordable Housing; Meeting Housing Needs SPD; Affordable Housing Practice Note Planning Advisory Note; Housing Standards Planning Advisory Note.

5.1.1 The application site lies within the area covered by Policy SG1 (Lancaster South Broad Location for Growth (hereafter 'BLG') including Bailrigg Garden Village (hereafter 'BGV') of the SPLA DPD. Policy SG1 is a designation of land, which promotes the strategic delivery of sustainable housing and employment growth in South Lancaster. The BLG is regarded a sustainable location for growth and supports the development strategy (urban-focused approach) for the district as set out in policy SP3 of the SPLA DPD. The purpose of policy SG1 is to deliver a self-contained Garden Village, which focuses on high quality development that carefully balances housing and employment requirements across the BLG, whilst maintaining strong and embedded environmental and high-quality design objectives. It is important to stress that Policy SG1 does not allocate land for particular uses - this would be the role of the Area Action Plan. Instead, it sets out a series of Key Growth Principles for development within this designated land.

5.1.2 There are 15 Key Growth Principles set out in SG1. A summary of these principles is set out here:

1. Pro-active community engagement.
2. Securing high-quality design and development with a sense of place.
3. Seeking modal shift away from traditional forms of private car usage (public transport and cycle infrastructure).

4. Delivering market and affordable housing to meet evidenced housing needs and to secure cohesive and balanced communities.
5. Ensuring necessary infrastructure is delivered to support the strategic growth of South Lancaster.
6. The delivery of high-quality open space and green corridors and securing distinct areas of separation between the BGV and the existing urban edge of Lancaster and Galgate.
7. Development to take account of the Heritage Impact Assessment for the area.
8. Safe, accessible and well-serviced development to create healthy and cohesive communities.
9. Master planning for growth of the University Campus and its wider estate.
10. Safeguarding the University Campus.
11. Design new development to minimise its contribution to, and the impacts of, climate change and to be resilient and adaptable to the effects of climate change.
12. Managing and reducing surface water and flood risk to existing and new residents and businesses.
13. Housebuilders to provide opportunities to work alongside local firms/suppliers during construction and the BGV to provide opportunities for self/custom build properties.
14. Promotion of innovative design and use of technology for buildings, transport and energy.
15. Improvements to traffic management and physical interventions to increase network capacity and advantage sustainable travel.

5.1.3 To support the delivery of strategic growth in South Lancaster significant infrastructure will be required. This ranges from new highways, public transport networks, cycle infrastructure, education facilities, local centre(s) and valuable open space and green/blue corridors/networks. The mechanism for the delivery of this strategic growth area rests largely with the Council in the first instance with the requirement to prepare a subsequent DPD, entitled the Lancaster South Area Action Plan (AAP) DPD. This will provide additional detail on how the Key Growth Principles will be delivered as part of an extensive master planning exercise. The AAP will provide a strategic spatial framework for development (for example it will seek to allocate land to specific land uses) within the BLG and shall also address the delivery of infrastructure to facilitate development. In addition, Lancashire County Council has also secured funding (Housing Infrastructure Fund - HIF) from central government towards transport infrastructure improvements in South Lancaster. The whole purpose of the policy approach here is to secure and deliver well-planned and comprehensive development.

5.1.4 Development within the broad location of growth will be supported in advance of the AAP assuming the following criteria can be met:

1. There would be no prejudice to the delivery of the wider BGV (including its infrastructure requirements) and would not undermine the integrated and co-ordinated approach to the wider BGV development;
2. The development would conform with and further the Key Growth Principles described in SG1; and
3. That the opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been fully considered and that the residual impacts on the transport network will not be severe.

Furthermore, the preamble to policy SG1 is clear that the Council would only permit development within the BLG ahead of the AAP in *exceptional circumstances (our emphasis)*. In order to be compliant with SG1, the Key Growth Principles for Development in the BLG must be considered in detail. This will follow under each of the main material considerations set out in this report.

5.1.5 The Council recognises this is challenging with a plan reliant on the delivery of a number of strategic sites and therefore policy SP6 sets out a stepped approach to housing delivery during the plan period. The Council is comfortable that the allocation of land within the Local Plan will lead to a wide range of opportunities for development which will sufficiently provide for housing delivery in the first five years of the plan. The Lancaster South BLG designation will facilitate the delivery of least 3,500 new homes and 1205 new homes anticipated within this plan period, including affordable housing.

5.1.6 The NPPF requires the Council to identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide a minimum of five years' worth of housing against their housing requirements set out in the adopted Local Plan. The most up to date housing land supply position for the Council

remains that contained within the November 2020 Housing Land Supply Statement, which concludes that the Council is unable to identify a five-year land supply position. Currently, the Council can demonstrate a 3 years' worth of supply.

5.1.7 It is acknowledged that opportunities to address this lack of a five-year supply can only come forward through the approval of more residential proposals and the identification of further supply through the Land Allocations process. As set out above, the BLG is nothing more than an area identified for growth. It does not seek to identify parcels of land for specific land uses. Which parcels of land within the BLG designation most suitable for residential development has not yet been determined, as this will be established through the preparation of the South Lancaster Area Action Plan. The Local Plan (either through its evidence or policy) does not earmark the application site for housing development. Instead, policy SG1 provides some opportunities for early housing delivery ahead of the AAP in exceptional circumstances. The applicant contends their proposal would comply with the conditions for early release set out in policy SG1 and that in the absence of a five-year housing land supply position planning permission should be granted in accordance with the presumption in favour of sustainable development.

5.1.8 The absence of a five-year housing land supply (even with a newly adopted and up-to-date Local Plan) does trigger the presumption in favour of sustainable development (para 11 and footnote 7 of the NPPF). For decision making this means granting planning permission unless:

- i) The application of policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development; or
- ii) Any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole.

The following section of this report will assess the main planning considerations having regard to national and local planning policy and guidance and, in particular, the Key Growth Principles of policy SG1.

5.1.9 Since the submission of this application in 2020 there has been a substantial amount of work undertaken in terms of the masterplan work for the Garden Village. It is expected that the outcomes of the masterplanning exercise will be published later this summer in 2021. Once a masterplan has been shared, the City will begin to work on the South Lancaster Area Action Plan DPD (AAP DPD). Whilst the masterplan provides a sound starting point for the AAP DPD it will be for the Development Plan Document itself to test the expectations of the masterplan and refine accordingly. The DPD will seek to address issues such as patterns of development and land use planning, design matters, transportation and housing delivery. It is expected that the DPD will be available for consultation by the end of 2021 with the submission and examination of the DPD taking place in 2022.

5.2 **Consideration 2 - Highway Matters** NPPF Chapter 9 paragraphs 108-111: Promoting Sustainable Transport and Chapter 12 paragraph 127: Achieving well-design places; Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM29: Key Design Principles, DM60: Enhancing Accessibility and Transport Linkages, DM61: Walking and Cycling, DM62: Vehicle Parking Provision, DM63: Transport Efficiency and Travel Plans; DM64: Lancaster District Highways and Transport Masterplan; Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policies T2: Cycling and Walking Network and T4: Public Transport Corridors.

Vehicular Access into the site

5.2.1 The scheme proposes a single point of access which allows for access and egress into the site off Ashton Road. The road is lit and enjoys a 30mph speed limit that runs along the site. The applicant has shown the site access with a right turn ghost island and a new pedestrian refuge. The overall geometry of the access arrangement is accepted. What is not is that the 85% percentile speeds are in the region of 39mph southbound and 35mph northbound. This means that the splays which currently show 43 metres in either direction would have to be increased to 62 and 53 metres. An updated plan has been shared with the case officer that shows the northbound and southbound splays can be achieved within land controlled by the applicant, and could be addressed by means of planning condition. For completeness this has been shared with the County Council as Highway Authority for any observations.

Highway Capacity and Safety

- 5.2.2 One of the reasons the scheme in 2016 was refused by the Council was due to the impact on the highway network, as the applicant had failed to demonstrate that the provision of 125 units would not cause a severe impact. The applicant has engaged a different transport consultant this time around, and the number of units has been reduced by half. Councillors will be aware that at peak times through its primary junctions, the network experiences significant traffic and congestion. This is a locally significant concern but is also a significant constraint to future development in South Lancaster as set out early in this report. The Local Plan (mainly policy SG1 and SG3) sets strategic objectives and ambitions to tackle the highway constraints along the A6 corridor, which will require significant intervention including the reconfiguration of Junction 33 of the M6 and modal shift, in order to improve operational capacity between the motorway and the city centre to support significant growth. Policy SG1, however, recognises some development could come forward ahead of the AAP (and plans to secure the transport-related infrastructure) provided the residual impacts upon the network are not severe (in terms of safety and efficiency). This is the primary test in this case and one which Officers have been mindful of.
- 5.2.3 A detailed Transport Assessment has been submitted for this application and this has been heavily scrutinised by Highways England and also the County Council as the Highway Authority. There has been some disagreement between the parties in connection with the TRICS trips rates being used, and it is the case there is still some disagreement over the forecasted vehicular trips passing through the Pointer Roundabout and the Boot and Shoe (Hala) junctions on the A6. Following dialogue between all the parties the County Council raises no objection to the additional volume, on the basis that a financial contribution is made towards the no.89 bus service and contributions towards Hala crossroads junction. The applicant had proposed an overall contribution of £40,517 towards the Boot and Shoe junction and Pointer Roundabout. This has not been accepted and £35,000 towards the Boot and Shoe junction (for MOVA technology) and £15,000 towards the relocation of the Bus Stop on the A6 is required. The applicant is amenable to such a request. With the mitigation it is considered that the scheme will not undermine the wider aspirations for the garden village, nor will it result in a severe highway impact.
- 5.2.4 Sustainable Transport and Accessibility
- The site is located circa 2.5km to the south of Lancaster City Centre and could be regarded a sustainable location meaning opportunities to travel by alternative and more sustainable modes of transport are achievable (subject to measures being put in place). The site is well within the preferred maximum walking distance (2000 metres) to the local shops in Scotforth (such as Booths), Scotforth primary school and existing bus stops to the north and south of the site. Bus services that travel past the site are restricted to a service that operates between Knott End and Lancaster and run on a 90 minute schedule. The nearest northbound and southbound bus stops on Ashton Road are within a suitable walking distance, but do require upgrading to a LCC quality bus stop standard. A contribution towards the bus service of £100,000 has been agreed as part of the application process. New footways are incorporated into the junction design, together with a suitable crossing points over the A588 to enhance and make safe pedestrian movements. The proposal also includes the proposed widening of the existing northern footway to 1.8 metres to allow users to safely walk into and out of Lancaster to access services.
- 5.2.5 The scheme proposes a new footway adjacent to Ashford Road opposite the cemetery and the construction of a new footway measuring circa 160 metres long. There has been extensive discussions between the applicants and the Estates team at the City Council about the potential for the link. Discussions have been taking place for over 9 months and it is considered that this link could come forward for development. In recommending support for the scheme it is on the basis that this link is delivered – in short without it the County Council would object. Since the scheme was presented to Planning Committee in July, the case officer has liaised with colleagues in legal services and external solicitors to establish the mechanism. It has been concluded that it could be secured by means of legal agreement of which the applicant is amenable to.
- 5.2.6 There is concern that this is piecemeal development with regards the effects of the proposal on the cycle network. It is recognised that several concerns have been raised over the quality and safety of the existing cycle route between the site and Lancaster. There are clearly wider and more substantial strategic ambitions to tackle this through the Local Plan and the delivery of the BLG (via

the AAP), such as proposals for a Cycle/Pedestrian Superhighway. Whilst the proposal will not be contributing to this, given the scale of the development it is considered such would not prejudice these ambitions. The Canal and Rivers Trust has raised whether the canal towpath could be upgraded. Whilst this would be beneficial, Officers do not feel it is required to make the development acceptable in planning terms and therefore cannot realistically be asked for.

5.2.7 Overall, the proposed development is sustainably located to promote more trips by public transport, walking and cycling. The development can be safely accessed, and with mitigation will not lead to a severe impact on the local highway network. Subject to securing a range of off-site highway works and the following contributions, the development does not conflict with the policies pertinent to highway matters.

- Hala Road MOVA **£35,000**;
- Bus Stop relocation at the Boot and Shoe **£15,000**;
- Bus Service contribution towards the 89/89H service **£100,000**;
- Provision of new footway on the southern site of Ashford Road and offsite highway work within Ashton Road and pedestrian refuge.

5.3 **Consideration 3 – Design and Open Space** (NPPF: Chapter 8 paragraphs 91, 96 – 98 (Open Space and Recreation), Chapter 12 paragraphs 124, 127 and 130 (Achieving Well-Designed Places), Chapter 11 paragraphs 117, 118, 120, 122-123), Chapter 12 paragraphs 124, 127 and 130 (Achieving Well-Designed Places); Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policy SG1 Lancaster South Broad Area of Growth; Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM29 (Key Design Principles) and DM27 (Open Space, Sports and Recreational Facilities), DM43 (Green Infrastructure), DM45 (Protection of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland) and DM57 (Health and Well-Being); Open Space Provision within New Residential Development Planning Advisory Note (PAN) (2015); Energy Efficiency PAN; National Design Guide.

5.3.1 Design and Masterplanning

The consideration of design is two-fold. Firstly, detailed design matters such as the layout, appearance, scale and landscaping of the development are matters reserved for subsequent approval. Give the site's secluded position within the BLG, the design expectations are high. It should be noted that there are several competing requirements and constraints that have been identified in the assessment of the proposal which will need to be carefully considered when developing the final proposal (including the number of units). For example, the protection of retained trees along the canal to ensure that future pressure is not detrimental to them, provision of open space, ecology mitigation, drainage attenuation and noise mitigation with those units alongside the Ashton Road (A588) all matters that will interplay with one another. These competing requirements must not conflict with one another – rather they should complement one another. This can only be achieved through well-planned, high-quality design. With regards the illustrative framework plan this could be refined through the planning application process and whilst Officers are supportive of the proposal we would expect and require a high quality scheme at reserved matters stage (i.e. not the applicant's standard house types).

5.3.2 The second aspect of design is that of place-making. Both national and local planning policy and guidance place increasingly greater focus on design. This is advocated in policy SG1 for the BLG. The National Design Guide provides detailed guidance and structure to help deliver good design. This focuses on ten design characteristics across three themes (physical character, community and climate). The forthcoming AAP will, through proper masterplanning, explore design across the whole of the strategic site to deliver the Garden Village in a well-planned and comprehensive way. The Key Growth Principles in SG1 include the need to secure high-quality urban design which promotes sustainable, attractive places to live and creates a sense of community. It should provide high quality open space with a distinct sense of place and should deliver green corridors and contribute to walking and cycling routes.

5.3.3 The submission comes forward in advance of the AAP whereby the design aspirations and vision work for the future Garden Village have not yet been set. In this regard, the question is whether or

not the proposal would prejudice the wider design aspirations and masterplanning for the future Garden Village.

- 5.3.4 Unlike many of the other sites in the BLG designation, this site is enclosed by existing development to the south and existing transport corridors in the form of the A588 to the west. The site occupies a discrete parcel of land quite unconnected to the main body of the garden village and could be considered a logical infilling. One of the Key Growth Principles set out in policy SG1 requires the delivery of open spaces and green infrastructure that would make for distinct areas of separation between new development within the BLG and existing settlement boundaries of Lancaster, Bailrigg and Galgate. The development would not provide separation between it and the properties on Pinewood Close. However, the thrust of the policy is in the context of delivering the Garden Village. Officers do not consider this proposal part of the Garden Village – rather an extension to Pinewood Close. Given existing development in this location, the prospects of the site forming part of the area of separation is likely to be limited in any case. Overall, given the scale of the development across 1.9 hectares and its contained location, the development of the site would not compromise or prejudice opportunities to secure wider design ambitions of the BLG (such as the areas of separation), subject to delivering high quality design and landscaping to reflect the site's unique location between the city and rural fringe.
- 5.3.5 The development framework drawing sets out tree lined avenues and open space within the centre of the site. Whilst the detail will be required to be teased out through the reserved matters stage, it is accepted that there has been a landscape-led approach with significant green corridors. This is consistent with the aspirations set out in policy SG1 and the existing townscape character surrounding the development (albeit this development as proposed has a much greater density which does raise some concern). As set out in the highways section of the report above, additional requirements (above those initially proposed) including the bus service contribution and the new footway along Ashton Road are all proposed. Subject to the detailed layout, appearance, scale and landscaping of the development (matters reserved for subsequent consideration), the development would not conflict with local and national design policy.
- 5.3.6 The question for Councillors is can they envisage a development here conforming to the aims of SG1. Officers consider that given the self-contained nature of the site a development that represents good design can be achieved through the reserved matters process and the principle of development can be established.

Open Space Requirements

- 5.3.7 Policy DM27 and both chapters 8 and 12 of the NPPF place a strong emphasis on the benefits of open space for the health and well-being of communities and delivering good design. The current pandemic is a testimony to this with the move to people needing green space and gardens. In accordance with local planning policy, the proposed development will make a contribution to open space provision. This will involve the provision of on-site amenity greenspace and an equipped play area. The precise details (location, amount, design and appearance) are matters that would be determined at the reserved matters stage in accordance with the methodology and guidance provided within the Council's Open Space Planning Advisory Note.
- 5.3.8 Planning policy also requires development to mitigate the impacts of settlement expansion on local open space infrastructure where there are identified deficiencies. Locally there are identified deficiencies in the provision of young people's play space and outdoor sports facilities. Based on the thresholds set out in the Council's Open Space Planning Advisory Note (PAN) financial contributions would need to be sought towards these types of public open space. Therefore, it is considered a financial contribution towards offsite open space will be required. The provision on-site could form part of a more comprehensive, natural play offer. This would be determined at the reserved matter stage when there is greater understanding of the layout and design of the development. Should the layout and design not allow for on-site provision this would not conflict with policy, provided an off-site contribution was provided in its place. The provision of open space and play provision, which will be accessible to a large majority of the community, offers valuable social and environmental benefits that weigh in favour of the proposal.

- 5.4 **Consideration 4 Flood Risk and Drainage Matters**(NPPF: Chapter 14 paragraphs 150 and 153 (Planning for Climate Change) and paragraphs 155-163 and 165 (Planning and Flood Risk); Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM33 (Development and Flood Risk), DM34 (Surface Water Run-off and Sustainable Drainage), DM35 (Water Supply and Waste Water); Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policies SG1 Lancaster South Broad Area of Growth, SG3 (Infrastructure Delivery for Growth in South Lancaster) and SP8 (Protecting the Natural Environment); Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (October 2017); Surface Water Drainage, Flood Risk Management and Watercourses Planning Advisory Note (PAN) (2015);
- 5.4.1 The site lies within Flood Zone 1 and therefore is at low risk of flooding and at risk of surface water flooding from the 1 in 1000 year storm event. The applicant is proposing to deal with surface water by the use of soakaway and this could be sited within the open space which is centrally located at the western edge of the site. The applicant has demonstrated that the site has the capacity to drain via infiltration. Officers and the LLFA have some concern on the infiltration testing that has been carried out. Notwithstanding this, should infiltration not be possible there is connection to Burrow Beck (although at a distance of 1.5km, this is dubious), or attenuating on site and discharging to the main sewer. It is noted that the South Lancaster FLAG raise reservations regarding the proposal, but Officers consider that the use of planning conditions can overcome their concerns. Foul water is capable of being handled and United Utilities raise no objection to the scheme.
- 5.5 **Consideration 5 - Biodiversity** (NPPF: Chapter 15 paragraph 170 and 174-177 (Habitats and biodiversity); Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policies SG1 Lancaster South Broad Area of Growth and EN7 (Environmentally Important Areas); Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM44 (Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity), DM45 (Protection of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland).
- 5.5.1 An ecological appraisal has been submitted with the application, and this has been reviewed by Greater Manchester Ecology Unit (GMEU) who raise no objections with the loss of farmland for housing, on the assumption planning conditions are imposed. GMEU has also commented that the applicant's need to demonstrate net gain, and has asked for further information to demonstrate that net gain is possible in line with Policy DM44 of the Development Management DPD. It is considered in this instance to deal with biodiversity net gain via the use of planning condition as it will be possible to achieve. Notwithstanding this, the issue has been brought to the applicant's attention and additional information will be provided and Councillors verbally updated.
- 5.5.2 A shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment has been submitted with this application and has been shared with Natural England and also Greater Manchester Ecology Unit. Natural England raises no objection to the proposals on the basis that homeowner packs make future residents aware of the development pressures on Morecambe Bay SPA and RAMSAR site.
- 5.5.3 There are protected trees along the canal and the scheme would involve some removal of hedgerow to facilitate the creation of the access. This is necessary in order to facilitate a safe access and whilst the existing hedgerow is attractive, and would involve the removal of some 120 metres of hedgerow, which contains hawthorn, sycamore, ash and hazel its removal would be a significant loss. Notwithstanding this it can be compensated for either in terms of pushing this back or a replacement of a higher quality than what is currently in place. The proposed footway along Ashford Road (adjacent to the cemetery) would require the removal of circa 160 metres of hedgerow, the applicant has provided officers with a tree survey however has neglected to include the positioning of the footway. The hedgerow has been categorised as being a semi-mature mixed species of mostly hawthorn with young elder and sycamore and has a life expectancy of circa 40 years. The Councils Arboricultural Officer objected to the original submitted AIA however observations have still to be received based on the access arrangement, and secondly in connection with the proposed footway adjacent to the cemetery. Future pressure of trees is an important consideration, as the trees are part of the landscape character. Should the scheme be supported, a full AIA will need to be submitted with any future reserved matters application to demonstrate that proposed development and trees can work in harmony.
- 5.6 **Consideration 6 – Amenity, Landscape Character and Visual Effects** (NPPF: Chapter 15 paragraph 170 and 172 -177 (Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment); Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policy SG1 Lancaster South Broad Area of Growth, EN2 (Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty), EN3 (The Open Countryside), Policy EN4 (North Lancashire

Green Belt), EN5 (Local Landscape Designations), EN6 (Areas of Separation); Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM29: Key Design Principles, DM45 (Protection of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland) and DM46 (Development and Landscape Impact); A Landscape Strategy for Lancashire (2000).

5.6.1 Residential Amenity

Planning policy requires development to provide an acceptable standard of amenity to all. At the outline stage the main issues relate to the effects of noise, air quality and design. These are discussed below. DM29 of the DM DPD and to a lesser extent the design and well-being chapters of the NPPF, requires new residential development to have no significant detrimental impacts to the amenity of existing and future residents by way of overlooking, visual amenity, privacy, outlook and pollution. The nearest properties are those on Pinewood Close and Deep Cutting Farm. Concerns by the Parish have been noted about the loss of privacy for those residencies surrounding the site, however, the development (once operational) will not affect the residential amenity of existing dwellings (assuming the required separation distances can be achieved). The amenity of future occupants is largely a matter for the reserved matters application. All new dwellings will be expected to meet the amenity standards set out in policy DM29 insofar as it relates to garden sizes, interface distances, outlook and parking provision (also covered by policy DM62). The provision of private gardens and shared amenity space (where flats are proposed) is vitally important to the health and well-being of future residents and the community in general.

5.6.2 There will be inevitably a change from farmland to modern housing, but the proposal is judged not to have a significant adverse impact on the wider coastal drumlin landscape character area owing to the site's contained position on the edge of the existing built-up area and the other urbanising influences. The proposal, with mitigation (landscaping), will enable the site to respond sympathetically to the pattern of the surrounding development resulting in no adverse effects to the character and visual appearance of the immediate townscape (materials and design is critical). The development will, however, give rise to inevitable adverse impacts to the landscape character of the site itself. The visual effects of the development are capable of being mitigated by following the landscape-led approach that would be essential at reserved matters stage. This includes substantial green infrastructure to the western edges of the site. Overall, whilst there are inevitable landscape and visual effects from the development, these are largely contained to the site itself and would not create an unacceptable environmental effect. Important landscape features (boundary trees and woodland copse adjacent to the canal) shall be retained and are capable of being bolstered and enhanced through extensive landscape and ecology mitigation together with the provision of open space. The level of harm overall is not significant and would not result in a breach of local and national landscape policy, and moreover change is expected given the proposal falls within the area of growth.

5.7 Other Matters

5.7.1 The scheme is adjacent to Ashton Road (which is a A-road) and therefore noise levels can be slightly elevated. Whilst noise levels can be mitigated, this would take the form of an alternative means of ventilation provided to certain facing rooms and rear gardens could be subject to higher levels of noise disturbance. No objection has been received from the Environmental Health Officer, and in many ways these issues can be teased out during the reserved matters stage should Councillors support the scheme. The site is not within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA), but much of the traffic generated by this development would pass through the AQMAs in Galgate and Lancaster. Given the development proposal, an air quality assessment was submitted in support of the scheme. The resulting conclusions are that with the provision of a travel plan and electric vehicle charging points the scheme is overall acceptable. No objection has been received from the Council's Environmental Health Officer. The site is agricultural in nature and not expected to be contaminated and therefore an unforeseen contaminated land condition is suggested.

5.7.2 Paragraph 94 of the Framework and policy DM58 of the DM DPD requires local planning authorities and developments to take a positive and collaborative approach to ensuring future residents of new development have access to school places. In this case the County's School Planning Team, have confirmed that there would be a shortfall in secondary school places and that a contribution of the full pupil yield for this development would be required. The Education Assessment from the Schools Planning Team request a contribution of **£200,647.20** (based on all dwellings being 4-bedroom units

– i.e. a worst-case scenario). This was dated June 2020 and therefore they have been asked to recalculate this figure to see whether it still stands. Concern has been raised that there is insufficient capacity within the local schools and whilst the County has not suggested a contribution is required at present they have been asked to recalculate this position and Councillors will be updated verbally. The final figure would need to be recalculated at the reserved matters stage once the final number of dwellings and bedroom numbers are known. This will be included within the planning obligation should the proposal be supported.

5.7.3 This is an outline planning application, but an energy statement has been submitted in support of the submission. This sets out some of the proposed energy conservation measures that could be incorporated into dwellings ranging from the use of low energy lighting to increased U values across the site. The adopted policy associated with sustainable design only encourages sustainable build, and does not prescribe a set standard within DM30. It is proposed that should Councillors support the scheme this could be dealt with via a planning condition.

6.0 Conclusion and Planning Balance

6.1 In accordance with Policy SG1 of the Strategic Policies Land Allocations DPD, development should only be supported in exceptional circumstances, and where the following tests have been met:

- 1) There would be no prejudice to the delivery of the wider BLG designation and the proposed Garden Village (including its infrastructure requirements) and would not undermine the integrated and co-operated approach to the wider designation;
- 2) That the development would conform with and further the Key Growth Principles described in Policy SPG1; and
- 3) That opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been fully considered and that the residual impacts upon the transport network will not be severe.

6.2 Due to the Council's inability to demonstrate a deliverable 5 year housing land supply, the presumption in favour of sustainable development is engaged. The application site is a discrete pocket of agricultural farmland situated on the far western extent of the area of growth, and it is contained by Lancaster Canal and Ashton Road and a mature banding of trees. Whilst Officers have reservations about piecemeal development proposals coming forward, it is considered that this development in isolation would not undermine the delivery of the BGV or would undermine the wider designation.

6.3 Policy SG1 sets out the expectations of development proposals coming forward, but it is the Area Action Plan (AAP) that would tease out some of the more pertinent issues such as design, modal shift and so on. The reason the early release mechanism was put in place was to allow some growth that adhered to the policy but would not be prejudicial to the eventual garden village. Officers therefore have to look at proposals holistically whilst being mindful of the need to promote sustainable growth in south Lancaster.

6.4 Whilst it is accepted that the scheme in 2016 was refused, the present scheme is much reduced, and critically removes the southern section of the site where the main concerns emanated. One of the deciding factors for Officers with this application is the provision of the footway along Ashford Road. This was not proposed previously, but came out of discussions during the application process. This would not only serve the development but would be used by the local community. This is a significant benefit of the proposal and it is essential that this is delivered. With the footway and the offsite highway contributions, Officers feel that the site is deemed sustainable.

6.5 As noted above, the site is enclosed, apart from on the western boundary, and can really only be seen in very close viewpoints, and given it is adjacent to the development at Pinewood Close and adjacent to the built form associated with Deep Cutting Farm the location lends itself to a development proposal as presented. The scheme provides for a mix of open market and affordable housing and this weighs strongly in the planning balance. In order to ensure that the site is brought forward promptly, as opposed to a standard 3-year commencement period, 2 years is recommended to assist in boosting the Council's housing supply.

- 6.6 A concern of many local residents is the impact on the highway network, and this is something which Officers completely understand and agree with. The County Council as the Highway Authority and Highways England raise no objection to the development proposals (even taking into account Policy SG1). It is therefore considered that the traffic generated as a result of 55 homes can be accommodated on the highway network, and not result in a severe impact, assuming mitigation is provided. Matters of noise and air quality have been addressed, and conditions can be imposed to ensure electric vehicle charging points and the mitigation to protect future occupants in the form of orientation of properties and ventilation.
- 6.6 The scheme provides for open space on the site together with an equipped play area (or a contribution made elsewhere should it be deemed appropriate at reserved matters stage). A substantial contribution is proposed towards education provision. Both these contributions are to make the development acceptable in planning terms and therefore are afforded limited weight.
- 6.7 Weighing against the proposal is the very localised adverse land and visual impacts formed from a transition from agricultural land to modern housing. Whilst there will be landscape harm through the reserved matters process Officers can ensure a well thought out and designed scheme is arrived at.
- 6.8 Any planning applications coming forward in advance of the AAP will always be difficult for Officers and Councillors to grapple with. However, assuming the criteria in the early release mechanism can be achieved, schemes can be supported to assist in the delivery of housing within the district. On balance, officers recommend approval of the scheme on basis of the applicant entering into a Section 106 legal agreement and the planning conditions noted below.

Recommendation

That Outline Planning Permission **BE GRANTED** subject to securing a Section 106 Agreement controlling the following:

- 30% affordable housing;
- Education contribution for secondary school provision (to be assessed at reserved matters stage);
- **£100,000** towards the 89/89H bus service;
- **£35,000** towards Boot and Shoe junction;
- **£15,000** towards the bus stop improvements works to relocate the bus stops on A6;
- Provision of footway along Ashford Road adjacent to Scotforth Cemetery;
- Management and maintenance of non-adopted infrastructure; and
- Open space financial contribution to be agreed during reserved matters process.

and the following conditions:

Condition no.	Description	Type
1	Time Limit (2 year)	Control
2	Approved plans list	Control
3	Employment Skills Plan	Pre-commencement
4	Written Scheme of Investigation Archaeology	Pre-commencement
5	Homeowner Packs and Ecology Enhancement Measures	Pre-commencement
6	Provision of updated AIA	Pre-commencement
7	Scheme for housing mix	Pre-commencement
8	Site levels and finished floor levels to include private gardens, amenity space	Pre-commencement
9	Access details	Pre-commencement
10	Offsite highway works	Pre-commencement
11	Surface water drainage scheme	Pre-commencement
12	Foul Water drainage	Pre-commencement
13	Environmental Management Plan	Pre-commencement
14	A scheme for the Protection of the Canal Embankment	Pre-commencement
15	Cycle provision and EV charging	Above slab level
16	Sustainable design	Above slab level

17	Surface Water Management Plan	Above slab level
18	Play Space and Open Space	Above slab level
19	Lighting Scheme in the interests of protecting protected species	Above slab Level
20	Travel Plan	Above slab Level
21	Protection of vis splays	Control
22	Dwellings to meet NDSS and 20% of total units to be M4(2) compliant	Control
23	Travel Plan	
24	Removal of permitted development rights	Control
25	Unforeseen contaminated land condition	Control

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	A6
Application Number	20/01072/REM
Proposal	Reserved matters applications for the erection of 15 dwellings
Application site	Land South East Of Church Bank, Church Bank, Over Kellet, Lancashire
Applicant	Fellside Land Developments
Agent	HPA Chartered Architects
Case Officer	Mr Adam Ford
Departure	No
Summary of Recommendation	Approval (subject to the submission of a revised landscaping and layout plan)

1.0 Application Site and Setting

- 1.1 The proposed development is located to the south of the village of Over-Kellet, with the site accessed from Greenways. The application site comprises undeveloped pastureland and amounts to a site area of approximately 0.6 hectares. There are no buildings within the site, but the site is bound by hedgerows to the northwest whilst further north lie the properties on Greenways. A mature pond lies adjacent to the site and to the east the land rises steeply and contains a combination of Craggs and Woodland. The development site rises gradually from the west towards to the east, however the highest part of the site is within the southwest corner of the site at approximately 86.5 metres Above Ordnance Datum (AOD). Further south lies agricultural land and undeveloped fields.
- 1.2 To the north-west of the site lie the existing residential properties on Church Bank, with their rear gardens abutting the application site's boundary, to the north is Greenways which is a residential road with a mix of semi-detached and detached properties. The steeply rising land to the east is populated with trees along its ridge and incorporates a limestone pavement and crags being evident also.
- 1.3 Although the application site is not within a protected landscape, it does lie adjacent to the Over Kellet Pond which is a Biological Heritage Site (BHS) and the Kirk House Craggs (to the east of the site) benefit from being a Regionally Important Geological Site (RIGS) and are also a Biological Heritage Site. The Kirk House Craggs also benefit from a Limestone Pavement Order (LPO). The nearest SSSI is Morecambe Bay which is approximately 5km to the west (which is also RAMSAR, SPA and SAC protected). Footpath 12 passes the north-western fringe of the application site and Footpath 13 is located 50 metres to the south of the proposal. St Cuthbert's Church which is Grade II* listed is located 180 metres to the southwest of the site, with Kirkhouse (also Grade II Listed) being located 140 metres to the south of the site.
- 1.4 The majority of the site is included within a Mineral Safeguard Zone (Limestone). In terms of nearby Tree Preservation Orders, TPO 391/2006 lies to the north west of the site and relates to the land to the rear of 14 Church Bank. In addition, the two TPO belts lie adjacent to the site with TPO 134/1998 relating to trees within the Craggs and TPO 581/2016 relating to trees located to the south of the

site. In addition the access track which leads from Church Bank to the adjacent farmland is also subject to a recent TPO pursuant to 682/2020.

2.0 Proposal

2.1 This reserved matters application seeks approval for the layout, scale, appearance and landscaping with respect to 15 residential properties, following the granting of outline permission under 16/01572/OUT.

2.2 It should also be noted that although this application for reserved matters relates to 16/01572/OUT, the same developer is also proposing a further 7 units under application 20/01073/FUL within the same site as the original outline application site. This means that in total, 22 units are proposed but this *current* application is only able to consider the reserved matters insofar as they relate to the 15 units demonstrated on the submitted plans.

2.3 The 15 units as proposed comprise the following mix:

- 5 x 4 bed units (types A and B)
- 4 x 3 bed units (types C and D)
- 4 x 2 bed units (type E)
- 2 x 1 bed flat (type F)

Of these 15 dwellings, 4 are offered as affordable units as demonstrated by the hatched blue properties on the submitted layout plan. For clarity, the offered affordable units comprise 2 x type E (2 beds) and 2 x type F (1 bed flat). Each open market property is provided with dedicated off road parking in accordance with the maximum standards as set out within Appendix E of the Development Management DPD. The affordable units benefit from a shared parking area which can accommodate 7 cars whereas appendix E of the DM DPD requires the 4 affordable units (total of 6 bedrooms) to provide 6 spaces; a surplus of 1 space.

2.4 The 15 properties all benefit from private amenity space which generally comprises grassed rear gardens with a small amount of patio also provided. Externally, the properties will be finished with a mix of the following materials:

- Ivory K render
- Grey gutters and fascia boards
- Cast stone window detailing and heads
- Reconstituted stone plinths

In addition, although the submitted elevational drawings initially showed the roofs as being finished in concrete tiles, the applicant has agreed that natural slate will be utilised, and the associated viability appraisal undertaken on behalf of the LPA has factored this design cost in. Natural slate is reflected on the amended elevation plans.

2.5 As demonstrated on the submitted layout and landscaping plans, public open space amounting to approximately 750sqm is proposed as part of the reserved matters application. At the time of granting outline permission, it should be noted that a condition was imposed requiring any reserved matters to incorporate an ecological buffer zone adjacent to the off-site pond. The submitted application includes this buffer zone but refers to the area as being public open space. Public access would not be possible to the buffer zone as it would be enclosed by a 1.1m stock proof fence.

2.6 Since the initial submission, the layout has been amended so that the dwellings relate to their context in a more organic way and do not appear as a rigid urban development. This has been achieved through introducing a curvature to the main spine road whilst also re-orientating a number of the dwellings so that they interact with the site and surroundings in a more harmonious manner.

2.7 In addition to this current application, it should also be noted that a formal application to discharge the conditions (21/00063/DIS) imposed upon the outline permission has also been submitted for consideration. These details are not strictly relevant to the determination of the current reserved matters, but officers remain in negotiation with the applicant to secure acceptable and policy

compliant details insofar as the discharge of condition application allows. It is important, however, to ensure the details are compatible and do not result in a permission that is incapable of being implemented.

- 2.8 Finally, as noted above, a full planning application has been made for the development of 7 dwellings within the boundary of the site subject to the outline planning permission. This site is in the same ownership and the dwellings are proposed as part of a wider, holistic, approach to developing the application site. Naturally, the inter-relationship between the reserved matters and full applications have been considered by statutory consultees and have also been taken into account in considering issues of development viability and deliverability. Accordingly, the full application is similarly reported to this Committee so as to provide the opportunity to consider the wider scheme holistically, noting the important implications with respect to viability.

3.0 Site History

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
16/00934/OUT	Outline application for the erection of 15 dwellings and creation of a new access.	Withdrawn.
16/01572/OUT	Outline application for the erection of up to 15 dwellings and creation of a new access	Approved
20/01073/FUL	Erection of 7 dwellings and associated access road	Pending Consideration
20/01220/VCN	Outline application for the erection of up to 15 dwellings and creation of a new access (pursuant to the variation of condition 2 on approved application 16/01572/OUT to amend the red edge of the approved location plan).	Pending Consideration

4.0 Consultation Responses

- 4.1 With respect to the reserved matters application, the following responses have been received from statutory and internal consultees:

Consultee	Response
County Highways	No objection to the proposal subject to a number of conditions (please note however that given the conditions imposed on the outline permission, a number of the recommended conditions requested by the Highway Authority need not be imposed).
LCC Conservation Officer	No comments to make
LCC Planning Policy	No objection offered but advice provided with respect to housing mix and internal sizing of the proposed affordable units.
Natural England	No objection to the proposal
Lancashire Constabulary	No objection to proposal and standard advice issued with respect to crime reduction
Public Realm	Based on 15 dwellings, on site amenity space should equate to 227sqm with a maximum off site financial contribution towards Public Open Space of £30,007.32: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £20,291.04 towards natural and semi natural green space • £2,496.12 towards amenity green space • £7,220.16 towards refurbishment of local community play space
Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Objection to application due to lack of information and perceived risk to adjacent pond. Objection refers to pollution risk, lighting and vehicle movements, public

	disturbance, poor ecological management, impact on Great Crested Newts & impact on Limestone outcrop.
Environment Agency	Objection to proposal on drainage grounds (however, it should be noted that this is an issue which is addressed via the relevant conditions imposed on the outline permission)
CSTEP	Comments received Submitted employment and skills plan is not acceptable due to lack of measurable content
Parish Council	Detailed objection to the proposal which refers to lack of information, drainage concerns, ecological harm, unsafe vehicular access, lack of affordable housing and inaccurate plans.
United Utilities	No objection to proposal (comments relate to the associated discharge of conditions application rather than the reserved matters)
Waste and Recycling	No comments provided
LCC Tree Officer	No comments provided
Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	Proposed landscaping and ecological buffer is acceptable and no objection raised (Principal matters of ecology are addressed through the outline and associated condition application in any event)
Geo-Lancashire	No comments provided
Environmental Health	No objection subject to conditions
Fire safety officer	No comments provided
RSPB	No comments provided
Ramblers Association	No comments provided
Public Rights of Way	No comments provided

4.2 In total, 42 objections from members of the public have been submitted in response to this application and a summary of the issues raised is set out below.

- Scheme will generate too much traffic and results in unsafe access
- There is no need for more housing in the area
- Existing drainage infrastructure would be overwhelmed
- Loss of open space
- Lack of privacy for new and existing units
- Development is harmful to local ecology
- The scheme will cause increased flood risk
- Application is not consistent with the outline approval
- Scheme is harmful to local character
- Car collisions are likely to occur
- Without 40% affordable housing, scheme is not acceptable
- Over Kellet is not appropriate for more housing
- The site should be preserved for agriculture only
- The village does not have adequate amenities to support more housing
- Children will be at risk of pollution
- The site is too cramped and the dwellings are not well spaced out
- The scheme destroys local views enjoyed by residents
- Noise and disruption would be unacceptable
- If approved, a valuable area of recreation will be lost
- Lack of public transport provision would increase car reliance

5.0 Analysis

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

- The principle of development
- Layout

- Scale and appearance
- Landscaping
- Heritage matters
- Relationship with planning application 20/01073/FUL
- Compliance with outline planning permission

5.2 **Principle of Development SPLA DPD Policies SP1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development, SP2: Lancaster District Settlement Hierarchy, Development Management DPD Policies DM1: New residential development and meeting housing needs, DM2: Housing standards, DM3: Delivery of Affordable Housing and National Planning Policy Framework Sections 2, 5, 11, 12**

5.2.1 As noted earlier in this report, the site benefits from an extant outline planning permission (16/01572/OUT) which granted consent for up to 15 dwellings. This application for reserved matters seeks to agree the layout, scale, appearance and landscaping of the site. It does not, and cannot test the principle of development again. In addition, since the outline permission was granted, a new development plan has been adopted and this confirms, via the settlement hierarchy in policy SP2 of the SPLA DPD that Over Kellet is deemed to be a sustainable rural settlement with the ability to accommodate additional housing.

5.2.2 It is, however noted that a small portion of the site's eastern boundary lies in area designated under policy SC2 as a local green space. This policy confirms that such areas will be protected from development owing to their importance and rich value. However, in this instance, it must be noted that the designation under policy SC2 was made after the grant of outline planning permission. Accordingly, a pragmatic approach must be taken in considering the weight to be attributed to the protection afforded by this policy. In doing this, given the location of the site's proposed ecological buffer zone and the lack of over development in this north-eastern corner, a significant conflict with policy SC2 has not been identified. Furthermore, given that the allocation was made after the granting of the outline permission, it would be somewhat unreasonable to now cite this as a major constraint to a development that can, for the most part, be delivered without offending the policy.

5.2.3 With respect to housing standards, policy DM2 requires all new dwellings (market and affordable) to meet the nationally described space standards and for at least 20% of all housing to meet the building regulations requirement M4(2) category. In this instance, of the 15 units proposed on site they are all capable of meeting or exceeding the internal gross internal floor space prescribed by the NDSS with the exception of house type F. House type F (plots 11 and 12) are one-bedroom flats that are intended to function as affordable units. The NDSS would require these units to meet or exceed 50sqm. However, as proposed they are 48.6sqm. This represents a conflict with policy DM2 but given the deficiency is less than 1.5sqm, this is not judged to represent a significant conflict that would warrant the scheme being recommended for refusal. Ultimately, it poses a potential risk that an affordable housing provider may not be prepared to take on the units but this is understood by the applicant.

5.2.4 From a housing mix perspective, insofar as it relates to *open market dwellings*, policy DM1 (which is underpinned by the evidence included within the 2018 Strategic Housing Market Assessment) confirms that across major developments an appropriate mix of dwelling types / sizes should be delivered. The below table demonstrates how this reserved matters application in isolation and in conjunction with the associated full application perform against the indicative housing mix shown in table 4.1 of the DM DPD:

Property type	DM1 Requirement (%)	Reserved matters (%)	Reserved matters and full application (%)
1 bed house / flats	10%	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
2 bed house	20%	2 (18%)	2 (11%)
3 bed house	35%	4 (36%)	10 (55%)
4+ bed house	25%	5 (45%)	6 (33%)
bungalows	10%	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
TOTALS	100%	11 (100%)	18 (100%)

Although the above analysis does not include the affordable units (owing to viability discussions), it demonstrates that the proposed mix across the scheme is broadly consistent with the mix of properties advocated by DM1. Whilst there is a skewed preference towards 3 bed properties, given the site's context and location, this is not uncommon. Furthermore, although the scheme does not represent a strict compliance with the mix suggested by DM1, this alone would not be sufficient to recommend refusal of the scheme given the district's lack of a 5 year housing supply.

To clarify the position on the affordable housing position, at the time of granting outline permission for 15 units, the associated S106 agreement required an affordable housing scheme (40% provision) to be submitted to and approved in writing. Due to the applicant submitting a proposal for a further 7 units, the schemes are to be aggregated and the LPA would thus expect 40% across the 22 units; thereby equating to 9 affordable units. However, the applicant claims that due to viability issues, across the full 22 units only 4 affordable units can be delivered; a position that the LPA's viability consultant disagrees with. The reserved matters application however cannot be refused on this basis because the provision of affordable housing is not a reserved matter. Therefore, the scheme (insofar as it relates to the reserved matters) is recommended for approval subject to amended plans pertaining to layout/landscape. To comply with the S106 agreement, the applicant will still need to submit an affordable housing scheme that is acceptable to the LPA at a later date; until this is done and agreed, development cannot commence on site in any event.

5.2.5 In terms of meeting M4(2), the submitted plans demonstrate that at least 20% of the units have adequate internal space for potential adaptations and amendments should they be required at a later stage. The proposed elevations do however show that the front doors to the properties are served by very minor, shallow ramps (up to 15cm) and they are not therefore strictly 'level' with the driveway. However, given the minor nature of the gradient access into the units via a wheelchair is still likely to be possible. A condition could, however, be imposed that requires details of the gradients to be submitted to and approved in writing prior to being installed.

5.2.6 Overall, given the site's existing outline planning permission and the above discussion, the principle of residential development in this location is considered acceptable and can be supported.

5.3 **Layout of the development: Development Management DPD Policy DM27: Open space and facilities, DM29: Key Design Principles. NPPF sections 2 and 15.**

5.3.1 As confirmed above, outline planning permission has been granted previously but the 'layout' of the development is to be considered under this reserved matters application. The layout of a development is defined as being the way in which buildings, routes and open spaces within the development are provided, situated and orientated in relation to each other and to buildings and spaces outside the development.

5.3.2 The site is served by a main spine road with a width of 5.5m although this narrows on the eastern boundary to 3.5m to allow for a pedestrian crossing. In addition, a 2.0m footpath runs through the site and allows for a connection to Greenways. The pending discharge of condition application also proposes a footpath connection to the west of the site so that the development site ties in with the locality's existing provision of footpath links. These details have been reviewed by the LPA and the Highway Authority and are judged to be acceptable subject to some minor adjustments. The proposed spine road has been adjusted since the initial submission from a rigid straight line to a slight curve. This reflects the pattern of development to the north of the site and it also prevents the scheme from appearing as a harsh urban extension.

5.3.3 As illustrated on the submitted layout plan, although 22 units are proposed in total, the 15 dwellings proposed under this reserved matters application have been positioned so that they are well spaced and do not appear as being cramped or contrived. This is achieved through plots 1 and 22 being set back away from the site's main entrance to allow for a landscaped gateway into the site. This spacing creates a buffer between the proposed development and the existing development on Greenways and in doing so, the scheme does not simply appear as a basic elongation of the established development already in situ.

5.3.4 In conjunction with paragraph 130 of the revised NPPF, policy DM29 seeks to ensure developments are well designed with a high level of amenity incorporated into proposed layouts. The scheme in question has been designed to ensure that appropriate separation distances are secured and in

general, garden provisions are in accordance with the standards set by policy DM29 of the DM DPD. Due to plots 15 – 21 being proposed by the associated FUL application, the separation distances between these units are not considered here. However, in terms of the development proposed by the reserved matters application, the submitted layout plan illustrates that between the front elevations of plots 10/09 to 11/12/13/14 there is a separation of at least 24m and between the front of plot 01/02 to plot 22 there is a distance of 21m. These separation distances are acceptable in terms of the impact on amenity for potential site occupiers.

- 5.3.5 The outline permission requires site levels to be agreed via the relevant condition and policy DM29 further clarifies that for every additional 0.5m difference in ground level, a further 1m in separation distance should be secured. The application site is, it must be noted, at a higher level than the adjacent development to the north. However, the separation distance between the rear elevations of the proposed units and those on Church Bank is between 30.1m and 26.4m. Given the difference in site levels across the site, although the units will be visible, they are not judged to be at a distance which would be detrimental to existing levels of amenity in terms of overlooking or loss of privacy.
- 5.3.6 With regards to private amenity space, the recent Covid-19 pandemic has highlighted how crucial access to private, outside space can be; and could continue to be in should the pandemic continue or worsen. Policy DM29 of the DM DPD provides that new houses should be provided with at least 50sqm of usable garden space that is not overlooked with a *minimum depth of at least 10m (our emphasis)*. Small north facing gardens should also be avoided. The submitted layout plan indicates that the vast majority of the proposed gardens are suitably compliant with this requirement. It is noted that plot 1 relies on a side garden to deliver the required amount of space but given the curvature of the spine road as required by the LPA, this is deemed acceptable. In addition, the gardens to plots 11/12/13 and 14 are noticeably smaller than the open market units. However, they have been designed with a minimum 10m depth and the annotations on the site plan illustrate that they exceed 50sqm as required by policy DM29. Furthermore, given the outlook these gardens have across the crags and undeveloped land, the fact they are slightly smaller than Officers would like to see is not a significant weight against the scheme by any means.
- 5.3.7 In terms of the layout (but also relevant to landscaping), it is important to consider the proposed open space within the development as this allows residents a further outlet for recreation and relaxation. Given the provisions of the outline permission, the submitted layout plan includes an ecological buffer zone to the east of the site. This will be enclosed by stock proof fencing and will not therefore feature as conventional open space; although its basic presence does contribute towards a pleasant, open setting for the site. Ultimately, two areas of accessible public open space are provided by the development and these are shown to the north east of the site (121sqm) and to the west of the site (627sqm). This provision exceeds the minimum amount of open space required for 15 units, but Members should bear in mind that the open space provided has been designed to account for 22 units as opposed to just 15.
- 5.3.8 The open space provided is basic amenity grass which will be used by residents of Over Kellet. The smaller area to the northeast is not likely to be used for ball games but it is large enough to be enjoyed and used for sitting, reading and other such activities. The area to the west of the site is larger and would likely be utilised for ball games and general play. Details of the open space maintenance and management are required under the outline permission but given the levels of the site, it must be noted that the POS area of 627sqm includes the existing Limestone outcrop. This has steep sides and is not particularly 'useable' in the way POS would typically be. However, given the comments from the Wildlife Trust (and the condition imposed at outline), the LPA would prefer to retain this feature within the development. By retaining it, the scheme's bespoke character is enhanced, and it also helps to denote the development's boundary.
- 5.3.9 Finally, with respect to the layout, as councillors will note from the submitted layout plan, the southern segment of the wider site is essentially removed from the original outline plan and is subject to a full application for 7 further dwellings; with said application recommended for refusal due to viability concerns. However, this means that if the current reserved matters application is approved, there will essentially be a 'void' within the site's layout. The submitted plans do not illustrate what will happen to the land in the event that the 15 units proposed here are approved and the additional 7 are refused. Ultimately, if the land were to be included as landscaping, it would not result in an adverse impact or a policy conflict with respect to the layout as it would simply be open space. Accordingly, Officers have advised the applicant that this application is recommended for approval

subject to an amended landscaping plan being submitted so that the area currently 'removed' from the site can be appropriately controlled. A formal response to this approach is awaited and a verbal update will be offered at committee accordingly.

- 5.4 **Scale and Appearance of the development: Development Management DPD Policy DM29: Key design principles; DM30: sustainable design; NPPF section 12**
- 5.4.1 In conjunction with the NPPF, policy DM29 seeks to secure developments that contribute positively towards the identity and character of the areas in which they are proposed. Good design should respond to local distinctiveness and in locations such as Over Kellet, a focus on an appropriate palate of materials will be important. The revised NPPF also places an increased focus on good design through advocating 'beautiful' buildings and places to reside.
- 5.4.2 In this instance, the scheme does not propose any single storey units and all 15 units in question are to be two storeys in their scale. In terms of the dwelling heights, house type A for example, which is visible upon entering the site, has a ridge height of 7.9m with eaves of 4.9m. This is not considered to be excessively large or inappropriately scaled for the site given the prevailing context and existing development. All other dwelling types are of a similar scale and whilst there are some small deviations in terms of roof height, this allows for a varied form of development, and it prevents the scheme from appearing as monotonous and uninspiring.
- 5.4.3 Given the site's prominence and the long views which are possible from Nether Kellet Road, Officers consider that the use of high-quality materials throughout this development are important. Initially, as members will note, the original plans proposed concrete roof tiles and reconstituted stone on the front of certain plots. It is also proposed to use render throughout the development. Although the viability claims made by the applicant are noted, it is felt that the roofscape here, given the relationship with the open countryside is visually important. As such, amended plans have been submitted which show the roofs as being constructed of natural slate. The use of render in conjunction with natural slate and re-constituted stone is deemed acceptable given the prevalence of rendered properties on both Church Bank and Greenways. This allows for the development to retain its own character and identity whilst respecting the local characteristics and prevailing landscape.
- 5.4.4 With the exception of plots 11-14, each dwelling has a 900mm high stone wall to its frontage and this further serves to create a sense of local character and also introduces pleasant visual features that help to frame the development. Although the submitted street scene drawing has now been superseded, it serves to demonstrate that the proposed use of materials and external finishes are able to complement each other and that they have been utilised in such a way so as to deliver a degree of consistency throughout the development.
- 5.4.5 Prior to their use on site, details and samples of the proposed slates, stone and render will need to be agreed but this is a matter which can be adequately controlled via a suitably worded planning condition.
- 5.5 **Landscaping DM DPD Policy DM46: Development and Landscape Impact; NPPF section 15**
- 5.5.1 With respect to reserved matters applications, landscaping is defined as being the treatment of land (other than buildings) for the purpose of enhancing or protecting the amenities of the site and the area in which it is situated and includes: (a) screening by fences, walls or other means; (b) the planting of trees, hedges, shrubs or grass; (c) the formation of banks, terraces or other earthworks; (d) the laying out or provision of gardens, courts, squares, water features, sculpture or public art; and (e) the provision of other amenity features.
- 5.5.2 A number of these elements have been discussed already throughout this report and following the revised scheme layout, an updated landscaping plan has been provided to take into account the alterations to the plot layouts. Crucially however, new planting (with approximate amounts) will be secured in the following locations:
- POS area of 121sqm: 6 native trees planted
 - POS area of 627smq: 13 native trees planted
 - Ecological buffer zone: 13 native trees planted subject to compatibility with drainage basin

- Rear gardens of properties: mixture of new shrubs and trees
- Front gardens: mixture of new trees planted

5.5.3 To ensure that any landscaping as may be proposed is compatible and indeed appropriate for the site's ecological buffer zone, formal comments on the revised landscaping plan from the LPA's Ecological advisor have been sought. These comments, dated 25th August 2021 confirm that GMEU wish to raise no objection to the proposed landscaping and that it is suitable for the ecological buffer.

5.5.4 In terms of general boundary treatments, the ecological buffer zone will be enclosed by a 1.1m high stock proof fence. The properties to the south of the scheme will be separated by 1.8m feather boarded fencing whilst their rear boundary treatment will comprise of a 1.1m stock proof fence in conjunction with a native hedgerow. The properties to the north of the site however will still be separated by a 1.8m feather boarded fence but their rear boundary only comprises a native hedge. It is also noted that a new masonry retaining wall is indicated as being installed to the rear of properties 1-7. No details pertaining to this have been provided and as such it will need to be controlled via a condition to ensure it is compatible with the proposed layout and landscaping.

5.5.5 In addition, although not strictly required for the purposes of the reserved matters application, the associated DIS application confirms that in order to facilitate the development, there is no need to remove or fell any existing trees within or adjacent to the site. A tree protection plan has been provided and this confirms that fencing will be installed along the northern boundary to preserve existing off-site trees. Protective fencing will also be installed around the perimeter of the site to protect mature trees to the south and the group of trees to the east.

5.6 **Heritage Matters DM DPD Policy DM37: Development Affecting Listed Buildings; DM DPD Policy DM39: The setting of heritage assets. SPLA DPD Policy SP7: Maintaining Lancaster's unique heritage. NPPF section 16.**

5.6.1 Although this application does not propose any alterations to a Listed Building or any other Heritage Asset, St Cuthbert's Church which is Grade II* listed is located 180 metres to the southwest of the site, with Kirkhouse (also Grade II Listed) being located 140 metres to the south of the site. The setting of these listed buildings must therefore be considered as part of this application. Given the degree of separation and the scheme's use of soft landscaping with appropriate materials, the LPA's Conservation Officer has raised no concerns with respect to the impact of the development upon the aforementioned heritage assets.

5.6.2 Accordingly, Officers are satisfied that the development as proposed does not adversely impact upon the setting of St Cuthbert's Church or Kirkhouse.

5.7 **Relationship with planning application 20/01073/FUL (7 dwellings)**

5.7.1 As noted, whilst this current application for reserved matters relates to 15 units, a further application within the original site boundary (as per the outline permission) has been submitted for an additional 7 units. This brings the total number of proposed dwellings to 22.

5.7.2 This has implications for the way in which the current reserved matters are considered because the two schemes need to be assessed holistically as one development given that they share the same access road and will rely on the same surface water drainage infrastructure. Ultimately, the 7 units proposed by the FUL application (plots 15-21) occupy a 'cut out' of the southern segment of the site. As members will note, due to the interrelated nature of the schemes, the viability claim submitted by the applicant relates to all 22 dwellings and the proposals must therefore be considered on an aggregate basis. Having sought external input with respect to the viability appraisal submitted by the applicant, it would appear that across the 22 units it is viable to deliver a policy compliant amount of affordable housing, ie 40%.

5.7.3 This means that the 15 units proposed should deliver 6 affordable units and the scheme for 7 should provide 3; therefore securing 9 affordable homes across both sites. However, due to the scheme for 7 offering no affordable units, the application is recommended for refusal. Therefore, if the current application for the reserved matters is approved, the area of the site which relates to plots 15-21 will be undeveloped and remain as open space. In such a circumstance, a bespoke planning condition

would need to be imposed upon the reserved matters application requiring the submission of a landscaping scheme (and its maintenance) to be submitted prior to occupation to ensure that a satisfactory scheme was delivered. In terms of the impact upon how this relates to landscaping (and by default layout), please refer to paragraph 5.3.9.

5.8 **Compliance with the site's outline planning permission**

- 5.8.1 As noted at several junctures within this report, this is a reserved matters application following the granting of outline planning permission. It is noted that a significant number of public comments refer to drainage and ecology but these are not matters that are strictly relevant to the current application because such matters are being addressed under the associated discharge of condition application.
- 5.8.2 There is no requirement (in statute) for the discharge of condition application to be dealt with, and matters agreed, at the same time or in advance of the decision relating to the Reserved Matters application. The conditions imposed on the outline permission stipulate the trigger by which details need to be agreed and, in this case, include a number of pre-commencement conditions. What is important at this stage is that proposed layout, scale, appearance and landscaping of the development (herein the reserved matters) should not prejudice the ability for the applicant to comply with the outline conditions. The critical conditions here relate to site drainage and ecology.
- 5.8.3 How the site will be drained and not increase the risk of flooding has previously, and still remains, a concern to the community (noted in the public representations). This is particularly understandable following recent flood events. It is the conditions imposed on the outline planning permission that govern the acceptability (or otherwise) of the proposed drainage strategy (not this application for Reserved Matters consent). However, the layout of the scheme still needs to be able to respond to the site wide drainage strategy (as submitted or amended). The layout and scale of the development ensures the site can accommodate any such requirements and should be noted that following detailed comments offered by both the Lead local Flood Authority and the Environment Agency, revised drainage details have been submitted under 21/00063/DIS. However, further comments from these two consultees is yet to be received. However, given the submitted information in response to the initial comments, there are no indications that the principle of the drainage strategy (i.e. the use of soakaways and provision of and the location of an attenuation basin) is unacceptable, and therefore Officers are confident that the proposed layout would not prejudice the ability for the developer to comply with the drainage conditions.
- 5.8.4 With respect to ecology, the significant concern raised pertaining to the Over Kellet Pond is duly noted. However, with respect to the site's drainage / water quality, the Council's ecology advisors (Greater Manchester Ecology Unit) are satisfied with the details submitted under 21/00063/DIS. The landscaping as proposed within the buffer zone has also been reviewed by GMEU who have confirmed it is suitable and acceptable with respect to the potential impact upon the pond and its supported species. The management of the area is yet to be agreed but this is something which is controlled via a specific condition on the outline permission in any event.
- 5.8.5 It must also be noted that although a significant number of public comments relate to and refer to the impact of the development upon Great Crested Newts, Natural England have issued the developer with a District Level Licence (DLL). This is a new regime and Officers have spent time liaising with Natural England to understand how this new approach impacts developments where permission has already been granted. Ultimately, as confirmed by Natural England and the gov.uk website, where a DLL is granted, developers do not need to carry out their own survey work and nor do they need to plan and carry out site specific mitigation work. Once issued by Natural England, the countersigned certificate is provided to the LPA to show that the applicant's obligations to GCN are being met through DLL. Officers understand that this may be frustrating for a number of residents but given Natural England's status and the extant nature of the scheme, the impact it has upon the development here must be appropriately weighted.
- 5.8.6 In addition to the planning conditions imposed upon the outline permission, a number of planning obligations are also stipulated within the associated S106 agreement:

- **40% affordable housing:** through the submitted viability appraisal, the applicant intends to deliver 4 affordable units on site. This is currently under review but as noted the LPA's viability consultant has suggested a full policy compliant quantum can be delivered. However, the lack of agreement with respect to affordable housing should not fetter member's decision with respect to the reserved matters. The need to submit and agree an affordable housing scheme is controlled through the associated legal agreement and this control will remain even if this application is approved.
- **Open space provision:** in total, across both schemes approximately £10,000 has been requested to go towards the community play area. The other requests made by the Public Realm team are not considered CIL compliant. This contribution can be delivered in addition to the 40% affordable housing and the scheme remains viable.
- **Maintenance of open space and non adopted areas:** this obligation remains in situ irrespective of the outcome of this application.
- **Biodiversity improvements:** the original S106 agreement contains an obligation that requires a 25 year management plan for the Crags and Pond. This obligation remains in situ and no development may take place until an agreement has been reached.

6.0 Conclusion and Planning Balance

6.1 The principle of development of this site is established. The proposed details submitted as reserved matters show how the impact of the layout and design have been minimised and should not give rise to any unacceptable effects. The dwellings have been designed to be sympathetic to the locality through the use of natural slate and reconstituted stone whilst a significant amount of open space is provided given the modest number of units proposed. Further technical matters relating to drainage, ecology for example are capable of being dealt with under the conditions imposed on the outline permission and agreed under the terms of the s106 with discussions continuing.

Recommendation

It is recommended that reserved matters approval is granted subject to an amended layout and landscaping plan being submitted **and** the following planning conditions:

Condition no.	Description	Type
1	Time limit for reserved matters	Control
2	Development to be in accordance with approved plans: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Layout (to be amended) • Floor plans • Elevations • Landscaping (to be amended) 	Control
3	Details, samples and specifications of external materials to include slate, render and reconstituted stone (including retaining stone wall) to be used on dwellings to be submitted before development above ground	Above ground
4	Details of cycle storage to be submitted prior to development above ground and thereafter maintained	Above ground
5	Parking and driveways to be constructed in accordance with agreed details and thereafter maintained	Pre-occupation
6	Internal estate road to be built to at least base course level	Pre-occupation
7	Landscaping to be implemented and maintained	control
8	Removal of PD for enlargements	control
9	Compliance with submitted energy statement	control

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	A7
Application Number	20/01073/FUL
Proposal	Erection of 7 dwellings and associated access road
Application site	Land South East Of Church Bank, Church Bank, Over Kellet, Lancashire
Applicant	Fellside Land Developments
Agent	HPA Chartered Architects
Case Officer	Mr Adam Ford
Departure	No
Summary of Recommendation	Refusal

1.0 Application Site and Setting

- 1.1 The proposed development is located to the south of the village of Over-Kellet, with the site accessed from Greenways. The application site comprises undeveloped pastureland and amounts to a site area of approximately 0.2 hectares. There are no buildings within the site, but the site is bound by hedgerows to the northwest whilst further north lie the properties on Greenways. A mature pond lies adjacent to the site and to the east the land rises steeply and contains a combination of Craggs and Woodland. Further south lies agricultural land and undeveloped fields.
- 1.2 To the immediate north of the site, planning application 20/01072/REM proposes 15 dwellings whilst the existing residential properties on Church Bank, with their rear gardens lie beyond this. To the northeast is Greenways which is a residential road with a mix of semi-detached and detached properties. The steeply rising land to the east is populated with trees along its ridge and incorporates a limestone pavement and craggs being evident also.
- 1.3 Although the application site is not within a protected landscape, it does lie adjacent to the Over Kellet Pond which is a Biological Heritage Site (BHS) and the Kirk House Craggs (to the east of the site) benefit from being a Regionally Important Geological Site (RIGS) and are also a Biological Heritage Site. The Kirk House Craggs also benefit from a Limestone Pavement Order (LPO). The nearest SSSI is Morecambe Bay which is approximately 5km to the west (which is also RAMSAR, SPA and SAC protected). Footpath 12 passes the north-western fringe of the application site and Footpath 13 is located 50 metres to the south of the proposal. St Cuthbert's Church which is Grade II* listed is located 180 metres to the southwest of the site, with Kirkhouse (also Grade II Listed) being located 140 metres to the south of the site.
- 1.4 The majority of the site is included within a Mineral Safeguard Zone (Limestone). In terms of nearby Tree Preservation Orders, TPO 391/2006 lies to the northwest of the site and relates to the land to the rear of 14 Church Bank. In addition, the two TPO belts lie adjacent to the site with TPO 134/1998 relating to trees within the Craggs and TPO 581/2016 relating to trees located to the south of the site. In addition, the access track which leads from Church Bank to the adjacent farmland is also subject to a recent TPO pursuant to 682/2020.

2.0 Proposal

2.1 This application seeks planning permission for 7 dwellings and an associated access road to serve the development.

2.2 It should also be noted that although this application is for 7 dwellings, the same developer is also proposing a further 15 units under application 20/01072/REM; collectively the two sites will operate as one holistic development. This means that in total, 22 units are proposed but this current application is only able to consider the merits of the 7 dwellings proposed by this specific submission.

2.3 The 7 units as proposed comprise the following mix:

- 1 x 4 bed property (type A)
- 6 x 3 bed property (type C)

Of these 7 dwellings, due to viability claims made by the applicant none (0) are proposed as affordable units. Typically, a scheme for 7 units would not attract the need to deliver any affordable units in this location but due to the two schemes, which amount to 22 units, being considered as an aggregated proposal, 40% of the 7 units proposed should be ‘affordable’ under the terms of the development plan.

2.4 Each open property is provided with dedicated off road parking in accordance with the maximum standards as set out within appendix E of the DM DPD document.

2.5 The 7 properties all benefit from private amenity space which generally comprises grassed rear gardens with a small amount of patio also provided. Externally, the properties will be finished with a mix of the following materials:

- Ivory K render
- Grey gutters and fascia boards
- Cast stone window cills and heads
- Reconstituted stone plinths
- Natural slate roofs

2.6 As demonstrated on the submitted layout plan, the current proposal for 7 units does not deliver any on site open space. However, the associated application for 15 units makes up for this shortfall and this is explained in the report that relates to 20/01072/REM.

2.7 As noted above, a reserved matters application has been made for the development of 15 dwellings immediately adjacent to this site and the proposals are therefore contiguous. This site is in the same ownership and the dwellings are proposed as part of a wider, holistic, approach to developing the application site. Naturally, the inter-relationship between the reserved matters and full applications have been considered by statutory consultees and have also been taken into account in considering issues of development viability and deliverability. Accordingly, the reserved matters application is similarly reported to this Committee so as to provide the opportunity to consider the wider scheme holistically, noting the important implications with respect to viability.

3.0 Site History

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
16/00934/OUT	Outline application for the erection of 15 dwellings and creation of a new access.	Withdrawn.
16/01572/OUT	Outline application for the erection of up to 15 dwellings and creation of a new access	Approved
20/01072/REM	Reserved matters applications for the erection of 15 dwellings	Pending consideration

20/01220/VCN	Outline application for the erection of up to 15 dwellings and creation of a new access (pursuant to the variation of condition 2 on approved application 16/01572/OUT to amend the red edge of the approved location plan).	Pending Consideration
--------------	--	-----------------------

4.0 Consultation Responses

4.1 With respect to this application, the following responses have been received from statutory and internal consultees:

Consultee	Response
Lead Local Flood Authority	No objection to proposal subject to conditions. These comments are dated 7 th July 2021 but further, more detailed drainage information has been submitted to address the concerns that been raised by the LLFA in their comments relating to the proposed drainage scheme.
Natural England	No objection to proposal subject to homeowner packs being secured
Public Realm	No objection to proposal subject to financial contributions being secured for off-site open space: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £11,088 towards natural and semi natural space • £1,364 towards amenity space • £3,488 towards refurbishment of village play area
LCC Education Team	No objection and no contributions required
Environmental Health	No objection subject to conditions relating to provision of EV charge points
Environment Agency	No objection subject to condition pertaining to surface water drainage (please note that further detailed information relating to surface water drainage has been submitted under the 21/00063/DIS which addresses the whole site. This information has been updated at the request of the Environment Agency but they are yet to comment further)
Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	No objection to proposal with respect to drainage information and submitted construction environmental management plan.
County Highways	No objection to proposal subject to conditions (some conditions are not relevant however due the issues being adequately addressed via the site's existing outline permission)
Conservation Officer	No objections
Waste and Recycling	No comments provided but it should be noted that a swept path analysis drawing has been submitted which demonstrates how a refuse vehicle can enter, turn and leave the site
Fire safety Officer	No comments submitted
Ramblers Association	No comments submitted
PROW	No comments submitted
Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Objection to application due to lack of information and perceived risk to adjacent pond. Objection refers to pollution risk, lighting and vehicle movements, public disturbance, poor ecological management, impact on Great Crested Newts & impact on Limestone outcrop.
Geo Lancashire	No comments submitted
Lancashire constabulary	Standard advice issued, no objection
Parish Council	Detailed objection to the proposal which refers to lack of information, drainage concerns, ecological harm, unsafe vehicular access, lack of affordable housing and inaccurate plans

LCC Landscape Officer	No comments provided
-----------------------	----------------------

4.2 In total, 41 objections from members of the public have been submitted in response to this application and a summary of the issues raised is set out below.

- Scheme will generate too much traffic and results in unsafe access
- There is no need for more housing in the area
- Existing drainage infrastructure would be overwhelmed
- Loss of open space
- Lack of privacy for new and existing units
- Development is harmful to local ecology
- The scheme will cause increased flood risk
- Application is not consistent with the outline approval
- Scheme is harmful to local character
- Car collisions are likely to occur
- Without 40% affordable housing, scheme is not acceptable
- Over Kellet is not appropriate for more housing
- The site should be preserved for agriculture only
- The village does not have adequate amenities to support more housing
- Children will be at risk of pollution
- The site is too cramped and the dwellings are not well spaced out
- The scheme destroys local views enjoyed by residents
- Noise and disruption would be unacceptable
- If approved, a valuable area of recreation will be lost
- Lack of public transport provision would increase car reliance

5.0 Analysis

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

- The principle of development
- Layout, design and landscape impacts
- Impacts on amenity
- Highways and parking
- Ecology and biodiversity
- Heritage considerations
- Surface water drainage
- Viability considerations

5.2 **Principle of Development** SPLA DPD Policies SP1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development, SP2: Lancaster District Settlement Hierarchy, Development Management DPD Policies DM1: New residential development and meeting housing needs, DM2: Housing standards, DM3: Delivery of Affordable Housing and National Planning Policy Framework Sections 2, 5, 11, 12

5.2.1 Planning law (Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004) requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Development Plan (hereafter 'Local Plan') for Lancaster District includes the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations Development Management Documents (SPLA DPD), a reviewed Development Management (DM) DPD, the Morecambe Area Action Plan DPD and the Arnside and Silverdale AONB DPD.

5.2.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (as updated in 2021) is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications. In this instance, the NPPF reiterates that there is a need to 'significantly boost' the supply of homes and chapter 5 sets out the priorities that LPAs should pursue in delivering an appropriate number of dwellings to meet their objectively assessed need. From a local perspective, the most recent five year housing land supply position document (November 2020) confirms that the LPA are presently only able to demonstrate a 3 year supply. As a consequence,

there is a clear expectation that unless material considerations imply otherwise sites that offer the opportunity to deliver additional housing should be considered favourably and in the majority of cases, unless dictated otherwise by relevant policy requirements, proposal for residential development will need to be considered within the context of the NPPF's tilted balance. The general need for housing throughout the district is established and table 4.1 of the DM DPD sets out the mix of properties that the LPA expects proposals to deliver.

5.2.3 The 0.17 hectare application site lies outside any of the district's main urban areas and under policy EN3, the site is therefore judged to be located within the open countryside. However, although the provisions of policy EN3 are noted, policy DM1 provides generic support for new residential development and policy SP2 of the SPLA DPD sets out the settlement hierarchy for the Lancaster district. In this regard, Over Kellet is defined as being a sustainable rural settlement outside of the locality's AONBs. Such settlements are identified as being able to provide the focus of growth outside of the main urban areas subject to their wider impacts and planning implications. Furthermore, policy DM4 reiterates that the Council will support proposals for residential development outside of the main urban areas of the district where they reflect sustainable patterns of development and accord with the Council's settlement hierarchy, as described in Policy SP2 of the Strategic Policies & Land Allocations DPD.

5.2.4 Although the above paragraph generally confirms that the broad principle of development here is acceptable, it is equally important to note that policy DM4 provides that proposals for housing in rural locations must:

- I. Be well related to the existing built form of the settlement;
- II. Be proportionate to the existing scale and character of the settlement unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated;
- III. Be located where the environment and infrastructure can accommodate the impacts of expansion;
- IV. Demonstrate good siting and design in order to conserve and where possible enhance the character and quality of the landscape

Although a significant number of public objections have suggested that the site is simply not appropriate for residential development, the proposed development is located on the southern fringes of Over Kellet and whilst it is greenfield, it very much feels part of the settlement given the presence of properties on Church Bank to the west and Greenways to the north; it is therefore considered that the scheme is well-related to the built form. In addition, weight must be given to the fact that site in question already has an extant outline planning permission for 15 units. As discussed at the relevant junctures in this report, the requirements of DM4 are judged to be adequately met with respect to the proposed submission for 7 units.

5.2.5 As noted, the scheme only proposes 7 units and accordingly, given the wording of DM1, such a scheme would not necessarily be expected to closely align to the preferred mix as set out within table 4.1 of the DM DPD. In isolation, the scheme only delivers 6x3 bed properties and 1x4 bed property. This is a relatively poor reflection with respect to the requirements of DM1 and table 4.1. However, as set out in the accompanying report for the reserved matters application, when the 7 units proposed here are aggregated with the 15 units proposed on the same site, the wider scheme is significantly more compliant with the requirements of the mix prescribed by table 4.1.

5.2.6 With respect to housing standards, policy DM2 requires all new dwellings (market and affordable) to meet the nationally described space standards and for at least 20% of all housing to meet the building regulations requirement M4(2) category. In this instance, of the 7 units proposed on site they are all capable of meeting or exceeding the internal gross internal floor space prescribed by the NDSS. In terms of meeting M4(2), the submitted plans demonstrate that at least 20% of the units have adequate internal space for potential adaptations and amendments should they be required at a later stage. The proposed elevations do however show that the front doors to the properties are served by very minor, shallow ramps and they are not therefore strictly 'level' with the driveway. However, given the minor nature of the gradient access into the units via a wheelchair is still likely to be possible. A condition could, however, be imposed that requires details of the gradients to be submitted to and approved in writing prior to being installed.

- 5.2.7 Insofar as affordable housing is concerned, given the advice contained within the NPPF and policy DM3 a proposal for 7 units in this location would not typically attract an obligation to deliver on site affordable units. However, as explained previously, this application for 7 units has been submitted at the same as an application which seeks reserved matters approval for 15 units. Accordingly, as an aggregate, 40% affordable provision should be delivered by both schemes. The implication here being that of the 7 units proposed, 3 units should be affordable. However, as set out towards the end of this report, owing to viability concerns, the applicant is currently offering no affordable units as part of this proposal.
- 5.2.8 Overall, notwithstanding the issues pertaining to affordable housing, given the site's existing planning permission, it's identification as a sustainable settlement, the provisions of DM1 and DM4 and the LPA's lack of a 5 year housing supply, the principle of residential development is something that can be supported; albeit subject to the following material planning considerations as discussed below.
- 5.3 Design and Landscape Impacts (NPPF: Chapter 12, Chapter 15 paragraph 170 and 172 -177 (Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment); Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policy EC3 (Open Countryside) Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM4: Housing outside urban areas, DM29: Key Design Principles,) and DM46 (Development and Landscape Impact).**
- 5.3.1 In conjunction with the NPPF, policy DM29 seeks to secure developments that contribute positively towards the identity and character of the areas in which they are proposed. Good design should respond to local distinctiveness and in locations such as Over Kellet, a focus on an appropriate palate of materials will be important. The revised NPPF also places an increased focus on good design through advocating 'beautiful' buildings and places to reside.
- 5.3.2 In this instance, the scheme does not propose any single storey units, and all 7 units in question are to be two storeys in their scale. In terms of the dwelling designs, the units comprise 1 x type A dwelling and 6 x type C dwellings. House type A is a detached property which is externally finished with ivory K render and cast stone detailing whilst benefitting from a natural slate roof. The type C units on the other hand are semi detached with a cast stone porch, ivory K render and natural slate roof detail. The unit types benefit from their own style but relate well to each other and the additional development proposed under the reserved matters application. In addition, whilst there are some small deviations in terms of roof height, this allows for a varied form of development, and it prevents the scheme from appearing as monotonous and uninspiring.
- 5.3.3 Given the site's prominence and the long views which are possible from Nether Kellet Road, Officers consider that the use of high-quality materials throughout this development are important. Initially, as members will note, the original plans proposed concrete roof tiles and reconstituted stone on the front of certain plots. It is also proposed to use render throughout the development. Although the viability claims made by the applicant are noted, it is felt that the roofscape here, given its relationship with the open countryside is visually important. As such, amended plans have been submitted which show roofs as being constructed of natural slate. The use of render in conjunction with natural slate and stone is deemed acceptable given the prevalence of rendered properties on both Church Bank and Greenways. This allows for the development to retain its own character and identity whilst respecting the local characteristics and prevailing landscape.
- 5.3.4 Each dwelling proposed has a 900mm high stone wall to its frontage and this further serves to create a sense of local character and also introduces pleasant visual features that help to frame the development. Although the submitted street scene drawing has now been superseded, it serves to demonstrate that the proposed use of materials and external finishes are able to compliment each other and that they have been utilised in such a way so as to deliver a degree of consistency throughout the development.
- 5.3.5 With regards to site levels and the wider landscape impact, there is a gradual decline in height moving from the west to the east of the site. Based on the submitted existing topographical survey and the site level plans, a small degree of land levelling is proposed but this is minimal. The finished floor level of plots 15 and 16 will be 83m AOD whereas the finished flood levels for plot 21 will be

81.7m AOD. This decline in levels is broadly consistent with the site's existing topography. As a result, the proposed dwellings will sit approximately 2m higher than the existing properties on Church Bank. However, due to the significant separation distance of approximately 55m, this is considered to be acceptable. Naturally, this means that the properties will be in something of an elevated position compared to Nether Kellet Road but given the natural undulation of the land, whilst some glimpsed views through and over treetops may be possible, a significant adverse impact on the landscape is not judged to arise.

- 5.4 Amenity Impacts and Open Space** (NPPF: Chapter 8 paragraph 91 (Promoting Healthy and Safe Communities), Chapter 12 paragraphs 124, 127 and 130 (Achieving Well-Designed Places), and paragraphs 178 – 183 (Ground Conditions and Pollution); Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM2 (Housing standards), DM29 (Key Design Principles), DM30 (Sustainable Design), DM31 (Air Quality Management and Pollution), DM32 (Contaminated Land) and DM57 (Health and Well-Being)).
- 5.4.1 In conjunction with the National Planning Policy Framework, the development plan requires proposals to be of a high quality so that they contribute positively to the locality's sense of place and the community's wider health. In this regard, the Council expects proposals for new residential development to deliver a good standard of amenity whilst also being attractive and accessible to all. The delivery of on-site open space significantly enhances a scheme's design credentials whilst also providing an important community asset to those who live, work and play in the area.
- 5.4.2 Policy DM29 of the DM DPD (and the design and well-being chapters of the NPPF), requires new residential development to have no significant detrimental impacts to the amenity of existing and future residents by way of overlooking, visual amenity, privacy, outlook and pollution. In this instance, existing residential development is adjacent to the site on Greenways and Church Bank. However, given the separation distances and spacing demonstrated on the submitted layout plan, the scheme is judged to be sufficiently compliant with the development plan in terms of amenity impacts. The proposed properties do not overlook existing dwellings and they have been positioned so that there is at least 21m separation between the front elevations of the 7 units proposed here and the additional 15 units proposed under the reserved application. Undue and harmful overlooking is not therefore judged to arise. There is a minor degree of overlooking possible from the upper floor windows of plot 15 into the garden of plot 14 but due to the orientation of the dwellings and the set back relationship, this is to be expected to a degree. However, it is not considered to be significant, and an adequate degree of private amenity space is delivered.
- 5.4.3 With regards to private amenity space, the recent Covid-19 pandemic has highlighted how crucial access to private, outside space can be; and could continue to be in should the pandemic continue or worsen. Policy DM29 of the DM DPD provides that new houses should be provided with at least 50sqm of usable garden space that is not overlooked with a minimum depth of at least 10m. Small north facing gardens should also be avoided. The submitted layout plan indicates that the proposed gardens are suitably compliant with this requirement. It is noted that plot 18 relies on a side garden to deliver the required amount of space but given the curvature of the spine road as required by the LPA, this is deemed acceptable. Furthermore, given the outlook these southern facing gardens have across the open crags and undeveloped land offers a pleasant benefit for potential occupants.
- 5.5 Highway Matters and Access:** NPPF Chapter 9 paragraphs 108-111 (Promoting Sustainable Transport) and Chapter 12 paragraph 127 (Achieving well-designed places); Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policies T2: Cycling and Walking Network; Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM29: Key Design Principles, DM60: Enhancing Accessibility and Transport Linkages, DM61: Walking and Cycling, DM62: Vehicle Parking Provision
- 5.5.1 From a National Planning Policy perspective, paragraph 110 of the 2021 NPPF advises that where appropriate, schemes should secure safe and suitable access to the public highway for all applicable users. The NPPF further advises that sustainable transport modes should, where possible and relevant, be taken up and encouraged although this will of course depend on the type of development and its location. This requirement is reflected in policy DM29 (Key Design Principles) which requires proposals to deliver suitable and safe access to the existing highway network whilst also promoting sustainable, non-car dominated travel. As illustrated in the comments against this application and those submitted with respect to the previous outline application, the local community have highlighted concerns pertaining to road safety and the ability of the highway network to

accommodate further development. The site has one point of access onto Kirkby Lonsdale Road and this is via Greenways; a through route to Nether Kellet Road is not possible and this prevents the access being utilised as a convenient cut through.

- 5.5.2 Although the concerns with respect to highway safety are noted, it must be remembered that the outline permission granted consent for the access onto Greenways and at the time of determining this application, the LPA sought to secure a number of footpath connections. The outline permission requires details of the footpath linkages and improvements to be submitted to the LPA for approval. These details have been provided though the DIS application, but Officers are not yet satisfied with the quality of the submission. Nonetheless, due to this application sharing the same access as the reserved matters, the submitted layout plan indicates that the access road will be 5.5m wide with a pedestrian crossing installed at the northeast corner. In addition, a 2.0m wide footpath is provided adjacent to the main spine road and this enables pedestrian access through the site, to the public open space and it also connects footpaths 10, 12 and 13 (subject to the details submitted under the discharge of condition application being agreed). Given the safe access which is achievable through the site and the narrowing of the entrance as a speed management measure, the LPA are satisfied that the scheme complies with policies DM29, DM60 and the advice contained within the NPPF.
- 5.5.3 The proposed dwellings all benefit from allocated off road parking with plots 15,16,18, 19, 20 and 21 all having two spaces whilst plot 17 benefits from 3 spaces. This allocation is compliant with policy DM29 and it should also be noted that each unit is to be equipped with a 7kw electrical charge point and secure cycle storage. Precise details of the EV units and cycle stores would need to be secured via condition in the event that the proposal is recommend for approval, however.
- 5.5.4 Member's attention is also drawn to the comments offered by the Highway Authority. In their formal response dated 11th January 2021, the Highway Authority have raised no objection to the proposal. Within these comments a number of suggestions with respect to EV points, cycle storage and wall heights were offered, and the applicant opted to voluntary update the proposed plans to reflect these suggestions. However, in addition, the Highway Authority have requested that a number of the conditions imposed on the outline permission are re-imposed on this application for 7 units. Whilst the rationale for this request is, to a degree, understood, the LPA must consider the advice within the NPPF (para 56) when imposing conditions. In this case, given the off-site highway works and improvements already secured pursuant to the outline permission, and given that an application to discharge these requirements has been made, Officers do not feel that the same conditions need to be imposed on this scheme for 7 units.
- 5.5.5 Had the scheme been recommended for approval, a variation to the existing S106 agreement would have secured to ensure that this scheme and the development for 15 units were undertaken together. Therefore, the risk that the 7 units could be built and occupied before the relevant off-site highway improvement works had taken place would be minimal in any event.
- 5.5.6 With respect to air quality, the site is not located within any of the District's Air Quality Management Areas and owing to the modest nature of the scheme, a significant amount of traffic is not likely to be generated by the development. It is noted that the Council's Air Quality Officer has not raised an objection. However, policy DM31 of the Development Management DPD requires all development to demonstrate how they will seek to minimise and reduce air polluting emissions. Given the site's location, albeit within a sustainable settlement, there will be a degree of reliance upon private vehicles. Accordingly, the proposed electric charge points and cycle storage facilities are welcomed by Officers.
- 5.6** **Biodiversity (NPPF: Chapter 15 (Habitats and biodiversity references); Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policies: SP8 (Protecting the Environment); Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM44 (Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity), DM45 (Protection of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland)**
- 5.6.1 As required by the National Planning Policy Framework at paragraphs 8c, 170 and 175 the Local Planning Authority has a duty to consider the conservation of biodiversity and to ensure that valued landscapes or sites of biodiversity interest are protected when determining planning applications. The NPPF indicates that when determining planning applications, Local Planning Authorities must aim to conserve and enhance biodiversity and that opportunities to incorporate biodiversity in and around developments should be encouraged (Paragraph 175). This is underpinned by Paragraph 8

of the Framework, which details the three overarching objectives that the planning system should try to achieve, and it is here that the Framework indicates that planning should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment. At a local level, this requirement is reflected through policies SP8 and DM44.

5.6.2 Typically, where greenfield sites are to be developed, given the above, the LPA would expect applications to be supported by suitably detailed ecological appraisals. Indeed, the outline permission that precedes this proposal concluded that the site had a degree of nature conservation value. However, this value flora value predominately related to the southwestern outcrop of Limestone and this is why the outline permission includes a condition that requires its retention or protection; this is addressed via the reserved matters application. The 0.17Ha site in question here has limited ecological value although its proximity to the crags is noted. A number of residents have raised concern about the potential harm to the existing flora but the 7 dwellings as proposed do not result in the loss of valued species or other features that the LPA would wish to see retained.

5.6.3 The principal concern with respect to ecology on this site is the impact upon amphibians; a point raised by many residents and the Lancashire Wildlife Trust. However, on this point Members are reminded that the reserved matters application intentionally includes an ecological buffer zone (with other conditional requirements) so that the marginal habitat around the Over Kellet Pond retains ecological value in its ability to support the pond. The application for 7 units proposed by this application does not undermine this provision or requirement. Furthermore, the proposed fencing to the rear of the properties and the amphibian friendly gullies are measures that offer a positive environment for amphibians. In addition, the application is supported by a Construction Environmental Management Plan and this sets out a number of additional measures that would serve to mitigate the potential harmful impacts upon the locality's amphibian population:

- Temporary Amphibian Fencing installed during construction phase;
- Heras fencing installed adjacent to the ecological buffer zone

These measures (and the remainder of the CEMP document) have been reviewed by the Greater Manchester Ecology Unit and they have confirmed that the measures are acceptable with respect to the protection offered.

It should also be noted that a capture and exclusion exercise was undertaken on the site between 30th July 2021 and 8th August 2021. Written confirmation from the applicant's Ecologist clarifies that during this period 1 male Toad was caught and released back outside of the site boundary.

5.6.4 However, although the capture and exclusion exercise revealed no evidence of newts, due to the risk that great crested newts *may* still be harmed, under the terms of the Habitats Directive and the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (as amended), a Licence will be required from Natural England. In this instance, rather than seek the traditional mitigation Licence, the applicant has opted to enter into the new District Level Licence incentive offered by Natural England.

5.6.5 Under the traditional approach to licensing disturbance of great crested newts, developers who want to build on land where they are found must trap and relocate the species before starting work, simply keeping them out rather than helping to conserve their wider populations. Research by Natural England has found that the amount of money spent on survey, trapping and exclusion with plastic fencing can outstrip that spent on habitat creation and management by a ratio of almost seven to one. Crucially, a lot of resource is used without there really being significant benefits for the newts.

5.6.6 With respect to this application, Natural England have confirmed in writing that a District Level Licence was issued in relation to the application site on 19th July 2021 with reference 2021-00113-EPS-DLL. A copy of the signed DLL has also been provided to the LPA. The volume and veracity of the objections submitted with respect to the potential impact upon the GCN population are of course duly noted but significant weight must be attached to the fact that Natural England have granted a Licence in this instance.

5.6.7 Ultimately, although Natural England have granted the DLL, the local planning authority must still have regard to Regulation 9(1) and 9(5) of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 and must consider whether or not:

- i) That the development is 'in the interest of public health and public safety, or for other imperative reasons of overriding public interest, including those of a social or economic nature and beneficial consequence of primary importance for the environment;
- ii) That there is 'no satisfactory alternative'; and,
- iii) That derogation is 'not detrimental to the maintenance of the populations of the species concerned at a favourable conservation status in their natural range'

Having engaged with Natural England, it is accepted that their granting of the Licence demonstrates compliance with test iii above. However, tests 'i' and 'ii' must still be considered by the Local Planning Authority.

5.6.8 With respect to the first test, although supporting information has not been provided by the applicant, the 2018 Strategic Market Housing Assessment clarifies that the district as a whole has a significant need for housing and at present, the LPA cannot demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing. Coupled with the Government's requirement to 'boost' the supply of housing, given that the site already benefits from outline planning permission with a very low risk posed to Newts, this test is considered to be passed.

5.6.9 In terms of test two and the lack of a satisfactory alternative, it must be noted that the site already has permission for 15 units and this includes a purpose designed ecological buffer zone with a range of amphibian friendly features built into the development's obligations. It is therefore unreasonable to expect an alternative site to be sourced when the proposed layout and arrangement proposed here is judged to be suitably compliant with the development plan. Furthermore, there is therefore nothing before Officers to suggest that any alternative sites in the village would necessarily have a less effect on protected species (whether that be bats or great crested newts) and, the Licence has been granted by Natural England in any event; thereby rendering a search for an alternative site somewhat superfluous.

5.6.10 Finally, in terms of biodiversity matters, policy DM45 seeks to protect trees and vegetation that offers a positive contribution to the district's settlements, open spaces and built form. The application site is bordered by trees to the north east and the south west as demonstrated in the submitted tree protection plan. Although some basic tree maintenance is required (having been discussed with LPA's Tree Officer), no trees are to be removed or lost as a result of the development and this, quite naturally, is welcomed by Officers. Furthermore, a revised tree protection scheme has been submitted and this demonstrates that protective fencing in accordance with BS5837-2012 will be installed to protect the existing specimens that frame the site. This fencing would be installed prior to development commencing and it is deemed acceptable with respect to the requirements of policy DM45.

5.7 Heritage Impacts: NPPF Chapter 16 (Conserving and enhancing the historic environment); Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policy SP7 Maintaining Lancaster's Unique Heritage; Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM29 (Key Design Principles), DM37 (Development affecting listed buildings) and DM39 (The Setting of Designated Heritage Assets).

5.7.1 The site is not within a Conservation Area (this is located approximately 280m to the west), however there is St Cuthbert's Parish Church (Grade II* listed building) located 180m to the south west of the application site and Kirk House (Grade II) is located 140m to the south of the application site. The principal setting of the Listed buildings is not compromised and so there are no justifiable objection. The setting of the site does however endorse the need for high quality design, appropriate landscaping and suitable boundary treatment. Given this it is considered that the scheme complies with the relevant development plan policies insofar as heritage impacts are concerned, adequate regard has been paid to Section 66 of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Area) Act 1990.

5.8 Flood Risk and Drainage Matters (NPPF: Chapter 14 (Planning for Climate Change), Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM33 (Development and Flood Risk), DM34 (Surface Water Run-off and Sustainable Drainage), DM35 (Water Supply and Waste Water); Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policies SP8 (Protecting the Natural

- 5.8.1 The NPPF advises that Local Planning Authorities should avoid permitting development in areas at the greatest risk of flooding and instead, it should be directed towards the areas with a lower flood risk. This national requirement is reflected in policy DM33. The application site in question is wholly within flood zone 1 and is not therefore subject to the sequential or exception test as set out within the NPPF and there is no evidence within the submitted application which would suggest that the scheme is likely to exacerbate flooding in other locations
- 5.8.2 With respect to surface water runoff, policy DM34 advises that all new development should manage surface water run off in a sustainable way and that the design of all proposed surface water drainage systems should have regard to the surface water drainage hierarchy as set out below with 1 being the preference and 4 being the least preferred method:
1. Into the ground (infiltration at source);
 2. Attenuated discharge to a surface water body, watercourse or the sea;
 3. Attenuated discharge to surface water sewer, highway drain or another drainage system;
 4. Attenuated discharge to a combined sewer (as a last resort only in exceptional circumstances where it can be demonstrated that no other options higher up the hierarchy are feasible).
- 5.8.3 Accordingly, following initial commentary from the Environment Agency and the Lead Local Flood Authority, the application is supported by the following documentation with respect to surface water drainage:
- Infiltration testing results (5 x trial pits)
 - Ground water monitoring information (April and March 2021)
 - Composition of borehole 1
 - Drainage layout scheme
 - Drainage cross sections
 - Infiltration basin details
 - Flood risk assessment and drainage report
 - Drainage maintenance and operation scheme
- 5.8.4 The submitted drainage report confirms that following ground condition testing, soakaway drainage represents a viable option for the development site. As demonstrated through the testing results, infiltration results were in the region of 1×10^{-4} m/s to 2.5×10^{-3} m/s across the completed trial pits with sand and gravel common at soakaway depths.
- 5.8.5 Accordingly, based on the soakaway testing, it is proposed that all roof areas will drain into private geo-cellular crate systems, located within private rear gardens. Advanced silt traps will be located upstream of each soakaway, which will provide surface water treatment and access for maintenance. Silt traps isolate silt and other particles by encouraging settlement into removal silt buckets, preventing ingress into the tank. With regards to the driveways, they will be served by Type A (full infiltration) permeable block paving. This would comprise a free draining coarse graded aggregate sub-base of min. 350mm thickness to provide sufficient volumetric storage for the Q100+40% CC storm event. A 'Type A' system will also provide enhanced treatment (i.e., removal of silt and pollutants), prior to discharge into the ground.
- 5.8.6 The access road will be served by an infiltration basin located within the north-east of the site. The basin is sized to contain the runoff from the access road for a 1 in 100-year + 40% climate change event. Highway runoff will be collected and conveyed in the highways drain within the carriageway, discharging into the basin via a silt trap. The basin will be finished with a minimum 100 mm sand, overlaying a minimum 300 mm topsoil and seed following construction. This will provide additional treatment of runoff, before discharge into groundwater.
- 5.8.7 In designing the soakaway / basin volume and sizes, storage calculations have been undertaken for the Q30 and Q100+40% CC storm event; the full results of these calculations are provided in

Appendix C of the submitted drainage strategy. Provided the designed drainage system is installed in accordance with these details, the post development run off rate of QBAR 3.4l/s will equate to the existing greenfield (i.e. pre development) run off rate.

5.8.8 The Environment Agency have advised that the proposed drainage strategy is acceptable (within the parameters of their remit) and although the additional information provided is in accordance with the most recent request of the LLFA, no further comments have been received at the time of writing this report. However, given the submitted detail and detailed design (which demonstrates that the system is capable of dealing with a Q100+40% event), an objection from the LLFA is not anticipated. In the event that clarification is offered before the Committee meeting, Officers will provide a verbal update.

5.8.9 In terms of foul water drainage, discharge from the development shall discharge to the existing 150 mm diameter combined sewer in the footpath linking the proposed development to Church Bank and as confirmed in their comments dated 10th June 2021, United Utilities have raised no objection to this approach.

5.9 Viability considerations: affordable housing provision

5.9.1 Notwithstanding the above commentary, which, for the most part, is positive, the scheme is supported by a financial viability appraisal which concludes that across the current application for 7 units and the associated reserved matters application for 15 units, only 4 affordable units can be delivered. Across the entirety of the development this amounts to 18%. As a breakdown, each application (in the current submitted state) proposes the following:

- 20/01072/REM: 15 dwellings and 4 affordable units (26%)
- 20/01073/FUL: 7 dwellings and 0 affordable units (0%)
- **Total: 22 units with 4 affordable units equates to 18%**

5.9.2 The applicant's submitted viability appraisal has been reviewed by the LPA's Viability consultant and the conclusions of this work are uploaded to the application website. Based on the applicant's analysis, with 6 affordable units, the scheme produces a residual land value of approximately £274,000 which, when compared to the applicant's benchmark value of £640,500 this is then considered to represent an 'unviable' scheme. However, having reviewed the inputted sales values, the quoted costs and the applicant's unjustified benchmark value, the LPA's viability consultant has concluded that the scheme is capable of delivering the full policy compliant 40% affordable housing required pursuant to policy DM3 of the DM DPD. The LPA's analysis concludes with the full 40% provision, the residual land value, for the entire site, amounts to £459,691 against a benchmark value of £418,402; thereby delivering a viable scheme. This, however, is disputed by the applicant who maintains that no additional affordable units can be delivered.

5.9.3 Due to the aggregate nature of the two proposals, in undertaking the viability review, a specific appraisal for the 7 units in question has been completed. This again includes 40% affordable housing, with a public open space contribution of £3,488. The LPA's Viability consultant has adopted a pro-rata approach to costs, (for example the abnormals total £74,677) and the benchmark land value is £133,128. This generates a residual land value of £153,243, which is above the benchmark land value and therefore deemed to be viable.

5.9.4 Accordingly, the scheme for 7 units as proposed under this application fails to deliver the required number of affordable units in order to satisfy the provisions of policy DM3 of the DM DPD. It would appear to the LPA that with the full 40% (3 units) provision required, the scheme is financially viable; no exceptional or compelling reasoning to justify a departure from policy DM3 has been provided to the LPA. Given the district's chronic need for affordable housing (a shortfall of approximately 375 units per annum) with the viability appraisal confirming a viable scheme, the failure to deliver the required affordable quantum is a significant and substantial factor which weighs against the proposal.

5.10 Conclusion and planning balance

5.10.1 This report has set out that the principle of residential development in this location is acceptable and can be supported. The proposed dwellings offer suitably sized units that the district would benefit

from. If built in conjunction with the associated reserved matters application that sits parallel to this scheme, the application would deliver a well-designed scheme that incorporates public open space and context appropriate dwellings. The units benefit from private amenity space with off road parking, and they are, more the most part, spaciouly set out to reflect the requirements of the development plan. Given the LPA's lack of a five-year housing supply the application represents an opportunity to boost the district's supply, albeit modestly. However, although the application must, as a result, be considered within the context of the NPPF's tilted balance, with a full 40% provision of affordable housing, the scheme has been demonstrated to be financially viable. Despite this, the applicant is not prepared to deliver a policy compliant scheme in terms of the quantum of affordable housing and of the 7 units proposed, none (0) are affordable whereas policy DM3 requires at least 3 affordable units from this proposal. Given that the LPA's under supply of affordable units amounts to approximately 375 units per annum, this is a significant weight against the scheme.

- 5.10.2 In applying the overall planning balance, although the benefit of the scheme are noted, the proposal ultimately fails to comply with paragraphs 58 and 63 of the NPPF which state that where a need for affordable housing is identified, it should be delivered on site and policy DM3 of the DM DPD which expressly states that in this location, unless compelling evidence can be provided, 40% affordable housing is required. In this instance, the lack of the required affordable housing significantly outweighs the potential benefits of granting planning permission and as such, the application is recommended for refusal.

Recommendation

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

1. The proposed development is considered aggregate to the wider outline planning permission for 15 dwellings that prevails across the land and accordingly, the proposed development must contribute to affordable housing provision and other s106 contributions deemed necessary to mitigate the impacts of the development. In this case, Policy DM3 dictates that the scheme should deliver an affordable housing quantum of 40% but it presently proposes no affordable units at all. The proposal fails to sufficiently justify the lack of affordable housing (through the submitted viability argument) as part of the scheme and the proposed development is therefore considered contrary to policy DM3 of the Development Management Development Plan Document and paragraphs 58 and 63 of the 2021 National Planning Policy Framework.

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	A8
Application Number	21/00290/FUL
Proposal	Erection of 7 dwellings (C3) with associated access, parking and landscaping
Application site	Land East of Forest Heights, Halton, Lancashire
Applicant	Wrenman Lancaster Ltd
Agent	Mr Dan Ratcliffe
Case Officer	Mrs Jennifer Rehman
Departure	N/A
Summary of Recommendation	Refusal

(i) Procedural Matters

A proposal of this scale would ordinarily be determined under delegated powers. However, given it forms a further extension to the major development approved by outline planning permission 13/01433/OUT, the subsequent reserved matters approval 17/01423/REM, and the last extension to the scheme (20/00277/FUL) this application has been referred to the Planning Regulatory Committee for determination.

1.0 Application Site and Setting

1.1 The application site (herein referred to as ‘the site’) is approximately 0.23 hectares in area and relates to part of an existing larger development site (herein referred to as ‘the whole site’) being built out by Wrenman Homes (the applicant). The whole site is located adjacent to the south eastern edge of Halton village, behind the Forgewood residential estate, and forms part of a housing allocation in the Lancaster District Local Plan. The site relates to part of the whole site and was originally approved for landscaping. A temporary sales building (now demolished) and parking area currently occupy the site.

1.2 The northern boundary of the site comprises a native Hawthorn hedgerow and a group of mature Sycamore trees that are protected by a Tree Preservation Order (TPO 321 (2001)). The western boundary abuts the newly constructed highway (Forest Heights), which serves the whole site, with open landscaping and a surface water attenuation pond beyond. This landscaping area separates the proposed site from the existing built-up area of the Forgewood estate. The south-eastern boundary also comprises a native Hawthorn hedgerow. The site gently rises from the northern boundary (approximately 29m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD)) to 33.4m AOD at the far southern boundary.

1.3 The site is located outside the village Conservation Area (c680m due west) and falls a significant distance from other designated heritage assets (listed buildings). The western edge of the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) lies approximately 130m (from the centre of the site) east of the application site with the River Lune Biological Heritage Site (BHS) (to the

south) and Lambclose Wood and Gutterflat Wood BHS (to the east) - both more than 200m from the site. The site is situated in floodzone 1 and is not affected by surface water flooding (for the 1 in 30 and 1 in 100yr events).

1.4 The main constraints include the site’s proximity to a high-pressure gas pipeline and overhead transmission power lines (both to the east) and the presence of protected trees along Low Road. A mineral safeguarding designation sweeps across the proposed site. However, this is not a constraint to development given the site falls within an existing housing allocation and formed part of the development approved under the outline planning permission.

2.0 Proposal

2.1 The applicant seeks full planning permission for the erection of seven two-storey dwellings with associated access, parking, and landscaping. The accommodation breakdown is as follows:

- 4 no. three-bedroom semi-detached dwellings
- 3 no. two-bedroom (3 person) terraced dwellings

2.2 The development comprises three different housetype designs finished in natural stone, white through-render under slate roofs. The scale, design and appearance of the proposed dwellings replicate the dwellings approved on the whole site. All new dwellings shall be constructed to meet the national described space standards.

2.3 An access to serve the development is taken off the main spine road (Forest Heights) around 30m south of the junction with Low Road. This leads to a private drive and parking court to the rear of the development accommodating twelve vehicle spaces and a turning area. The private drive has a carriageway width of 4.2 metres with no footways and is situated between proposed plots 2 and 3. Two additional parking bays are proposed to the south of plot 7.

3.0 Site History

3.1 The proposed site falls within land that already benefits from planning permission for residential development and falls within an existing housing allocation. The relevant planning history is set out in the table below:

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
14/01344/OUT	Outline application for the development of 60 dwellings with associated access	Approved
17/01423/REM	Reserved matters application for the erection of 60 dwellings and associated infrastructure	Approved
18/00672/FUL	Siting of temporary sales cabin with associated parking	Approved
20/00277/FUL	Erection of 9 dwellings with associated infrastructure and landscaping	Approved

4.0 Consultation Responses

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

Consultee	Response
Parish Council	Requests no further homes be built on this site until the issue of water supply is rectified in consultation with United Utilities.
Lancashire County Council Local Highway Authority (LHA)	No objection , subject to the following conditions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scheme to prevent parking along site frontage • Implementation of CMS • Future management and maintenance of estate road • Full engineering, drainage, street lighting and construction details of estate road and access

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protection of access sightlines • Estate road to be constructed to base course level before occupation • Provision of parking, cycle provision and EV charging facilities.
Lancashire County Council School Planning Team	No objection , subject to a contribution towards one primary school place amounting to £16,749.96. Failure to secure the contribution would result in an objection from the County Council's School Planning Team.
Lead Local Flood Authority	No objection
United Utilities	<p>No objection, subject to the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission of detailed surface water drainage scheme • Foul and surface water to be drained on separate systems <p>United Utilities have provided further comments in relation to concerns raised locally about the impacts of the development of water supply. UU have confirmed they do not object to the development (on water supply grounds) and recommend the applicant engages with UU in respect of the timing of the development.</p>
Environmental Health Service	<p>No objection, subject to the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision of electric vehicle charging points (rates at a minimum of 7.2kW) to be provided for each dwelling before occupation. • Implementation of submitted Construction Method Statement
HSE	Do not advice against the granting of Planning Permission on safety grounds.
Shell UK	No objection , stating the proposed works will not affect the Shell North Western Ethylene Pipeline.
Cadent Gas	Advises that the development lies within proximity to National Transmission assets. Referral to the Plant Protection team.
National Grid Plant Protection Team	No objection
Electricity North West	At the time of drafting this report, no comments received. A verbal update shall be provided.
Lancashire Fire and Rescue Service	Standing Advice received relating to Building Regulations Document B, Part B5 (Access and facilities for the Fire Service).
Planning Policy Team (strategic Housing)	At the time of drafting this report, no comments received.
Arboricultural Officer	No objection
Waste and Recycling Team (LCC)	At the time of drafting this report, no comments received.
Forest of Bowland AONB	At the time of drafting this report, no comments received.
Lancashire Constabulary	Below the development threshold for a Crime Impact Assessment consultation. Standing advice received in relation to Secure by Design accreditation.

4.2 At the time of writing this report, the following responses have been received from members of the public:

32 letters of objection. A summary of the main planning reasons for opposition are as follows:

- **Principle matters and housing need** concerns including loss of countryside by extending the village eastwards, lack of affordable housing, inappropriate piecemeal development of the wider site, too many new homes for the village and any housing need benefit should not outweigh local objections to the impacts of this development.
- **Environment and amenity** concerns including excessive light and air pollution (from development and traffic), proximity to the adjacent powerlines, construction noise and disruption, loss of land for landscaping and open space secured by the approval of reserved matters (17/01423/REM), disruption to wildlife and livestock on adjacent fields, impact on trees, adverse impact on landscape character and increased risk of flooding.

- **Design** concerns including the car park on the edge of the village is not in keeping with the natural beauty of the area, the dwellings bear no resemblance to the scale and design of the built form of the village, lack of sustainable design measures, these dwellings are poorly designed and don't reflect the "luxury and quality" homes of the rest of the development, the development is isolated from the rest of the development and looks like an afterthought and represents poor planning.
- **Insufficient facilities and infrastructure** to cope with additional development, in particular poor water supply and inadequate drainage infrastructure, poor internet on the site, water-logged gardens, soakaways not functioning correctly, little open space on site and poor maintenance of on-site landscaping, insufficient school places and concern over the lack of contributions by Wrenman Homes towards school places.
- **Traffic and highway** concerns including increased traffic and an additional access close to a busy road where traffic is in excess of the 30mph limit would be dangerous, increased risk in road safety incidents, increase in air pollution, highway safety issues and traffic distribution compounded by construction vehicles/traffic, existing roads not to standard, insufficient footways will increase risk to pedestrians particularly those with disabilities and children, risk of car parking on spine road affecting access viability and safe operation of the main access junction to Low Road.
- **Procedural/Consultation** concerns including a lack of pre-planning public consultation by the developer and concerns over public planning consultation process, the proposal conflicts with the planning permission and associated conditions for the temporary sales building and the reserved matters approval, developer already in breach of its planning permission/conditions, lack of detail/information in the submission, concerns that public objections and representations have been ignored by planning officers, concerns and lack of trust in the decision-making process given the voting (on two occupations) for the previous planning application, criticism over publicity (site notice not noticeable).

1 letter neither objecting or supporting the proposal. A summary of the comments are as follows:

- Proximity of the development to the overhead pylons and associated safety risks

5.0 Analysis

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

1. Principle of development
2. Contribution to housing needs
3. Traffic and highway matters
4. Landscape and design
5. Biodiversity
6. Amenity and Pollution
7. Flood risk and Drainage
8. Open Space
9. Education Infrastructure
10. Reducing Carbon Emissions

5.2 **Consideration 1: Principle of development:** (NPPF paragraph 7 – 12 (Achieving Sustainable Development) , 47 (Determining applications), Chapter 5 (Delivering a Sufficient Supply of Homes); Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policies SP1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development, SP2: Lancaster District Settlement Hierarchy, SP3: Development Strategy for Lancaster District, H2: Housing Delivery in Rural Areas of the District; Development Management DPD policy DM4 (Residential Development outside Main Urban Areas).

5.2.1 The District's settlement hierarchy (policy SP2 of the SPLA DPD) recognises Halton as one of the districts most sustainable settlements where the principle of housing can be supported. This policy recognises that Sustainable Rural Settlements offer a range of facilities and infrastructure to support additional growth, provided, in general, that the scale of housing growth is proportionate to the

existing scale and character of the settlement and availability of, or the opportunity to provide, infrastructure, services and facilities to serve the development can be accommodated in the local area. Policy H2 of the SPLA DPD allocates the whole site for housing (for 60 dwellings). This was based on an earlier approval of outline planning permission that the proposed site forms part of (as a single planning unit). Policy SP6 relates to housing delivery (a matter to be discussed further below) and clearly states that the figures set out in this policy represent minimum figures for new homes in the district. The policy goes on to state that opportunities for further growth will be supported where it represents sustainable development and is in accordance with relevant national and local planning policy. The principle of housing growth in Halton is acceptable in spatial planning terms. The key considerations (set out in paragraph 5.1 and discussed through this report) will assess whether the proposal constitutes sustainable development.

5.2.2 Following the grant of outline planning permission, the subsequent reserved matters approval purposefully (through negotiation) precluded development around the site access to provide amenity space, landscaping, biodiversity gains and space for necessary drainage infrastructure. That said, the land that is the subject of this application does not form part of the formal public open space (POS) (pursuant to the outline planning permission and associated legal agreement), nor does it comprise necessary ecological mitigation as part of the original development. Instead, it was designed to provide structural planting comprising a mix of native and ornamental trees, a native woodland and hedgerow mix to complement and enhance the rural edge to the settlement and provide a suitable gateway for the whole site. The loss of the approved landscaping in this area to accommodate the proposed development is disappointing and has design and townscape implications. However, it does not result in a direct conflict with essential and necessary requirements of the outline planning permission that would go to the heart of this early planning permission e.g. POS provision or ecology mitigation). On this basis, there are no overriding reasons why housing on the site could not be supported in principle (subject to all other material considerations).

5.2.3 The applicant secured planning permission for a temporary building to be used as a sales office with an associated car park (for 9 vehicles). Condition 1 of this planning permission requires the removal of the building and associated works on or before the 31st March 2021 or within 1 month of the sale of the last dwelling (based on the build programme provided with the application), whichever the earlier. The land was to be restored in accordance with a landscaping scheme first to be agreed in writing by, the local planning authority (LPA). The reserved matters approval requires the implementation of the approved landscaping scheme in this area in any case. The building and associated works no longer benefit from planning permission. The building has been removed with the car park remaining. The applicant has been made aware of the requirement to comply with the temporary consent and the reserved matters approval. Non-compliance with the earlier planning permission is a separate matter (for the LPA to investigate and monitor) and does not affect consideration of the pending planning application, other than the fall-back position (implementation of the approved landscaping pursuant to the reserved matters approval) which is a material consideration.

5.3 **Consideration 2: Contribution to housing needs** (NPPF paragraph 7 – 12 (Achieving Sustainable Development), Chapter 5 (Delivering a Sufficient Supply of Homes); Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policies SP6 (Delivery of New Homes) and H2 (Housing in the Rural Areas of the District) and Development Management (DM) DPD policies, DM1 (New Residential Development and Meeting Housing Needs), DM2 (Housing standards), DM3 (Delivery of Affordable Housing) and DM4 (Residential Development Outside Main Urban Areas); Five Year Housing Land Supply Position (November 2020).

5.3.1 The NPPF requires Councils to significantly boost the supply of new homes in their districts. The provision of new homes (and affordable homes) had been one of the main issues grappled with during the preparation and examination of the newly adopted Local Plan. The strategic and spatial objectives of the plan have had to carefully balance the district's housing and employment needs and growth aspirations against the need to rightly protect and enhance the district's natural and built environment. In accordance with national planning policy, the Council has established their full objectively assessed housing need (OAN) and the subsequent housing requirement having regard to available supply, deliverability and the constraints of the district. The Council has sufficiently and soundly evidenced that the Council cannot meet its full OAN. The Council's housing requirement is based on the delivery of 522 dwellings per annum. This is a significant uplift from the previous Core Strategy requirement. The Council recognises this is challenging with a plan reliant on the delivery

of several strategic sites and therefore policy SP6 sets out a stepped approach to housing delivery during the plan period. The supply of land for housing still exists, however, anticipated delivery rates of the allocated sites have been delayed and this is what is affecting the five-year housing land supply position.

5.3.2 The NPPF requires the Council to identify and update annually a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide a minimum of five years' worth of housing against their housing requirements set out in the adopted Local Plan. The most up to date housing land supply position for the Council remains that contained within the November 2020 Housing Land Supply Statement, which concludes that the Council is unable to identify a five-year land supply position. Currently, the Council can only demonstrate 3 years' worth of supply. In these circumstances, the NPPF continues to make it clear that where an LPA is unable to demonstrate a five year supply its policies in relation to the supply of housing cannot be viewed as up-to-date policies. Consequently, the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies (§11, NPPF), meaning planning permission should be granted unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole (§11d.ii). The proposed development will make a very small but positive contribution to the district's supply of housing which weighs significantly in favour of the proposal.

5.3.3 Policy DM3 of the DM DPD relates to the provision of affordable housing. For greenfield sites in rural east, schemes comprising more than ten residential units are required to provide 40% affordable housing. Schemes of less than ten residential units are not required to provide any affordable housing.

5.3.4 The Brandlord judgement (R (Westminster City Council) v First Secretary of State and Brandlord Limited [2003] J.P.L 1066), established three criteria to determine and assess the piecemeal development of sites or/and aggregation of sites for the purposes of applying an affordable housing policy threshold. The three criteria include:

- a. the ownership of the site;
- b. whether the land could be considered to be a single site for planning purposes;
- c. whether the development should be treated as a single development.

Subsequent to the Brandlord judgment, in the New Dawn Homes Ltd v SSCLG [2016] EWHC 3314 (Admin) case, the judge endorsed the approach adopted by Brandlord but held the three criteria were not determinative and that such should help inform decision-makers in forming a planning judgement as to whether development should be treated as aggregate development or not.

5.3.5 Having regard to the specific circumstances of this case, the LPA contend all three criteria are met and that based on the submission details, it is clear this smaller proposal on the site forms part and parcel of the whole development. Therefore, any additional dwellings should contribute to the provision of affordable housing and education facilities given the absence of policy compliant affordable housing associated with the original planning permission (14/01344/OUT). This was the same approach adopted and accepted by the applicant for the previous extension to the wider development (20/00277/FUL). The matter of aggregation has not been disputed by the applicant and, in accordance with policy DM3, a viability appraisal has been submitted to evidence the applicant's position that the development cannot support any affordable housing.

5.3.6 To provide some context, the outline planning permission was approved with a legal agreement securing (in summary) the following:

- A minimum of 24 affordable housing units (out of the 60) subject to viability at the reserved matters stage;
- The provision of an Education Contribution (to be calculated at reserved matters stage)
- The provision of on-site open space and landscaping (to be identified at reserved matters stage)

At the reserved matters stage, a viability case was presented and independently assessed concluding the development was only viable with an offer of 10 affordable housing units (16.67%). The re-assessment of the education contribution at reserved matter stage determined no requirement for additional school places. The applicant's first extension to the scheme (20/00277/FUL) delivered an education contribution only after presenting a viability argument evidencing the extended part of the site could not support any affordable housing. This viability assessment was based on the extended part on the site only.

- 5.3.7 Upon receipt of the pending application and following the LPA obtaining legal advice on the matter of aggregation and viability, the applicant's submitted financial viability appraisal (FVA) is now based on the whole site (based on 74 dwellings). The applicant's FVA concludes the whole development cannot accommodate any contributions other than those already committed to as part of the previous applications. Notwithstanding the applicant's position that the development is unviable, the applicant has indicated a willingness to provide the education contribution (consistent with the last extension to the development).
- 5.3.8 The applicant's FVA has been independently assessed to provide advice to the Council as to whether the proposed development can support affordable housing and/or s106 contributions. The conclusions of this independent assessment indicate the development would remain viable with affordable housing and an education contribution. The main area of disagreement between the applicant and the Council relates to the benchmark land value (BLV). This is the minimum price that a hypothetical landowner would accept in the prevalent market conditions to release land for development. The National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) states the BLV should be established based on the existing use value (EUV) of the land plus a premium for the landowner. The NPPG states clearly that EUV should disregard hope value and BLV should reflect the implications of abnormal costs, site specific infrastructure costs and professional site fees. The applicant's assumed BLV equates to £3,441,149 (£291,953 per net acre). This is based on an inappropriate and inflated EUV assumption (basing the land value expectations on the fact the site was allocated for housing). The Council's independent assessment of the FVA adopts an approach consistent with national policy and guidance (i.e. BLV based on EUV (agricultural land) plus a premium and regard to abnormal costs). In terms of premium uplift, the guidance (NPPG) does not provide any indication of what a reasonable return equates to. However, based on other evidence and recent appeal decisions the approach adopted in this case is to apply 15 times multiple to the EUV (that being £10,000 per acre). The LPAs consultant's assumed BLV is therefore £1,356,332 (£115,073 per acre). Adopting this BLV enables the development to be viable with all seven dwellings delivered as affordable homes plus the education contribution. This would result in a 22.97% provision of affordable housing across the whole site (still below policy expectations but clearly an improvement from the original position).
- 5.3.9 At the time of writing this recommendation, the applicant had confirmed they would be providing a rebuttal to the Council's viability position. This will be reviewed by the Council's viability consultant ahead of planning committee. Should the position change, a verbal update will be provided. Nevertheless, the applicant's current position (that the development cannot viability support and affordable housing) is not accepted and therefore fails to comply with the Council's affordable housing policy (DM3) and paragraph 58 and 63 of the NPPF. The applicant's position in respect of BLV is inappropriate and highly inflated. While the development will make a positive yet small contribution to the current under supply of housing, the applicant has failed to sufficiently justify the lack of affordable housing which weighs heavily against the proposal.
- 5.4 **Consideration 3 Traffic and Highway considerations (NPPF: Chapter 9 paragraphs 110-113 (Promoting Sustainable Transport) and Chapter 12 paragraph 130 (Achieving well-design places); Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policies T2: Cycling and Walking Network and T4: Public Transport Corridors; Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM29: Key Design Principles, DM60: Enhancing Accessibility and Transport Linkages, DM61: Walking and Cycling, DM62: Vehicle Parking Provision.**
- 5.4.1 National and local planning policy requires development to be sustainability located to minimise the need to travel, particularly by car, and maximise opportunities for the use of walking, cycling and public transport. Furthermore, development proposals should be safe, secure and attractive and should not result in severe residual impacts on the local highway network.
- 5.4.2 Halton village is recognised as one of the districts most sustainable settlements. The site is within 1km of the River Lune Cycleway and around 210 metres to bus stops on Low Road. Bus No.80 and 81 provide services between Lancaster and Ingleton/Kirkby Lonsdale via Halton (and other Lune Valley villages). These buses offer early and late morning, afternoon, and an early evening services, mainly providing school bus services during school terms. There are sufficient footways between the site and the village hall/recreation grounds (circa 500m west of the site). From the village hall there is a safe, albeit steep, pedestrian link to High Road where the local centre and school are situated.

Overall, future occupants of the development could safely access local services by alternative transport modes.

- 5.4.3 The development shall be served by the recently constructed priority-controlled junction off Forest Heights onto Low Road. The location of the private access off Forest Heights (the main spine road) is approximately 30 metres south of the Low Road junction. Despite public comments to the contrary, given the scale of the development, this is deemed a safe distance from the junction. Furthermore, the increase in traffic arising from the development would not be significant and would not result in any severe highway impacts on the safe and efficient operation of the local highway network. The private drive serving the rear parking court is 4.5m wide with no separate footways. From within the parking court, plots 1-3 have direct access to their rear gardens. Plots 4-6 would need to walk to the front of the development via the drive. Plot 7 has its own driveway. Given the low levels of traffic anticipated from this development and low traffic speeds, a shared surface for the private drive (for pedestrians and vehicles) is deemed suitable. The level of parking proposed, together with the provision of EV charging points (3 in total - 1 serving plot 7 directly and 2 post-mounted 7kW chargers for the parking court) and cycle storage, is acceptable and accords with the policy requirements set out in the DPD.
- 5.4.4 Overall, the proposed development is considered acceptable from a traffic and highway safety perspective and fully accords with national and local planning policy. The local highway authority has raised no objection to the development, subject to conditions set out in the consultation summary of this report. One of the requested conditions requires a scheme for the prevention of parking along the spine road fronting the development. On-street parking would prohibit the protection of the visibility splays from the private access into the parking court therefore this condition is considered reasonable and necessary. Other conditions include the provision of parking/cycle spaces and EV charging provision before occupation. In the event the development was supported, such conditions would comply with paragraph 56 of the NPPF (relating to the tests for imposing conditions).
- 5.5 **Consideration 4 – Landscape and Design** (NPPF: Chapter 15 paragraph 174 and 176 -177 (Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment), Chapter 12 paragraphs 124, 127 and 130 (Achieving Well-Designed Places); Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policy EN2 (Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty), EN3 (The Open Countryside); Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM29: Key Design Principles, DM45 (Protection of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland) and DM46 (Development and Landscape Impact).
- 5.5.1 The application has been submitted with a Landscape and Visual Assessment Addendum (LVA). This assessment seeks to analyse the potential effects of the development (described as a slight extension to, and re-arrangement of, the wider development) on the surrounding landscape character and visual amenity, having regard to the proximity of the site to the edge of the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Policy DM46 requires the Council to attach great weight to the protection of nationally important designated landscapes (consistent with paragraph 176 of the NPPF), including the effects of development on the setting of designated landscapes. The proposed development sits within what would have been the extended landscaped buffer along the eastern boundary (secured as part of the original planning permission). The effects of the proposal on landscape character, above those effects identified upon the grant of the outline planning permission, are not considered significant. The primary focus in this case relates to the visual effects of the development. The submitted LVA concludes that the visual affects arising from the development would largely been seen in context with the consented scheme and the rest of the village settlement, with the residual effects likely to be minor moderate to negligible and therefore, overall, not significant. The greatest impacts are those from residential receptors (off Schoolhouse Lane (close to Low Lane)) and transport receptors along Low Road. From these views and contrary to the applicant's LVA, the development will not be seen in the context of the consented scheme. There will be a marked change in the visual appearance and character of this part of the site. This is largely due to proposal being some distance away from the rest of the scheme owing to the topography and the position of the spine road. The visual impacts arising from the development would be moderate minor but very localised and would not lead to significant impacts on the special qualities of the AONB or its setting. In this regard and with the proposed landscape mitigation the proposal would not result in a conflict with policy DM46.

- 5.5.2 As described above, at a more localised level, there is a degree of harm arising from the development. Policy DM4 and DM29 requires (amongst several measures) proposals for new residential development to be well related to the existing built form, be proportionate to the existing scale and character of the settlement and to demonstrate good design and siting to conserve the character and quality of the landscape and to have regard to local distinctiveness. The scale of the development is considered proportionate to the village, even having regard to cumulative impacts. The design of the dwellings themselves are acceptable reflecting those recently constructed as part of the wider site. However, the scheme results in an uncomfortable juxtaposition with the existing built form, owing to its separation from dwellings on the Forgewood estate and the separation and distance from the approved and recently constructed development. The wider site was purposefully set back from Low Road with the housing development starting at the rear of the Forgewood estate (aligning with the built form of the village). The original scheme had a relatively long open and landscaped approach towards the two gateway dwellings at the start of the development. This was to achieve two main objectives. The first, to reflect on the existing settlement pattern of the village in this location and secondly to secure a sensitive edge to the extended settlement boundary – providing a suitable transition from the build-up part of the village and the surrounding countryside. The proposed development diminishes these objectives and results in a divorced cluster of development, with a rather hard urban edge arising from the parking court to the rear of the dwellings. While the proposal includes additional planting along the eastern boundary it does not overcome the harm arising from the disconnected nature of the proposal, which overall does not represent good design. In this regard, the proposal does conflict with design elements of DM4 and DM29 of the DM DPD and section 12 (paragraphs 126 and 130) of the NPPF, which, through good design, seeks to secure high quality, beautiful and sustainable places.
- 5.6 **Consideration 5 – Biodiversity (NPPF: Chapter 15 paragraph 174 and 179-182 (Habitats and biodiversity); Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policy EN7 (Environmentally Important Areas); Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM44 (Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity) and DM45 (Protection of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland).**
- 5.6.1 Planning policy requires development to protect, contribute to and enhance biodiversity and the natural and local environment. The site has previously been used to occupy a temporary sales office and parking. The sales cabin has now been removed and the land left unfinished (despite the planning permission for the sale cabins to require the implementation of a landscaping scheme). The overall ecological value of the site is considered negligible. The most significant landscape/ecological features are the protected trees to the northern boundary that shall be retained. The development includes extensive lengths of new hedgerow planting with native standard trees to the eastern boundary, with hedgerow planting also proposed along the northern boundary, together with understorey planting close to the retained trees. Overall, whilst the extent of landscaping proposed is less than what was intended by the original planning permission, the proposal will still result in biodiversity benefits sufficient to comply with the requirement of policy DM44 and the paragraphs 180 of the NPPF. The proposed development would not adversely affect protected species and is located far enough away from Morecambe Bay designated sites (SPA, SSSI, SAC, RAMSAR –“the Bay”) to rule out any likely significant effects on the integrity of the Bay.
- 5.6.2 The development is sited away from the protected trees along the north boundary enabling their full retention. The Council’s Arboricultural Officer is satisfied with the proposed tree protection measures and the works proposed within the root protection areas. The proposal involves new tree planting within the hedgerows (to reflect surrounding roadside and field hedgerows) as well as new trees within the development layout. The extent of tree planting accords with policy and the new paragraph 131 of the NPPF, which recognises the importance trees make to the character and quality of urban environments as well as the contribution trees make to mitigate and adapt to climate change. The development therefore accords with policy DM45 and DM46 in relation to tree protection and landscaping.
- 5.7 **Consideration 7 – Amenity and Pollution (NPPF: Chapter 8 paragraph 91 (Promoting Healthy and Safe Communities), Chapter 12 paragraphs 124, 127 and 130 (Achieving Well-Designed Places), and paragraphs 178 – 183 (Ground Conditions and Pollution). Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policy SG1 Lancaster South Broad Area of Growth and EN7 (Air Quality Management Areas); Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM2 (Housing standards), DM29 (Key Design Principles), DM30 (Sustainable Design), DM31 (Air Quality Management and Pollution), DM32 (Contaminated Land) and DM57 (Health and Well-Being).**

5.7.1 Residential Amenity

Planning policy requires development to provide an acceptable standard of amenity for all. Policy DM29, and to a lesser extent the design and well-being chapters of the NPPF, require new residential development to have no significant detrimental impacts to the amenity of existing and future residents by way of overlooking, visual amenity, privacy, outlook and pollution. The proposed development forms a small extension to the previously approved development. However, it is located some distance from the wider scheme and from dwellings on the Forgewood estate. The closest dwellings are located well in excess of the required interface distances set out in DM29 and, therefore, there is no anticipated impacts arising from the development on the amenity of existing residential properties. The layout, siting and design of the proposed development provides for an acceptable standard of amenity for all future occupants, with internal layouts meeting the requirements of the nationally described spaces standards and external garden areas meeting the minimum requirements for size and privacy set out in the DM DPDD. The linear arrangement of the development means all of the proposed dwellings are protected from overlooking with sufficient outlook from their main front and rear elevations. Each dwelling shall be provided with two car parking spaces, cycle storage and access to electric vehicle charging facilities.

5.7.2 Pollution

Regard has also been paid to the proximity of the development to the overhead lines, in terms of visual and noise effects. The applicant has sufficiently evidenced to the satisfaction of National Grid that the proposed development will not impede the operation of the infrastructure and that the buildings are within accepted safety clearance distances. In terms of the visual effects, unlike the previous extension to the wider scheme, the proposed dwellings are a significant distance from the closest pylon and orientated with the habitable elevations facing away from the pylon itself. As such, there are no adverse visual effects associated with the proximity of the development to the pylon. The visual effects of the overhead lines are unlikely to be harmful given the proximity of the development to the overhead lines and their height above the buildings themselves. This leaves the issue of noise and health and safety.

5.7.3 The proposed dwellings lie within a range of 3 - 17 metres of the overhead lines. This is not a dissimilar relationship to the approved development, albeit one plot at 3m (at its closest point) is very close. Like the original outline, reserved matters and the latest extension application, National Grid and the Council's Environmental Health Service (EHS) have no objections to the development on the grounds of noise impacts. Following the assessment of the last planning permission (20/00277/FUL) the Council's Environmental Health Service advised the Case Officer (at the time of its determination) that they have not received any complaints from residents of the estate about adverse impacts concerning noise from the overhead power lines. Furthermore, they have advised that there are no recorded complaints relating to this type of noise on their information systems historically. This strongly suggests that the effects of noise from the overhead lines is not likely to result in significant adverse effects and certainly not from within the dwellings themselves. Noise from the powerlines will be greatest, albeit unlikely to be harmful, when it is raining. Inside the dwellings the noise is unlikely to be adverse, if at all audible. Externally, the noise would be audible but during wet conditions the external space will not be heavily used to result in significant adverse effects to the enjoyment of this space. The Council's EHS believed that development (20/00277/FUL) would not be adversely affected by noise and that there was little justification to request further noise information at that time to assess and determine the application or resist the application on the grounds of noise. The consultation response from the Council's EHS in response to this application echoes the same position and is satisfied that noise from the overhead lines is unlikely to be an issue.

5.7.4 This part of the wider site does lie closer to the high-pressure gas pipeline that runs to the east of the site. The Health and Safety Executive have been consulted and do not advise against the development.

5.7.5 Finally, in respect of land contamination, an appropriate site investigation has been undertaken which confirms the risk of contamination on the site is low and would not prevent the site from being developed for residential purposes. This conclusion is accepted by the Council's EHS.

5.7.6 Having concluded there will be no adverse effects on the amenity of existing residents, it is important to recognise that there will be a degree of disruption and nuisance arising from the construction

phases of the development, but these impacts are temporary and short lived, especially given the number of dwellings proposed. It is accepted that existing residents of the wider site have experienced extended disruption from construction activities because of subsequent extensions to the development. The submitted Construction Method Statement provides a degree of mitigation against such disruption. The local planning authority are aware of regular breaches of the existing CMS and do engage with the applicant on such matters to remedy concerns where possible. Whilst limited and temporary effects on residents during construction can be disturbing, it would not outweigh the benefits of the proposal. Nor is it possible or reasonable to prohibit acceptable development on the grounds of an applicant's current failure to regularly comply with an approved CMS. Overall, future residents of the development will have access to an acceptable standard of amenity and will not be at risk of adverse pollution. The identified effects on existing residents are not significant and would not be a reason to substantiate a refusal of planning permission. In this regard the proposal accords with development plan and the NPPF in relation to residential amenity, health and quality of life.

5.8 Consideration 7 – Flood Risk and Drainage (NPPF: Chapter 14 paragraphs 159, 167 and 169) (Planning and Flood Risk); Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM33 (Development and Flood Risk), DM34 (Surface Water Run-off and Sustainable Drainage) and DM35 (Water Supply and Waste Water).

5.8.1 The proposed site is situated in flood zone 1 and is not, therefore, a location at risk of flooding. This accords with the general presumptions set out in the NPPF and policy DM33. The critical consideration here relates to site drainage and the appropriate management of surface water to avoid a flood risk on site or elsewhere. Policy DM34 requires development to manage surface water in a sustainable way utilising sustainable drainage systems in accordance with the surface water drainage hierarchy. The proposed sustainable drainage strategy for the site accords with the SUDS hierarchy and is proposed to drain by infiltration through the use of geo-cellular soakaways designed to attenuate for the 1 in 100 year (plus climate change (40%)) storm events. The LLFA have reviewed the proposal and have raised no objection to the proposals. Individual soakaways in gardens shall be the responsibility for future home owners. The soakaways within the road shall be managed and maintained by a management company (like the rest of the development). Foul water shall drain to the public sewer. United Utilities have raised no objections to the development, but have advised the local planning authority to consult the LLFA given concerns being raised to UU about soakaways on the wider scheme not functioning correctly. The local planning authority have not been provided with evidence of this, but have reverted back to the LLFA for confirmation they remain satisfied with the details submitted and for the drainage layout/details to be controlled by condition should the development be considered favourably. A verbal update will be provided should this position change following further consultation with the LLFA.

5.8.2 Despite public concerns to the contrary, overall the general approach to the site drainage is acceptable. United Utilities and the Lead Local Flood Authority have raised no fundamental objections to the proposal, confirming the site is capable of draining without causing a flood risk elsewhere. The precise details of the drainage system and infrastructure, including maintenance requirements, can be adequately controlled by planning condition to ensure the development complies with planning policy.

5.8.3 Water supply has been an issue raised by many of the existing residents of the wider development and the Parish Council. The Case Officer has engaged with United Utilities regarding this matter. United Utilities have advised that there have already been improvements made to the local network and further works to replace bursting mains in Low Road and Forgewood due to take place soon on and this basis, United Utilities has no objection to the application in relation to water supply either. The applicant shall be advised to engage with United Utilities at the earliest opportunity regarding the time of their water supply requirements.

5.9 Consideration 8: Open Space (Development Management DPD Policies DM27 Open space, sports and recreational facilities, Appendix D of the DM DPD July 2020)

5.9.1 The proposed parcel of land is not identified as formal public open space, therefore the loss of this land for housing does not conflict with first part of policy DM27. The second strand to policy DM27 relates to the creation of new open space, sports and recreational facilities to support the needs and demands arising from new development. In this case, the original development secured ample amenity open space which, with the additional seven dwellings proposed as part of this application,

would not result in an under provision on site. Future occupants will benefit from the on-site open space and the connections provided through the development to wider open space/green networks. Should the planning permission be granted there would be an expectation that the future occupants of the site would be required to contribute to the management and maintenance of such open space (along with the landscaping and road/drainage infrastructure required for this development).

- 5.9.2 In terms of off-site provision, DM27 requires development proposals to contribute to open space, sports and recreational facilities in areas of recognised deficiency. Halton village benefits from high quality open space and recreational facilities. Whilst there will be additional demands and pressures arising from development growth, the village does not suffer from any significant deficiency of particular open space typologies. Given the viability position and mindful that all the previous planning permissions on this site were not required to contribute to off-site open space, on balance, the proposal would not conflict with policy DM27 in the circumstances.
- 5.10 **Consideration 7: Education Infrastructure** (Development Management DPD Policies DM1 New residential development and meeting housing needs DM57 Health and Wellbeing, DM58 infrastructure delivery and funding)
- 5.10.1 Paragraph 95 of the NPPF and policy DM57 recognises the need for development to support local infrastructure to cope with the impacts of expansion on local services, such as school provision. The NPPF requires local planning authorities to give great weight to the need to create, expand and alter schools through planning both in terms of policy making and decision taking. Local planning policy DM58 states that developments will be expected to provide or contribute towards the provision of measures to directly mitigate the impacts of development. This includes school place provision. In this case, an increase of 7 dwellings equates to a pupil yield of 1. The County Council's Education Assessment indicates that there will be a shortfall of primary school places in 5 years' time across the local primary schools within the catchment of this site. On this basis, a contribution towards 1 primary school place (£16,749.96) has been requested towards Caton Community Primary School or/and Nether Kellet. Lancashire County Council state these schools are the closest primary schools to the development that have space to accommodate expansion.
- 5.10.2 Policy DM58 states that development viability is a material consideration. Notwithstanding the applicant's current viability position, the applicant has committed to provide the education contribution (set out in the draft Heads of Terms) in order to mitigate the impacts of the development on local school infrastructure.
- 5.11 **Consideration 10: Reducing Carbon Emissions** (Development Management DPD Policy DM30 Sustainable Design)
- 5.11.1 Policy DM 30 recognises that sustainable design has an important role to play in improving the overall sustainability performance of new development as well as helping reduce environmental impacts by mitigating the effects of climate change. This policy states the council will seek to encourage higher standards of sustainable design, largely by adopting a fabric first approach, to reduce energy consumption and carbon dioxide and water consumption. The applicant has confirmed in their Energy Statement that all the houses are intended to be highly insulated and energy efficient and would exceed the minimum requirements of Building Regulations (Part L) by at least 10%. As set out earlier in the report, the proposed dwellings shall also have access to electric vehicles charging facilities and each dwelling shall have suitable cycle storage to encourage model shift. These are matters that can be controlled by condition to secure compliance with policy DM30 of the DM DPD.

6.0 Conclusion and Planning Balance

- 6.1 The proposed development will bring about several benefits. Most significantly is the fact the proposed development will make a small but valued contribution to the current under supply of housing. This is a matter that is given great weight in the planning balance. The housing would be in one of the districts most sustainable rural settlements and unlike some of the larger detached houses located on the wider site, this scheme will offer smaller homes for a different sector of the community, overall providing a better housing mix to meet local housing needs. The proposed dwellings shall meet the national described space standards and shall be designed to exceed Part L building regulations in terms of energy efficiency. The scheme secures a good standard of amenity for future occupants and the design of the dwellings themselves are of a high standard of design reflect the whole site. The development will further support the local economy through the generation of jobs during construction and wider benefits associated with construction supply chains. The development will also contribute to the provision of one primary school place to mitigate the impacts of the development. It has been assessed and accepted that the development would not lead to severe impacts on the local highway network, that the site is capable of being drained without causing a flood risk and the impacts on landscape character would not be adverse. Collectively, these measures and planning considerations help contribute positively to the delivery of sustainable development.
- 6.2 The identified impacts arising from the development relate to the siting of the development with no meaningful relationship with the existing settlement pattern or built form. Whilst planting is proposed along the eastern boundary the transition between the built-up part of the village and the surrounding countryside is diminished by these proposals. This results in a conflict with part of policy DM4 and DM29, largely relating to poor design and the associated visual impacts of the development at a very localised level. This impact is given moderate weight in the planning balance.
- 6.3 Turning to the matter of viability and affordable housing. Contributions toward housing generally is a matter given significant weight and clearly provides meaningful benefits. However, housing must meet identified needs with affordable housing being a significant component of that need. The lack of affordable housing in the district is acute. Therefore, when proposals fail to offer policy compliant affordable housing, it must be justified. As set out in this report, the applicant's position (at the time of writing this recommendation) offers no affordable housing based on their viability assumptions. Whilst the policy clearly allows for viability to be assessed on this occasion, the applicants evidence is not sufficient to justify no affordable housing. This is a matter that is given substantial weight and clearly weighs heavily against the development.
- 6.4 The balancing exercise in this case remains a 'tilted balance' which means planning permission must be granted unless the adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefit when assessed against the Framework as a whole. The proposed development, by virtue of its siting and poor relationship with the existing settlement pattern constitutes poor design. This identified impact, in isolation, would not outweigh the benefits of the proposal. When combined with the unjustified lack of affordable housing (a matter that is judged to significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal) officers strongly recommend that the development is refused.

Recommendation

That Planning Permission BE REFUSED for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development is considered aggregate to the wider development and in the absence of securing policy compliant affordable housing as part of the original planning permission, the proposed development must contribute to affordable housing provision and other s106 contributions deemed necessary to mitigate the impacts of the development. The proposed development is considered contrary to policy DM3 of the Development Management Development Plan Document and paragraphs 58 and 63 of the National Planning Policy Framework, as the applicant has failed to sufficiently justify the lack of affordable housing (as part of their viability argument) as part of the proposal.
2. The proposed development, by virtue of its siting and layout with the parking court to the rear, poorly relates to the existing built form and settlement pattern of the village. It would result in an isolated

pocket of development, separated by intervening areas of open space and landscaping, from surrounding development that would diminish the sensitive transition from the built environment to the surrounding countryside secured as part of the original planning permission for the wider site. Consequently the proposal is considered to constitute poor design and would result in localised visual harm, contrary to policies DM4, DM29 and Section 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

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

Lancaster City Council takes a positive and proactive approach to development proposals, in the interests of delivering sustainable development. As part of this approach the Council has sought to negotiate some changes during the determination period, aimed at positively influencing the development proposals. The applicant and offices continued to work together to address the identified impacts, however, three remains fundamental disagreement in relation to specific matters associated with the viability assessment, that such can not be overcome to alter our recommendation at this stage.

Background Papers

Agenda Item	A9
Application Number	21/00126/FUL
Proposal	Temporary siting of two cabin buildings for use as toilet block and welfare facilities
Application site	Marsh United Football Club, Willow Lane, Lancaster, Lancashire
Applicant	Mr Dennis McGonnell
Agent	
Case Officer	Ms Sophie Burch
Departure	No
Summary of Recommendation	Approve

(i) Procedural Matters

A scheme of this nature would normally determined under delegated powers, however the land to which the application relates to is within the ownership of the City Council and therefore has to be presented to Planning Committee.

1.0 Application Site and Setting

1.1 The site which forms the subject of this application is at Coronation Field, which is currently the home of Marsh United Football Club. The site is located to the west of Lancaster City Centre. Willow Lane Play Park is located adjacent to the application site, which is situated in a predominately residential area.

1.2 Under the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD the site is designated as open space. It is also designated under Policy DOS3, which identifies the site as an opportunity area for improvement to the current recreation and open space offer.

2.0 Proposal

2.1 The application seeks temporary planning permission for the siting of two cabin buildings for use as a toilet block and welfare facilities. These cabin buildings will be located on either side of an existing pavilion which is used by the football club. The welfare cabin will be situated north west of the existing pavilion and an existing store and will measure 6.1 metres in length and 2.4 metres in width. The toilet block will be located to the south east of the existing pavilion and will measure 6.1 in length and 2.4 metres in width. Both buildings will measure 2.3 metres in height and feature a flat roof.

3.0 Site History

3.1 There is no recent planning history

4.0 Consultation Responses

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

Consultee	Response
County Highways	No objections
Environmental Health	No adverse comments
Sport England	No objections
Public Realm Officer	No objections
Property Services	No response

4.2 The following responses have been received from members of the public:

- X3 objections received- 2 from neighbour notification, 1 provides no address.

The objection reasons are summarised below:

- Impact on views of nearby properties
- Impact on property values
- Traffic and parking
- Noise pollution
- Odour
- Litter
- Overlooking/loss of privacy

5.0 Analysis

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

- Principle of Development
- Design
- Highways and parking
- Residential Amenity
- Protection of Open Space
- Other Matters

5.2 **Principle of development (NPPF paragraphs 7, 8, 9, 10 and Policy SP1 of the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD (2020))**

5.2.1 The presumption in favour of sustainable development is at the core of the NPPF and requires the decision takers to approve development that accord with an up-to-date development plan without delay.

5.2.2 The site is located within a sustainable area and will help meet the ongoing needs of the site for the continued community sports use of the site. The principle of development can therefore be support subject to the proposal complying with the relevant policies of the Local Plan outlined below. The critical concern with any application that is located on sports pitches is whether the use is compatible and this is explored more in Paragraph 5.6 of this report.

5.3 **Design (NPPF paragraphs 124, 127 & 130 and Policy DM 29 of the Development Management DPD (2020))**

5.3.1 The cabins will be located adjacent to the existing pavilion and an existing cabin. They will measure the same size as the existing cabin and will be of a smaller scale to that of the existing pavilion. However, the design, materials, construction, and appearance of the flat roof temporary structure is poor and would be unacceptable on a permanent basis. Whilst the proposed green colour is more suitable to the surrounding pitches and grassland, the proposal will exacerbate the existing negatives of the site with an increased amount of temporary structures on site. The buildings will be

visible when travelling along Willow Lane and from the playpark and pitches. They will be somewhat screened from the properties to the rear by hedging

5.3.2 Given the above, the proposal of siting portable buildings is one that could only be supported on a temporary basis (of 3 years) as an interim measure whilst funding and planning permission is sought for a more permanent appropriate solution. The agent is agreeable to this temporary permission whilst options for further funding and a more permanent solution are explored. Given this it is considered that the scheme complies with Policy DM29 of the Development Management DPD.

5.4 **Highways and Parking** (NPPF paragraphs 102, 103, 109 and Policy DM 62 of the Development Management DPD (2020))

5.4.1 The grass pitches currently do not benefit from any designated car parking spaces. However the site is within a highly sustainable location, with a bus stop located adjacent to the site. There is on street parking along Willow Lane and adjoining streets. County Highways has been consulted and offered no objections to the proposal.

5.4.2 One objection makes reference to the potential increase in traffic and parking. There is however no evidence to suggest the provision of the buildings would result in an increase in traffic and pressure and parking.

5.5 **Residential Amenity** (NPPF paragraphs 124, 127 & 130 and Policy DM 29 of the Development Management DPD (2020))

5.5.1 The proposed toilet block is located three metres from the rear garden of 112 Willow Lane whilst the proposed welfare cabin is similarly located three metres from the rear garden of 5 Forest Park. Dense hedging and a two metre high wire fence separates the properties from the pitches. Although the proposal is located within close proximity to these properties, they are similar to what already exists on site and therefore are unlikely to significantly exacerbate any issues associated with residential amenity. One objection makes reference to the impact of the proposal on views from their property, and whilst amenity is a consideration the right to a view is not.

5.5.2 One objection, received from 112 Willow Lane makes reference to overlooking as a result of the proposal. Given the height of the structures, any overlooking is unlikely. In addition, the thick hedging will screen the proposal from the properties along Willow Lane to the rear and Forest Park. This objection also makes reference to the potential for noise and smell as a result of the proposal. There is however no evidence to suggest the proposal will result in any additional noises or smells. In addition, Environmental Health has been consulted and offered no adverse comments.

5.6 **Protection of Open Space** (NPPF paragraphs 96 & 97, Policy DM 27 of the Development Management DPD (2020) and Policy SC3, SC5 and DOS3 of the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD (2020))

5.6.1 Policy DM 27 seeks to protect and enhance existing designated open spaces and prevent the loss of designated open space, sports and recreational facilities unless a certain set of criteria is met.

5.6.2 While both buildings are located within the open space land designation, given their location to the edge of the playing fields, they will not impinge on its usability. The buildings will provide an improvement on the existing facilities for the football club providing toilet and welfare facilities. This is in line with Policy DOS3.

5.6.3 Sport England will oppose the granting of planning permission for any development which would lead to the loss of, or would prejudice the use of all or any part of a playing field. However, it is considered that the proposal meets exception 2 of their Playing Field Policy in that the proposal development is for ancillary facilities supporting the principal use of the site as a playing field, and does not affect the quantity or quality of playing pitches or otherwise adversely affect their use.

5.6.4 As discussed above, the addition will provide an improvement to the facilities of the existing football club and will not impinge on the usability of the playing field. By enhancing and investing in the existing facilities, the proposal secures a brighter future for the football club and as such complies with Policy DM 27. The public realm officer is in full support of the application as the scheme further

enhances and improves the grass root football facilities and helps maintain the club which is a essential part of the community.

5.7 **Other Matters**

5.7.1 One of the objections makes reference to the potential impact of the proposal on property values. This is not considered a material consideration and as such is afforded no weight in the determination of this application.

6.0 **Conclusion and Planning Balance**

6.1 Due to the relatively small nature of the development involved, the proposal is considered appropriate to both the site and the existing buildings. Although the design is of overall poor quality, a temporary permission, if granted, will allow the football club time to explore their options for a permanent solution. The proposal will not significantly impact neighbour amenity and it will improve upon the existing facilities and provide an enhancement to the playing fields. As such, the proposal is considered to comply with the local and national policies outlined above and is recommended for approval.

Recommendation

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

Condition no.	Description	Type
1	Standard three year timescale	Control
2	Development in accordance with plans	Control
3	Temporary Permission of 3 years	Control
4	Separate foul and surface water drainage	Control

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

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

Background Papers

None

LANCASTER CITY COUNCIL

APPLICATION NO	DETAILS	DECISION
19/01346/FUL	Beckside, Long Level, Cowan Bridge Erection of a two storey side extension and covered storage area to rear for Mr Andrew Makinson (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
20/00151/DIS	Land East Of Arkholme Methodist Church, Kirkby Lonsdale Road, Arkholme Discharge of conditions 7,8 and 9 on approved application 15/01024/OUT for Oakmere Homes (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00160/DIS	Land To The Rear Of Kirklands And Hanging Green Lane, Hest Bank, Lancashire Discharge of conditions 3,4,5 and 6 on approved application 17/01358/FUL for Chris Halhead (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Permitted Development
20/00162/DIS	Land East Of Arkholme Methodist Church, Kirkby Lonsdale Road, Arkholme Discharge of conditions 4,6 and 11 on approved application 15/01024/OUT for Oakmere Homes (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00163/DIS	Land East Of Arkholme Methodist Church, Kirkby Lonsdale Road, Arkholme Discharge of conditions 4 on approved application 18/00645/REM for Oakmere Homes (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00393/FUL	Moorlands Hotel, Quarry Road, Lancaster Partial retrospective conversion of lower ground floor to facilitate the creation of 4 self-contained studio flats (C3) for student accommodation, retention of single storey side extensions at lower ground floor level, provision of entrance porch, bin and bike stores, and construction of external staircase and retaining wall for Quarry Road Ltd (John O'Gaunt Ward 2015 Ward)	Appeal Against Non Determination
20/00640/FUL	Land Between 7 And 11, St Johns Avenue, Silverdale Erection of one 2-storey dwelling (C3), alteration of levels and installation of drainage infrastructure for Mr & Mrs John Burrow (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00672/CU	6 - 8 Slip Inn Lane, Lancaster, Lancashire Retrospective application for the change of use of bar (Sui Generis) to a mixed use unit comprising of a hairdressers (E) and beauty/tattoo studio (Sui Generis) for Simon Gill (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00782/CU	1 Westbourne Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Change of use of ground floor office (E) to hot food takeaway (Sui Generis) for Mr Derek Pye (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

20/00844/OUT	Redfields, Wyresdale Road, Quernmore Outline application for an agricultural workers dwelling (C3) and associated access for Anthony Gardner (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
20/00913/FUL	Arndale Centre, Market Street, Morecambe Erection of external sprinkler pump room and water storage tank within east service yard for Ian Henton (Poulton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn
20/00948/FUL	Land Adjacent To 247 Lancaster Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Demolition of existing garage, erection of a detached dwelling (C3) with associated access/parking for Mr W. Hill (Westgate Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/00956/FUL	Red Bank House, Shore Lane, Bolton Le Sands Erection of a stable block for Mr Rod Taylor (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
20/00960/FUL	Primrose Cottage, Tudor Rose Cottage, Briar Rose Cottage And Mistle Cottage, Borwick Road, Borwick Change of use of land to create vehicular access track and turning area, dropped kerb and parking for Linda Rigby (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
20/00978/CU	Ratcliffe And Bibby Solicitors, 3 - 7 New Street, Carnforth Change of use of office (Class E) into mixed use of cafe/restaurant (Class E) and hot food takeaway (Sui generis) with first and second floor living accommodation (Class C3), alteration to ground floor front facade and installation of flue to the rear for Mr Okkes Ozmicco (Carnforth And Millhead Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01035/FUL	Upper Foxholes Farm, Anyon Lane, Bay Horse Change of use of agricultural building and land to a dwelling (C3) with associated residential land, single storey extension to north and south elevation and creation of parking area. for Mr B Prest (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01106/REM	Hillam Farm, Hillam Lane, Cockerham Reserved matters application for the erection of a detached dwelling for Mr Gardner (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01141/FUL	234 Bowerham Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Change of use of former children's home (C2) into a two six bed student houses of multiple occupation (sui generis), demolition of existing side extension, erection of single storey side extension, single storey front porch extension, alterations to window positions and change in external materials for Mr. J. King (Scotforth East Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01143/FUL	120 North Road, Carnforth, Lancashire Erection of a single storey front extension including canopy, erection of a part two storey part single storey rear extension with raised terrace/balcony, construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation and alterations to land levels for Rick & Craig Myers (Carnforth And Millhead Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

20/01154/FUL	Pastordale Farm, Kellet Lane, Over Kellet Erection of a replacement stable and storage building for Mr and Miss Richard David and Lauren Alexandra Bellamy (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn
20/01155/FUL	Hazelwood Hall, Hollins Lane, Silverdale Installation of lightning conductor to the East Wing for Hazelwood Hall Management Co. Ltd (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01178/FUL	12 Ashcroft Close, Caton, Lancaster Retrospective application for the retention of a fence and gate to the front garden for Mr Adam Corcoran- Birtles (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
20/01209/OUT	49 Main Street, Cockerham, Lancaster Outline application for the erection of one dwelling with associated access for Mr T Salisbury (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01244/FUL	Lee Tenement, Rakehouse Brow, Quernmore Conversion of existing attached barn including new and altered window/door openings to provide additional living accommodation and the erection of a first floor rear extension, a first floor side extension and a two storey rear extension to the existing dwellinghouse and installation of a new package sewage treatment plant for Ms R Farthing (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01246/FUL	Land Southwest Of Church Bank, Main Road, Over Kellet Erection of 9 dwellings with associated access and alterations to land levels for Mr Lee Ogley (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
20/01257/ADV	41 - 47 Penny Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Advertisement application for the display of two internally illuminated projecting signs, two externally illuminated hanging signs, eight vinyl window signs and a non-illuminated ATM surround, Night Safe surround and Letter Box surround for Miss T Darbey (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01268/FUL	Land Rear Of, Chapel Croft, Main Street Alterations to land levels and the erection of two detached dwellings (use class C3) with associated garden and parking areas for Mr TJ and JW Hartley (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
20/01269/FUL	The Hamblings, Garstang Road, Cockerham Erection of a single storey front extension and single storey rear extension, installation of package treatment plant and re-positioning of existing access for Mr & Mrs Peter Walling (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01303/FUL	Netherby, Aughton Road, Gressingham Alterations to land levels to create a lake for Mr and Mrs John and Rebecca McGuinness (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
20/01311/FUL	Lancaster Music Co-op, 1 Lodge Street, Lancaster Installation of replacement windows, doors and stonework to the front elevation for Lancaster City Council (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

20/01336/FUL	Quarry Mount, Quarry Mount Mews, Lancaster Erection of a first floor extension to the rear and side and a part single storey, part two storey extension to the side/front incorporating a balcony for Mr J Mom (John O'Gaunt Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01380/ADV	25 Brock Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Advertisement application for the display of two non-illuminated fascia signs and two externally illuminated hanging signs for Dr Christopher Moss (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01383/FUL	Land At, Beckside, Church Lane Creation of an agricultural access track for Clarke (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01388/FUL	Land To The South Of Arna Wood Stables, Arna Wood Lane, Aldcliffe Construction of a manège for Ms Helen Barski (Scotforth West Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01391/FUL	Lancashire Fire And Rescue Service, Morecambe Community Fire Station, Westgate Change of use of gravel hardstanding to delineated car park including ambulance car parking bays for Clare Hedingham (Westgate Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01408/PLDC	18 Coach Road, Warton, Carnforth Proposed Lawful Development Certificate for the removal of a window and installation of replacement door and construction of external staircase to the rear elevation for Dr. Trevor Blease (Warton Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Refused
20/01436/FUL	29 Royds Avenue, Heysham, Morecambe Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of a detached dwelling (C3) for Mrs Jacinta Bottomley (Heysham Central Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn
20/01439/FUL	Palatine House, Scotforth Road, Lancaster Installation of 3 no. antennas and associated apparatus for Cellnex And EE Ltd And Hutchison 3G UK Ltd (Scotforth East Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
20/01462/FUL	Addington Lodge, Addington Road, Nether Kellet Demolition of two existing stable buildings and erection of three single storey buildings for use as office (Class E) and training facilities (Class F1) with staff facilities building and stable block for Mr Adrian Gott (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
20/01463/FUL	15 Church Bank, Over Kellet, Carnforth Erection of a part two storey, part single storey, front, side and rear extension and erection of a detached garage for Mrs Helen May (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00010/DIS	Christ Church, Broadway, Morecambe Discharge of conditions 4,5,6,8,9,11 and 15 on approved application 20/00293/FUL for Mr Philip Lambert (Bare Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00014/CU	55A Dallam Avenue, Morecambe, Lancashire Change of use of office (Class E) into one 1-bed self-contained flat (C3) for David and Linda McGuire (Poulton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

21/00019/DIS	St Johns Hospice, Slyne Road, Lancaster Discharge of conditions 3, 4, 5, 7, 8 and 11 on approved application 20/01005/FUL for St Johns Hospice (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision
21/00020/DIS	St Thomas Centre, Marton Street, Lancaster Discharge of conditions 4, 5, 6 and 10 on approved application 19/00697/FUL for Mr Tim Parsons (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00021/DIS	St Thomas Centre, Marton Street, Lancaster Discharge of condition 4 on approved application 19/00634/LB for Mr Tim Parsons (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00028/DIS	Gornalls Farm, Flintron Brow, Over Wyresdale Discharge of conditions 4, 6 and 7 on approved application 20/00335/LB for Declan Hoare (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00029/DIS	21-25 North Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Part discharge of condition 4 on approved application 18/01440/VCN for Bargh (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00029/VCN	1 Queen Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Change of use of offices to student accommodation comprising of one 7-bed cluster flat and one 8-bed cluster flat (Pursuant to the variation of condition 2 on planning permission 16/00796/CU to amend the elevations and floor plans, submit information to discharge condition 4 and revise the cycle storage provision required by condition 5) for Yellow Door Lets (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00032/DIS	Site Of Former Filter House, Scotforth Road, Lancaster Discharge of part of conditions 4 and 11 and discharge of conditions 7, 8 and 12 on approved application 19/00996/VCN for Mr Vivian Watts (University And Scotforth Rural Ward)	Split Decision
21/00035/DIS	2 Main Street, Overton, Morecambe Discharge of condition 3 and part discharge of condition 5 on approved application 19/01376/FUL for Mr & Mrs Williams (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00036/DIS	2 Main Street, Overton, Morecambe Discharge of condition 3 and part discharge of condition 4 on approved application 19/01377/LB for Mr & Mrs Williams (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00036/FUL	Sellerley Farm, Conder Green Road, Galgate Erection of agricultural building over existing open cattle yard area for Mr Edward Newsham (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00038/FUL	50 - 52 Penny Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Change of use of retail storage (Class E) on first and attic floor into one 2-bed flat and two 1-bed flats (3), erection of two storey extension to the rear to form one 1-bed flat (C3) and construction of two dormer extensions and installation of rooflight to the rear roof and replacement of existing rear windows for Mr Patel (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

21/00044/FUL	The Stables, Back Lane, Wennington Conversion of existing double garage to ancillary living accommodation, installation of flue to the west elevation, 2 rooflights to the west elevation, installation of new door and window to the south elevation, removal of garage doors, and installation of vertical timber boarding with glazing for Mr Matt Brazier (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00045/LB	The Stables, Back Lane, Wennington Listed Building application for the installation of flue to the west elevation, 2 rooflights to the west elevation, installation of new door and window to the south elevation, works to internal partition walls, installation of internal stairs, installation of balustrade, removal of garage doors and installation of vertical timber boarding with glazing for Mr Matt Brazier (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00050/DIS	Land East Of Heysham Free Methodist Church, Laureston Avenue, Heysham Discharge of conditions 3, 5 and 6 on approved application 20/00538/FUL for Mr Lee Ogley (Heysham South Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00052/DIS	Greystoke, Willey Lane, Cockerham Discharge of conditions 3, 4 and 5 on approved application 20/00211/FUL for Mrs Ruth Benn (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00057/DIS	Land Off Bye Pass Road And , Land Rear Of 18 To 24 Monkswell Avenue, Bolton Le Sands Discharge of conditions 8 and 11 on approved application 18/01493/FUL for Mr J Grafton (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision
21/00058/DIS	Field Adjacent To Woodlands View, Over Kellet, Lancashire Discharge of conditions 4 and 6 on approved application 20/00136/FUL for Mr Mark Drinkall (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision
21/00065/DIS	Brookhouse Old Hall, Brookhouse Road, Brookhouse Discharge of condition 4 and 7a and c on approved application 18/00035/LB for Martin Horner (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00072/DIS	Lancaster Girls Grammar School, Regent Street, Lancaster Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 21/00295/LB for Mr Stephen Sharpe (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00074/DIS	Hérons Wood Farm, Lancaster Road, Conder Green Discharge of conditions 4,5,8 and 9 on approved application 19/01457/FUL for Mr Tarik Jayousi (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision
21/00075/DIS	Swallows Nest, Melling Road, Melling Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 20/00077/FUL for Mrs A. Tomlinson (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision
21/00076/DIS	Brookhouse Old Hall, Brookhouse Road, Brookhouse Discharge of condition 6a, 6b and 6d on approved application 18/00035/LB for Martin Horner (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

21/00077/DIS	Brookhouse Old Hall, Brookhouse Road, Brookhouse Discharge of condition 4a and 4b on approved application 18/00034/FUL for Martin Horner (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00079/DIS	University Of Cumbria, Bowerham Road, Lancaster Part discharge of condition 9 on approved application 20/00554/FUL for Rebecca Thackray (John O'Gaunt Ward 2015 Ward)	Request Completed
21/00080/DIS	Field Adjacent To Woodlands View, Over Kellet, Lancashire Discharge of condition 7 on approved application 20/00136/FUL for Ms Karen Holden (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00081/DIS	West Penwyth, Kirkby Lonsdale Road, Over Kellet Discharge of condition 4 on approved application 20/01083/VCN for Mr and Mrs Oliver Whiley (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00082/DIS	Gornalls Farm, Flintron Brow, Over Wyresdale Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 20/00335/LB for Declan Hoare (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00083/DIS	Tarnsyke Cottage, Flintron Brow, Over Wyresdale Discharge of conditions 3 and 5 on approved application 20/00427/LB for Declan Hoare (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Request Completed
21/00083/LB	Brunthill House, Main Street, Arkholme Listed building application for the retention of solar panels to the rear facing roof slope for Mr Trevor Manton (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00084/DIS	Throstle Nest Farm, Main Road, Thurnham Discharge of conditions 3,4,5,6,7,8 and 9 on approved application 18/00539/CU for Mr & Mrs Whittingham (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision
21/00086/DIS	Mill House, Sandside, Cockerham Discharge of conditions 3, 4 and 5 on approved application 20/00827/FUL for Mr & Mrs R Kellet (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00087/DIS	Land South Of Playing Field Trumacar Lane, Middleton Road, Heysham Discharge of conditions 3,4,5 and 6 on approved application 20/01004/REM for Mark Barnes (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Closed
21/00089/DIS	Blackpool Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Community Health Offices, Slyne Road Discharge of condition 2 on approved application 21/00354/PAC for Healthcare Solutions Ltd (Skerton East Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00092/DIS	Land North Of, Royal Oak Meadow, Hornby Discharge of conditions 3,4,5 and 6 on approved application 19/00320/REM for Mr J Beard (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision
21/00095/DIS	Salt Ayre Landfill Site, Salt Ayre Lane, Lancaster Discharge of conditions 5 and 6 on approved application 21/00256/FUL for Mr Elliott Grimshaw (Skerton West Ward 2015 Ward)	Split Decision

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

21/00095/LB	Coach House, Summerfield House, Long Level Listed building application for the removal of two windows and retention of a bi-fold door for Mr Matt Armstrong (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00097/VCN	Christ Church, Broadway, Morecambe Change of use of former church (D1) to 13 self-contained flats (C3), erection of single storey side extension, creation of a bin and cycle store, installation of rooflights to rear and side elevations, construction of balconies to rear elevation and construction of raised decking to north east elevation with associated parking, garden and amenity space (Pursuant to the variation of conditions 2 and 10 on planning permission 20/00293/FUL to amend the approved plans and materials) for Turner Lambert Developments (Bare Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00098/DIS	Launds Field, Stoney Lane, Galgate Discharge of conditions 3 and 7 on approved application 20/01335/VCN for Mr Lee Norman (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00103/DIS	Salt Ayre Landfill Site, Salt Ayre Lane, Lancaster Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 21/00256/FUL for Mr Elliott Grimshaw (Skerton West Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00105/FUL	Land Adjacent Hill Top Farm, Kellet Road, Over Kellet Erection of a two storey detached dwelling house (C3) for Mrs S Nicholls (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00107/FUL	18 - 20 Penny Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Retrospective application for the installation of an extractor fan, extractor duct and grills to the rear and side elevations for Mr David Ferguson (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00116/VCN	Addington Lodge, Addington Road, Nether Kellet Erection of a block of five stables and farm office block (pursuant to the variation of conditions 3 and 6 of planning permission 12/00505/FUL to amend plans and change the wording of the use of the buildings condition) for Mr Adrian Gott (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00121/FUL	Higher Snab Farm, Aughton Road, Gressingham Change of use of agricultural building into dog boarding kennels (Sui Generis) including creation of windows and doorway for H Burrow (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00125/LB	Grand Theatre, St Leonards Gate, Lancaster Listed building application for the installation of new ventilation fans with associated works for Mr Michael Hardy (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00130/VCN	Former Filter House, Kellet Road, Carnforth Demolition of existing building and erection of a new building to be used as a church conference and resource centre (use class D1) and associated new car parking (pursuant to the variation of conditions 1 and 5 on planning permission 19/00495/VCN to amend plans including layout and finishes) for Mr John Carter (Carnforth And Millhead Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

21/00133/CU	Moss Side Racing Stables, Crimbles Lane, Cockerham Change of use of existing stables to boarding kennels for Mr Jeffrey Brough (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00139/FUL	The Cottage, Cantsfield Road, Cantsfield Erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr Beardsworth (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00144/LB	40 Yealand Road, Yealand Conyers, Carnforth Listed building application for repairs to barn including replacement of roof, mezzanine floor, staircase and lintels, repointing, reinstatement of rainwater goods and structural repairs for Miriam Naheed (Warton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00154/FUL	Willow Barn, Aughton Brow, Aughton Conversion of existing loft space above garage to create ancillary accommodation including the installation of 3x roof lights for Mr & Mrs Andrew Pyle (Halton-with-Aughton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00162/FUL	Cote Farm And Cote Cottage, Strellas Lane, Slyne Installation of sewage treatment plant for Mr N Casson (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00175/PLDC	8 Brock Close, Morecambe, Lancashire Proposed lawful development for erection of single storey rear and side extensions for Mr. & Mrs. J. Booth (Skerton West Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
21/00191/FUL	Strawberry Gardens Hotel, 390 Heysham Road, Heysham Erection of pergola, 3 covered seating huts, erection of 2.4m high posts and external lighting for T Wass (Heysham Central Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00211/FUL	14A Betony, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of one detached dwellinghouse (C3) and associated access for Mr Simon Livesey (Torrisholme Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00213/LB	25 Brock Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Listed building application for the fitting of two non-illuminated fascia signs and two externally illuminated hanging signs, painting of shopfront and cleaning of stonework for Dr Chris Moss (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00217/OUT	Land Adjacent , 41 Main Street, Cockerham Outline application for the development of one dwelling (C3) for Mr. Harry Parker (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn
21/00218/VCN	Hill Farm, Littledale Road, Brookhouse Change of use of barns to two dwellings (C3), demolition of existing modern barns and erection of two new dwellings (C3), creation of passing place and erection of bin store (pursuant to the variation of condition 2 on planning permission 18/01419/FUL to replace chimney, to amend internal layout, upgrade sewage treatment plant and to amend location, shape and size of various windows and doors to house 2) for Daniel Jackson (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

21/00233/FUL	Halton Green East, Green Lane, Halton Erection of a single storey side extension for Mr D and Mrs N Briggs (Halton-with-Aughton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00234/LB	Halton Green East, Green Lane, Halton Listed building application for the erection of a single storey side extension for Mr D and Mrs N Briggs (Halton-with-Aughton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00238/FUL	2 Rennie Court, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a two storey rear extension and a single storey rear extension for Mr.&Mrs. J. Taylor (Scotforth West Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00245/FUL	Cort House, Main Street, Arkholme Relevant demolition of exiting two storey and rear single storey extensions, erection of single storey rear extension, conversion of garages to create ancillary living accommodation and alterations to land levels to form a patio for Dr Lesley Bow (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00246/LB	Cort House, Main Street, Arkholme Listed Building application for the relevant demolition of rear two storey and single storey extensions, erection of new single storey rear extension, installation of a replacement roof, conversion of garage to form ancillary living accommodation, alterations to land levels to form a patio, removal of vestibule, partial removal of stone worktop in pantry, removal of existing first floor WC and bathroom, creation of enlarged landing at first floor level, formation of door opening within masonry wall leading into newly formed bedroom and creation of new bathroom for Dr Lesley Bow (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00264/LB	1 Queen Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Listed building application for the removal and installation of internal partition walls, replacement internal doors, replacement windows to western elevation of rear outrigger, installation of external lights, CCTV, boiler flue and air vents, erection of a bin store for Yellow Doors Lets (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00267/PLDC	43 Pinewood Avenue, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a replacement detached garage for Mr Butterworth (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
21/00278/FUL	2 Moor Platt, Caton, Lancaster Erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr John Huntington (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00282/FUL	Buccelli's, 29 Church Street, Lancaster Retrospective permission for the erection of a retractable awning to the front elevation for Mr Bruno Buccelli (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00288/FUL	The Farm House, Back Lane, Wrayton Demolition of existing rear extension and erection of a replacement single storey rear extension, the replacement of various existing windows, installation of a flue to the rear and erection of a canopy to the rear elevation for Mr and Mrs John Lowery (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

21/00289/LB	The Farm House, Back Lane, Wrayton Listed building application for works to internal walls, installation of a stud wall, installation of replacement windows, new openings installation of internal secondary glazing, alterations to window cill levels, installation of log burning stove and boiler, removal of internal stairs, installation of roof lights, installation of a flue, erection of a canopy to the rear elevation, installation of lead flashing, guttering and fascia, widening of existing external door way incorporating glazed side panel, demolition of existing rear extension and erection of a replacement single storey rear extension. for Mr and Mrs John Lowery (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00305/FUL	Ivy Lodge, Lowgill Lane, Lowgill Installation of replacement windows to the front and rear elevations for Miss Caroline Parkinson (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00306/LB	Ivy Lodge, Lowgill Lane, Lowgill Listed building application for the installation of replacement windows to the front and rear elevations for Miss Caroline Parkinson (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00307/FUL	4 Broadacre Close, Caton, Lancaster Erection of a single storey front extension, the construction of a raised replacement roof over existing front projection, re-rendering of part of the front elevation and the construction of a raised platform for Mr Graham Bennett (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00308/FUL	23 Lodges Grove, Morecambe, Lancashire Change of use of 2 flats (C3) to a single dwellinghouse (C3) and erection of a single storey side and rear extension for Mr & Mrs R & L Balderson (Bare Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00311/FUL	7 Dalton Square, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a three storey rear extension to form fire escape for Mr Angell (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00316/FUL	11 Church Park, Overton, Morecambe Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr. G. Tyson (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00318/FUL	18 Church Park, Overton, Morecambe Erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr. P. Parkinson (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00321/FUL	Westfield House, Rakehouse Brow, Quernmore Erection of an agricultural storage building for silage and creation of hardstanding for Mr Josh Atkinson (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00329/PLDC	180 Albert Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a single storey side extension, detached outbuilding and demolition of existing rear extension for Mr. D. Wilcock (Harbour Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
21/00335/FUL	Foxfield Barn, Main Road, Galgate Erection of a single storey orangery extension to rear for Mr & Mrs Wylie (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

21/00342/FUL	Curwen Hill Farm, Hornby Road, Wray Creation of concrete hardstanding on three existing yard areas for Mr Frank Towers (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00345/FUL	2 Swallow Close, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Erection of a boundary fence to the front and side to alter existing fence line for Mr Simon Daly (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00356/PLDC	14 Browsholme Close, Carnforth, Lancashire Proposed Lawful Development Certificate for the demolition of existing conservatory and erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr+Mrs S+J Butters (Carnforth And Millhead Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
21/00368/FUL	Camp House Farm, Hornby Road, Farleton Erection of an agricultural storage building for Mr Peter Norris (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00372/FUL	ENWL Depot, Freightway, White Lund Industrial Estate Reconfiguration of site layout and change of use of land including removal of two cabin buildings, relocation of one cabin, siting of two replacement cabins and creation of additional parking for Electricity North West Limited (Westgate Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00378/FUL	Ghyll House And Ghyll Bank, Aughton Brow, Aughton Installation of new sewage treatment plant for Mr Shaun McKirgan (Halton-with-Aughton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00387/PLDC	17 Priory Close, Morecambe, Lancashire Proposed Lawful Development Certificate for the erection of a single storey rear extension and erection of a garden shed for Mr.&Mrs. D. Hodges (Westgate Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
21/00388/FUL	Trixstan Contract Services , Woodgate, Morecambe Roof lift to existing industrial buildings and over existing entrance yard for Trixstan Contract Services Ltd (Westgate Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00391/LB	Tarnwater, Coneygarth Lane, Tunstall Listed building application to replace 5 windows and a door with 2 joining windows, reinstate original corner window panels in upper floor corner window, replacement of lintels and painting of existing extension for Mr Angus Wilson (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00399/FUL	51 Wingate Saul Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a single storey rear and side extension for Mr C Shaw (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00419/FUL	44 Ullswater Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Demolition of existing first floor rear extension, erection of single storey rear/side extensions with a replacement roof over existing single storey rear extension, construction of a raised patio area and construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation for Ransome (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

21/00423/FUL	10 Redvers Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Demolition of existing single storey rear extension and erection of a new single storey rear extension for S. Siebrasse H. Guyatt (Marsh Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn
21/00425/CU	34 Meldon Road, Heysham, Morecambe Change of use of dwellinghouse (C3) to a residential care home for one child (C2) for Mrs J Jones (Heysham South Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00426/CU	10 Penrhyn Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Change of use of dwellinghouse (C3) to a residential care home for one child (C2) for Mrs J Jones (Skerton West Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00429/FUL	23 Wennington Road, Wray, Lancaster Erection of a single storey rear extension, erection of a two storey side extension and construction of front porch for Mr and Mrs Tim and Emma Hodgkinson (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00431/FUL	49 Portland Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a single storey rear extension and construction of two boxed dormers to the rear elevation for Mrs S Dola (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00434/FUL	9 Clarksfield Road, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Construction of a raised roof over existing two storey side extension, conversion of garage into habitable room, alterations to land levels including the installation of new external steps at the rear, and erection of a single storey outbuilding to the side for Mr and Mrs Evans (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00437/FUL	Coach House, Kirkby Lonsdale Road, Arkholme Removal of existing septic tank and installation of sewage treatment plant for Mr James Benson (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00441/PLDC	42 Mill Lane, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Proposed lawful development certificate for the use of garage as a dog grooming business for Miss Francesca Frew (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn
21/00446/FUL	Thurnham Hall, Main Road, Thurnham Demolition of existing extension and erection of a replacement single storey side extension with associated external steps, and installation of external timber gates for Lucy Talbot Clegg (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00447/LB	Thurnham Hall, Main Road, Thurnham Listed building consent for the demolition of an existing extension and erection of a replacement single storey side extension with associated external door and steps, alterations to internal doorway and installation of external timber gates for Lucy Talbot Clegg (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00458/FUL	35 Hest Bank Lane, Hest Bank, Lancaster Demolition of existing side extension and front porch, and erection of a part two storey and part single storey rear and side extension, and erection of a replacement front porch for Mr Paul Ingleby (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

21/00461/FUL	Heysham Power Station, Princess Alexandra Way, Heysham Erection of 3 modular buildings for EDF Energy Nuclear Generation Ltd (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00471/FUL	15 Albert Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Installation of a replacement timber shop front for Mrs Kathryn Proctor (Harbour Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00472/FUL	6 Stuart Avenue, Morecambe, Lancashire Construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation and construction of hip to gable extension for Mrs. L. Parkinson (Bare Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00473/PLDC	28 Redruth Drive, Carnforth, Lancashire Proposed Lawful Development Certificate for the conversion of existing attached garage to habitable room for Mr. S. Halpin (Carnforth And Millhead Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
21/00475/FUL	1 Douglas Drive, Heysham, Morecambe Erection of a single storey side extension for Mr. R. Holmes (Heysham South Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00486/FUL	208 Brookhouse Road, Brookhouse, Lancaster Erection of a single storey side extension for Fiona Colburn (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00488/FUL	26 Glen View Crescent, Heysham, Morecambe Erection of a single storey rear extension, construction of a pitched roof to garage for Mr & Mrs Dent (Heysham South Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00491/FUL	24 Coleman Drive, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a shed on rear of driveway for Dr Jayaprakash Rajaram (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00499/FUL	William Pennys, Regent Street, Lancaster Replacement of flat roof with pitched roof and installation of rooflights for Lancaster Charity (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00508/FUL	Eskrigge Hall, Eskrigge Lane, Gressingham Demolition of existing conservatory, erection of single storey extension, canopy and creation of new window openings to the rear elevation for Mr & Mrs Peter and Deborah Robinson (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00509/LB	Eskrigge Hall, Eskrigge Lane, Gressingham Listed building application for demolition of existing conservatory, erection of single storey extension, canopy and creation of new window openings and insertion of stone mullion to the rear elevation for Mr & Mrs Peter and Deborah Robinson (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00518/FUL	65 Kayswell Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Construction of a hip to gable extension and construction of a dormer extension to the front elevation for Mr.&Mrs. M. Capstick (Torrisholme Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

21/00522/PLDC	32 Lowther Avenue, Morecambe, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the construction of a hip to gable extension, construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation and the insertion of a rooflight to the front elevation for Mr.&Mrs. D. Lord (Torrisholme Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
21/00532/PLDC	13 Homfray Avenue, Morecambe, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the construction of a hip to gable extension and construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation for Mr. S. Sandham (Torrisholme Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
21/00535/FUL	16 Dutton Drive, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a rear conservatory and alterations to the height of the existing side boundary fences for Mr & Mrs Hudson (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00537/VCN	19 Marine Road West, Morecambe, Lancashire Change of use of property to a cafe/coffee shop (pursuant to the variation of condition 4 on planning permission 08/01148/CU to amended the hours of operation from between 07:30 and 19:00 daily to 07:30 and 23:00 daily) for Mrs Julie Ley (Harbour Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00560/PLDC	2 Knowsley Close, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed Lawful Development Certificate for the conversion of existing conservatory to a single storey rear extension, partial conversion of garages to habitable room, installation of bi-fold doors, installation of new windows and doors and relocation of flue for Mr and Mrs Roberts (Marsh Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn
21/00567/ELDC	10 Oxcliffe New Farm Caravan Park, Oxcliffe Road, Heaton With Oxcliffe Existing lawful development certificate for the use of land known as 10 Oxcliffe New Farm Caravan Park as a residential caravan pitch for Bridget Hanley (Heysham South Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn
21/00570/FUL	2B Stankelt Road, Silverdale, Carnforth Conversion of existing garage to form additional living space, erection of a single storey rear extension and construction of a detached garage for Mr Stuart Taylor (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00573/PLDC	111 Hest Bank Lane, Slyne, Lancaster Proposed lawful development certificate for construction of a dormer extension to an existing outbuilding for Mr Shaun McGuire (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn
21/00575/ADV	Buzz Bingo, Marine Road East, Morecambe Advertisement application for the display of a double-sided internally illuminated freestanding digital advertisement screen for Mr Rob Smith (Poulton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
21/00589/FUL	Gleaves Hill Barn 1, Gleaves Hill Lane, Bay Horse Retrospective application for the installation of flue to the north west elevation and TV aerial to the north east elevation for Duchy of Lancaster (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

21/00590/FUL	Gleaves Hill Barn 2, Gleaves Hill Lane, Bay Horse Retrospective application for the installation of flue to the north west elevation and TV aerial to the south west elevation for The Duchy of Lancaster (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00593/PLDC	36 Greenset Close, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation for Mr Floyd (Skerton West Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
21/00597/PLDC	5 Bridge Croft, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a single storey rear extension for Mrs. V. Dixon (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
21/00603/PAA	Ravens Close Farm, Ravens Close Road, Wennington Prior approval for the change of use of agricultural building to a dwelling (C3) for Mr A Easterby (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Granted
21/00608/FUL	4 Jackson Close, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a first floor side extension over existing garage for Mr.& Mrs T. Kornas (Marsh Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00609/PLDC	7 Chester Close, Heaton With Oxcliffe, Morecambe Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr.&Mrs. P. Edgar (Westgate Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
21/00618/FUL	19 Sharpes Avenue, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a first floor front extension for Mr Steven Armer (Scotforth West Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
21/00620/NMA	10 Middleton Road, Middleton, Morecambe Non-material amendment to planning permission 17/01368/FUL to alter approved gable roof to hipped roof and for alterations to roof over entrance door for Mr Robert Campbell (Overton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00622/PLDC	2 Oak Avenue, Galgate, Lancaster Proposed Lawful Development Certificate for the partial demolition of garage and installation of a new pitched roof to side extension for E McDougall (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
21/00623/PLDC	4 Carr House Lane, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed Lawful Development Certificate for the erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr & Mrs Branscombe (Castle Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
21/00629/FUL	3 Tithebarn Hill, Glasson Dock, Lancaster Demolition of existing rear conservatory and erection of a single storey rear extension with canopy for Mr & Mrs T Woodward (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00644/PLDC	14 Wyresdale Gardens, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a single storey rear extension and conversion of garage into habitable room for Mr. Ellis & Dr. Gregg (John O'Gaunt Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

21/00646/FUL	Honeysuckle House, Bay Horse Road, Ellel Erection of a single storey side extension for Ms Anne Longton (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00652/PAA	Docker Park Farm, Docker Lane, Arkholme Prior approval for the change of use of agricultural building to 2 dwellings (C3) for Mr And Mrs Tamlin (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Refused
21/00653/FUL	29 Torrisholme Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a single storey side and rear extension for Mr and Mrs Robinson (Skerton West Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00657/PLDC	8 York Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the demolition of existing single storey rear extension and the erection of a replacement single storey rear extension for Mr. A. Romito (Scotforth West Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
21/00658/PLDC	6 Cathedral Drive, Heaton With Oxcliffe, Morecambe Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr. D. Nield (Westgate Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
21/00659/PLDC	115 Cleveleys Avenue, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the construction of a hip to gable roof extension and construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation for Mr.& Mrs. Hodgson (Skerton West Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
21/00660/PLDC	7 Keswick Grove, Heysham, Morecambe Proposed lawful development certificate for the construction of a hip to gable extension and construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation for Mr. A. Marsh (Heysham South Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
21/00665/HLDC	Brookhouse Old Hall, Brookhouse Road, Brookhouse Certificate of Lawfulness for proposed works to a Listed Building for installation of a replacement roof and replacement of lead work to chimneys, valleys and abutments for Mr Martin Horner (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
21/00666/PLDC	58 Lymm Avenue, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the construction of a hip to gable extension, dormer extension to the rear elevation and installation of two rooflights to the front elevation for Mr and Mrs Armitage (Skerton West Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
21/00669/PLDC	4 Richmond Avenue, Morecambe, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a single storey rear extension for Messrs ODonnell and Charlson (Bare Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
21/00673/FUL	94 Windermere Road, Carnforth, Lancashire Erection of a single storey rear extension for Mrs & Mrs E Waterworth (Carnforth And Millhead Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00680/FUL	Loyne View, Rabbit Lane, Gressingham Erection of a greenhouse for Mr Nigel Bottomley (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

21/00683/FUL	S J Bargh Claughton Warehouse, Hornby Road, Claughton Erection of side extension to warehouse (B8) for Mr Finlayson Green (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00685/PLDC	7 Cartmel Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the relocation of existing front door and installation of a new window for Robin Eyre (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
21/00691/FUL	Barn Cottage, 6 The Green, Silverdale Erection of a greenhouse for Dr Olivia Watson-Keith (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00707/PLDC	49 Winchester Avenue, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation for Mr. M. Armstrong (John O'Gaunt Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Refused
21/00721/NMA	2 Hazelmount Crescent, Warton, Carnforth Non material amendment to planning permission 20/00955/FUL to remove a window on the proposed rear dormer and to alter the cladding material for Mr Andrew Butterfield (Carnforth And Millhead Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00724/PLDC	13 Hatlex Drive, Hest Bank, Lancaster Proposed lawful development certificate for the demolition of existing outrigger, alterations to side elevation and the erection of a single storey rear extension for Sarah Bamber (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
21/00728/PLDC	65 Greenwood Avenue, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Proposed lawful development certificate for erection of a single storey rear extension for Mrs Sam Southwart (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Withdrawn
21/00730/FUL	22 Campbell Drive, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a rear conservatory for Mr & Mrs Perks (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00732/FUL	31 Kingfisher Drive, Heysham, Morecambe Erection of a single storey side extension incorporating a canopy roof and construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation for Mr and Mrs Davies (Heysham South Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00747/PLDC	5 Westbourne Place, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a single storey rear extension, construction of a hip to gable extension and a dormer extension to the rear elevation and installation of two roof lights to the front elevation for Mr.&Mrs. J. Davison (Marsh Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
21/00748/PLDC	25 Brier Drive, Heysham, Morecambe Proposed lawful development certificate for the construction of a hip to gable roof extension and construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation for Mr. P. Dullage (Heysham South Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

21/00749/PLDC	4 Bay View Crescent, Slyne, Lancaster Proposed lawful development certificate for the construction of a dormer extension to the side elevation, alterations to the existing windows and installation of a window to the rear elevation and installation of three roof lights to the side elevation for Mr. G. Pedder (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Refused
21/00750/PLDC	32 St Michaels Lane, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Proposed lawful development certificate for the construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation for Mr.&Mrs. M. Squires (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
21/00753/PLDC	1 Glentworth Road West, Morecambe, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr.&Mrs. W. Smith (Westgate Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
21/00759/PLDC	11 Windham Place, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the construction of a hip to gable roof extension and construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation for Mr. D. Green (Skerton West Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
21/00785/PLDC	3 Grizedale Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr.&Mrs. Wilson (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
21/00787/FUL	1 Ashbourne Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a two storey side extension for Mr Keith Hetherington (Skerton East Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00789/FUL	21 Yealand Road, Yealand Conyers, Carnforth Erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr & Mrs Hancock (Warton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00790/LB	21 Yealand Road, Yealand Conyers, Carnforth Listed Building Consent for the erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr & Mrs Hancock (Warton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00795/NMA	4 Bryn Grove, Hest Bank, Lancaster Non-material amendment to planning permission 19/01353/FUL to glaze the front dormers and peak of the porch and to alter garage door size for Mr & Mrs D Furey (Bolton And Slyne Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00805/PIP	Field At Grid Reference 352822 454619, Procter Moss Road, Abbeystead Permission in principle application for the erection of up to 2 dwellings for Mr Richard Parker (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
21/00814/FUL	17 Derwent Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Demolition of existing rear extension and conservatory and the erection of replacement single storey extension, and demolition of existing garage and the erection of replacement workshop building for Mrs and Mrs Thompson (Bulk Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

21/00827/PLDC	16 Cathedral Drive, Heaton With Oxcliffe, Morecambe Proposed lawful development certificate for demolition of existing conservatory and erection of a replacement single storey rear extension for Mr.&Mrs. A. Nutt (Westgate Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
21/00831/PLDC	38 Scotforth Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a garage to the side elevation for Mr. P. Brown (Scotforth West Ward 2015 Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
21/00838/PAM	Public Footway Off, Ovangle Road, Morecambe Prior approval for the installation of a 15m monopole and 4 associated equipment cabinets for CK Hutchison Networks (UK) Ltd (Westgate Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Granted
21/00865/AD	Land To The East Of Jeremy Lane And South Of The Canal, Glasson Dock, Lancashire Agricultural determination for erection of hay storage building for Mrs Beverley Morgan (Ellel Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Refused
21/00872/AD	Lawsons Farm, Shaw Lane, Nether Kellet Agricultural determination for creation of two tracks for Mr Chris Halhead (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Granted
21/00893/PAD	Ravens Close Farm, Ravens Close Road, Wennington Prior approval for demolition of an agricultural building and a silo for Mr A Easterby (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Granted
21/00927/PAM	Land At, Cinderbarrow Farm, Cinderbarrow Lane Prior approval for the installation of 22.5m lattice style telecommunications tower, antennas, ground-based equipment cabinets and associated development for EE Ltd (Silverdale Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Refused
21/00947/NMA	The Old Dairy, Keerside, Arkholme Non material amendment to planning permission 20/00775/FUL to alter the internal layout and window, door and rooflight arrangement of the ancillary building for Allan & Ellie Wright (Upper Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted
21/00956/NMA	Field Adjacent To Woodlands View, Over Kellet, Lancashire Non-material amendment to planning permission 20/00136/FUL to change single garage into double garage, removal of window to SE elevation, increase size of upper ground floor window and rooflight to SE elevation moved to NE elevation for Mr Mark Drinkall (Kellet Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Refused
21/00976/AD	Ivah Great Hill, Lowgill Lane, Lowgill Agricultural determination for the erection of a forestry building for David Stocks (Lower Lune Valley Ward 2015 Ward)	Prior Approval Refused
21/00989/NMA	61 St Wilfrids Park, Halton, Lancaster Non-material amendment to planning permission 17/01553/FUL to change the roof slope of rear single story extension for Mr Timothy Hartley (Halton-with-Aughton Ward 2015 Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

21/01005/PLDC

49 Winchester Avenue, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation and creation of a first floor window to the side elevation for Mr. M. Armstrong (John O'Gaunt Ward 2015 Ward)

Lawful Development Certificate Granted