



Committee: PLANNING REGULATORY COMMITTEE

Date: MONDAY, 1 SEPTEMBER 2025

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

To receive as a correct record the Minutes of meeting held on 28th July 2025 (previously circulated).

3 Items of Urgent Business authorised by the Chair

4 Declarations of Interest

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

Councillors are reminded that, in accordance with the Localism Act 2011, they are required to declare any disclosable pecuniary interests which have not already been declared in the Council's Register of Interests. (It is a criminal offence not to declare a disclosable pecuniary interest either in the Register or at the meeting).

Whilst not a legal requirement, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 9 and in the interests of clarity and transparency, Councillors should declare any disclosable pecuniary interests which they have already declared in the Register, at this point in the meeting.

In accordance with Part B Section 2 of the Code Of Conduct, Councillors are required to declare the existence and nature of any other interests as defined in paragraphs 8(1) or 9(2) of the Code of Conduct.

Planning Applications for Decision

Community Safety Implications

In preparing the reports for this agenda, regard has been paid to the implications of the proposed developments on community safety issues. Where it is considered that the proposed development has particular implications for community safety, the issue is fully considered within the main body of the individual planning application report. The weight attributed to this

is a matter for the decision-taker.

Local Finance Considerations

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

Human Rights Act

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

- | | | | | |
|---|--|--|-----------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 5 | A5 <u>23/01384/OUT</u> | Land off Powder House Lane
Lancaster Lancashire | Bolton and
Slyne | (Pages 4 -
47) |
| | | Outline application for the erection of up to 130 dwellings and associated infrastructure with access, road realignment / widening to part of Slyne Road and associated engineering work. | | |
| 6 | A6 <u>24/00597/VCN</u> | Land Rear Of Ingleborough View
Station Road Hornby | Upper Lune
Valley Ward | (Pages 48 -
71) |
| | | Erection of 9 dwellings (C3) with associated detached garages, formation of a new access and associated estate roads and landscaping (pursuant to the variation of conditions 2-14 and 18 on planning application 21/01370/FUL). | | |
| 7 | A7 <u>24/01171/FUL</u> | Former Builders Merchants Yard
New Quay Road Lancaster
Lancashire | Marsh
Ward | (Pages 72 -
80) |
| | | Erection of self-storage units with associated security building, boundary fencing and creation of access roads / parking. | | |

8 A8 [25/00866/PAD](#) Lancaster City Council White Westgate (Pages 81 -
Lund Depot White Lund Road 84)
Morecambe

Prior approval application for the
demolition of former mower storage
shed.

9 Delegated List (Pages 85 - 100)

ADMINISTRATIVE ARRANGEMENTS

(i) Membership

Councillors Sandra Thornberry (Chair), Dave Brookes (Vice-Chair), Louise Belcher, Martin Bottoms, Keith Budden, Tom Fish, Alan Greenwell, John Hanson, Jack Lenox, John Livermore, Andrew Otway, Catherine Potter, Robert Redfern, Sue Tyldesley and Paul Tynan

(ii) Substitute Membership

Councillors Wilson Colley (Substitute), Maria Deery (Substitute), Roger Dennison (Substitute), Martin Gawith (Substitute), Colin Hartley (Substitute), Paul Newton (Substitute) and Joyce Pritchard (Substitute)

(iii) Queries regarding this Agenda

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

(iv) Changes to Membership, substitutions or apologies

Please contact Democratic Support, telephone 582000, or alternatively email democracy@lancaster.gov.uk

MARK DAVIES,
CHIEF EXECUTIVE,
TOWN HALL,
DALTON SQUARE,
LANCASTER, LA1 1PJ

Published on 15th August 2025.

Agenda Item	A5
Application Number	23/01384/OUT
Proposal	Outline application for the erection of up to 130 dwellings and associated infrastructure with access, road realignment/widening to part of Slyne Road and associated engineering work.
Application site	Land off Powder House Lane Lancaster Lancashire
Applicant	Mr Warren Cadman, Wrenman Strategic Land Ltd
Agent	Dan Ingram, Stantec
Case Officer	Mrs Jennifer Rehman
Departure	Yes
Summary of Recommendation	Approve subject to conditions and completion of Section 106 Agreement. Delegate back to Chief Officer Planning and Climate Change to finalise legal agreement.

(i) Procedural Matters

This application was submitted in December 2023 for up to 200 dwellings with associated infrastructure, access and road realignment to Slyne Road. In June 2025 the proposal was amended with the quantum of development reduced to up to 130 dwellings. This is in response to changes in national and local planning policy as well as addressing previous flood risk, ecology, landscape and design concerns.

(ii) The Planning Regulatory Committee visited the site and its surroundings on 21 July 2025.

1.0 Application Site and Setting

- 1.1 The site comprises 10.37 hectares of agricultural land, subdivided into field enclosures by native hedgerows and boundary trees or watercourses. The site is located on the eastern edge of the existing built-up area of Torrisholme, approximately 800m to Torrisholme local centre, around 2.8km to Morecambe Town Centre to the west and around 2.5km north-west of Lancaster city centre.
- 1.2 The site straddles two parishes. The western half of the site is located in the parish of Morecambe (Torrisholme Ward) and the eastern half situated within the Slyne with Hest parish (Bolton & Slyne Ward).
- 1.3 The site is bound by residential development along Russell Drive to the west, Powder House Lane to the east, fields and Slyne Road to the north, and an existing pedestrian/cycle track which runs alongside the Bay Gateway to the west. The site is separated from Lancaster Road (to the southwest) by third party land that, in part, provides habitat enhancements associated with the delivery of the Bay Gateway. Part of this land, adjacent to Lancaster Road, is protected amenity greenspace (Russel Drive Amenity Green Space).

- 1.4 Existing access into the site is provided off Powder House Lane via existing field gates to the east and an access on the southern boundary via third party land. There are no formally designated public rights of way adjacent to or crossing the site.
- 1.5 A high voltage electrical line traverses the site with the supporting pylon located roughly in the centre of the site. A gas main runs along the western boundary parallel with Russell Drive. This is not a high-pressure gas main.
- 1.6 The site is relatively low-lying with an undulating topography. The high point within the site is to the north (east of the powerlines) on a shallow mound which has an elevation of approximately 12.5 metres Above Ordnance Datum (m AOD). From this high point, levels fall in all directions to around 10m AOD. At the location on the proposed access (on Slyne Road) the elevation is around 9.5m AOD, falling to the low point (6m AOD) at the southwestern end of the site.
- 1.7 The site is currently located in Flood Zone 1 with the watercourses running through the site classified by the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) as Flood Zone 3B. The SFRA also identifies the site to be at risk of flooding from other sources now and in the future, including surface water flooding, groundwater flooding and future tidal flooding.
- 1.8 Torrisholme Barrow lies to the northwest of the site. This is a distinct drumlin feature which is approximately 40m AOD and is prominent in the local area. It is also an archaeological feature at the top of the hill which is designated as a Scheduled Ancient Monument. Aside from this nationally significant designated heritage asset, there are no other designated heritage assets close to or adjacent to the application site.
- 1.9 Land between the existing built-up area of Morecambe and the railway line was formerly located within the North Lancashire Green Belt. This included the proposed site. This designation was removed when the Local Plan was adopted in 2020 following the Green Belt Review. The boundary of the Green Belt now lies to the east of the adjacent railway line.
- 1.10 The site now forms part of a larger local landscape designation (Key Urban Landscape (KUL)) which wraps around Torrisholme Barrow and is bound by the existing railway line, the Bay Gateway and existing development to the east of the site and the Barrow itself. The Local Plan includes the site within the Countryside Area but also includes the site within the Urban Boundary. In respect of the latter there is no corresponding policy to support this demarcation.
- 1.11 Morecambe Bay and the associated statutory nature conservation sites comprising the Special Protection Area (SPA), Special Area of Conservation (SAC), Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Ramsar Site, is located within 1.4km northeast of the site.
- 1.12 Parts of the site are also located within a Mineral Safeguarding Area and within the Air Quality Management Zone linked to Lancaster City Centre Air Quality Management Area. The site is also classified as Grade 3a and 3b (Good to Moderate) agricultural land.

2.0 Proposal

- 2.1 The applicant, Wrenman Strategic Land Limited, seeks outline planning permission for up to 130 dwellings and associated infrastructure with access, road realignment /widening to part of Slyne Road and associated engineering works. Full planning permission is sought for the access arrangements required to serve the development site. Layout, landscaping, scale and appearance are reserved for subsequent approval, herein “the reserved matters”.
- 2.2 The application is supported by an Environmental Statement (ES) which covers an assessment of significance in relation to the following topics:
 - Air Quality
 - Noise
 - Landscape and Visual Effects

- Transport and Access
- Ecology
- Cultural Heritage
- Water Resources and Flood Risk

Other standalone technical reports support the application which are to be read alongside the ES, the ES Addendum and the submitted plans. The ES was submitted voluntarily by the applicant. The initial screening was for residential development over 500 units. The applicant did not re-screen their proposal for up to 200 dwellings ahead of their initial submission. With the proposal reduced to up to 130 dwellings, it is unlikely the local planning authority would have considered this development EIA development had the proposal been resubmitted. Nevertheless, an ES accompanies the application and as such it has been determined on this basis, with regard to the EIA regulations.

2.3 The ES Addendum (May 2025) addresses changes in policy and evidence related to flood risk. With the exception of the Noise, Air Quality, and Transport chapters, all chapters of the original Environmental Statement (ES) have been updated. The chapters that have not been updated are considered to remain valid, as the proposed amendments reduce the scale of development and its associated impacts — thus the original assessment represents a worst-case scenario. Officers have reviewed and agreed upon the scope of the ES Addendum.

2.4 The application has been amended during an extended determination period and has reduced from up to 200 dwellings to up to 130 dwellings in response to flood risk, biodiversity and design considerations. The amendments also address changes in national and local planning policy that have occurred while this application has been under consideration. The amended scheme provided further information and additional information (in the context of the EIA regulations) which has been incorporated into an addendum ES.

2.5 A Parameters Plan has been submitted for approval to fix the location of built residential development and associated green infrastructure. The built development equates to 3.52ha of the site and will include all the residential development, associated roads, active travel infrastructure, easements associated with the powerlines, amenity open space and some drainage infrastructure (SuDS). The Green Infrastructures equates to 6.85ha and shall include public open space, drainage (SuDS) infrastructure, ecology mitigation and enhancement (BNG) along with existing utility easements. The application is supported by a Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy Plan.

2.6 Access is a matter to be considered in full. The proposal includes a single vehicular access / egress off Slyne Road. The access comprises a 7.3 metre wide carriageway and 8 metre kerb radius with visibility splays of 43 metres in both directions. The junction design (as amended) incorporates a ghost island right turn lane and the realignment of Slyne Road between the proposed junction and Hexham Road. This enables the provision of a continuous 2m wide footway on the south side of Slyne Road.

2.7 A 6 metre wide emergency access is proposed onto Powder House Lane, approximately 50m north of the shared cycleway/footway which runs alongside the southern boundary of the site. This access shall incorporate dismountable bollards to prevent misuse of the access.

2.8 Active travel connections are also proposed as part of the main vehicular access, the emergency access and a separate access in the south-west corner of the site connecting to the existing footpath that runs east-west along the southern boundary of the site leading to Lancaster Road. The submission indicates this will be upgraded by improved surfacing, lighting and access restrictions.

2.9 The proposal includes the provision of affordable housing and on-site public open space, along with associated infrastructure, such as internal estate roads, servicing and the provision of a sustainable drainage scheme. Earthworks are anticipated to form the proposed attenuation basins, development platforms and to mitigate against future tidal flood risk.

2.10 The Design and Access Statement includes an illustrative plan which has been provided to demonstrate one way in which the site could be developed based on the Parameters Plan. This is not for approval.

3.0 Site History

- 3.1 The site has a very limited planning history with only an EIA Screening Opinion request made by the applicant last year for a larger residential proposal on the site. Development associated with the Bay Gateway is of interest, but these historic consents bear little relevance to the proposal, other than assessing the relationship between the proposal and highway network.
- 3.2 There was a planning application for 129 homes off Fulwood Drive (by Oakmere Homes) which is of relevance to this proposal. Despite the officer recommendation of approval, the application was refused at Planning Committee and subsequently dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate.
- 3.3 It is noted that the site falls within LPSA ref: 712 Land west of Railway Line, as identified within the Strategic Housing and Employment Lane Availability Assessment (SHELAA), 2018, which forms part of the evidence base for the Local Plan. LPSA ref 712 relates to a much wider site area but excludes the area which forms the Drumlin and the Barrow. Within the SHELAA it states, '*The landscape is considered to be able to accommodate development although careful consideration will need to be given to the setting of Torrisholme Barrow.*' Notwithstanding this, the Local Plan continued to allocate the wider area, including the application site, as a Key Urban Landscape.
- 3.4 A summary of this planning history is set out below:

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
22/01211/EIR	Screening opinion for the erection of up to 600 dwellings and associated works.	Environmental Statement required
21/01341/OUT	Outline application for the development of 129 residential dwellings and creation of new access (<i>this relates to the site off Fulwood Drive by Oakmere Homes</i>)	Dismissed at appeal
11/01149/IPC	Application for a Development Consent Order by the Infrastructure Planning Commission pursuant to section 56 of the Planning Act 2008 : The Lancashire County Council (Torrisholme to the M6 link (A683 Completion of Heysham to M6 Link Road)) Development Consent Order	Permitted
05/01584/CPA	Construction of a new highway - Completion of Heysham to M6 Link and improvements to existing highways.	Approved by Secretary of State
4.0	Consultation Responses	
4.1	The following responses have been received from statutory and internal consultees:	

Consultee	Response
Slyne with Hest Parish Council	<p>Objection. A summary of the grounds for opposition are as follows (based on the original and amended (2025) proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unsuitable access – strong objection to the access on Slyne road. The development would be best served by the Bay Gateway. • Traffic will turn right at the access onto Slyne Road/Hasty Brow to access the A6 corridor, rather than left towards Torrisholme. This road does not have the capacity to support additional traffic and is congested and dangerous in some sections. It also routes traffic through the village of Slyne. • Additional traffic will exacerbate existing congestion through the centre of Torrisholme at rush hour. • Poor access to public transport from Slyne Road given lack of footways on Slyne Road/Hasty Brow and difficult to see how new public transport services could serve the site, given narrow carriageway widths. • Inadequate emergency access.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of the Green Belt status is mourned by all. Objection to any attempt at allowing urban sprawl to creep into the Parish's villages by removing the greenbelt status of the land. • Loss of open feel of the land, loss of natural habitat, loss of wetland and impacts on ecology. • Increased flood risk – watercourse and flooding issues to be addressed. • Redirecting watercourses could cause potential flooding issues. • Drainage system through Torrisholme at full capacity. Adding homes to the system will only cause more problems unless new drainage systems are provided for the whole area. • Infrastructure needed to support the development is not in place. • Object to any attempt to allow urban sprawl creep into the village removing greenbelt status of land that surrounds the parish.
Morecambe Town Council	<p>Objection. A summary of the grounds for opposition are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is designated as Key urban Landscape (KUL) and Open Countryside in the Local Plan and should be determined in this context. • Development in the Open Countryside is not consistent with the development strategy for the district (policy SP3). • The issue of re-aligning the Green Belt in the Torrisholme area was well-explored as part of the Hearing Sessions of the Local Plan Examination. The Inspector's Report supported the amended boundary and noted that its removal did not mean that it would be identified for development purposes and would instead be designated as Key Urban Landscape under Policy EN5. • The proposed development would clearly be contrary to the designation of the site a KUL and would significantly reduce the extent and function of this valuable local landscape designation at this location. • The Town Council does not support the view that the site makes a very limited contribution to the purposes of the KUL and contends any development of the KUL would impact the integrity of this designation. • During the Local Plan making process (SHELAA, in considering this site Lancaster City Council concluded that whilst potentially developable the local landscape designation should be applied. This decision was made having regard to the Council's housing land supply position and wider development strategy for the district and was supported by the Planning Inspector. • The application site is located within the ward of Bolton-le-Sands which falls within Rural West therefore 30% affordable housing is required. The applicant is proposing 15% subject to viability at reserved matters stage and therefore does not accord with policy DM3. • The land regularly suffers from floods as a result of rainfall, inadequate land permeability and an overwhelmed drainage system. The FRA underestimates this risk therefore the measures proposed to ameliorate the risk must be inadequate. • Proposed mitigation is unlikely to reduce the harm arising from the development on the Scheduled Monument significantly. • The site's location on the edge of the urban area is relatively remote from many services such as schools, employment areas and health facilities. The site is in excess of the recommended walking distances set out in the IHT guidance. The indicative layout plans do not prioritise walking and cycling and therefore would be contrary to policy DM60. • Development of the site undermines confidence in the forward planning process and therefore the scheme should be refused for the significant harm identified.
Planning Policy Team (City Council)	<p>Having regard to the housing supply position and the positive contribution the development would make to meeting the housing needs of the district, the policy team make the following conclusion:</p> <p>The site is designated as Open Countryside and allocated KUL in the recently adopted Local Plan and as such is not somewhere where the council would support development. Given the site's sensitive location and adopted open countryside and</p>

	<p>local landscape designation the adverse impacts of developing this site, protected from development in a very recently adopted Local Plan, would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.</p> <p><i>No comments following the June 2025 re-consultation.</i></p>
Local Highway Authority	<p>No objection. Following the submission of the applicant's Post Submission Highway Note, all previous concerns have been addressed, save for the impact on the wider network. Following re-consultation of the June 2025 amendments, the highway authority has confirmed no objection to the development, subject to a contribution of £570,266 towards wider transport infrastructure at the following named initiatives (based on £4,386.66 per dwelling):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ City Centre Gyratory ➤ A6 Slyne Road (other Feeder Roads) ➤ Local highway network around Junction 34 ➤ Lancaster Area Wide Local Road/Management Changes ➤ Morecambe Area Wide Local Road/Management Changes <p>and the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction Method Statement • Wheel washing facilities • Scheme for the construction of the site accesses and off-site highway mitigation including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Site access on Slyne Road (carriageway and footway improvements and extension to extension of 20mph limit) ○ Powder House Lane (Emergency and active travel restrictions and resurfacing) ○ Active travel connection to B5321 from south-west corner of the site including surfacing, street lighting and signage) ○ Bus stop enhancements on Lancaster Road • New roads to Lancashire County Council's adoptable standards and surfaced to base course to the entrance to the site compound before development takes place. • Interim Travel Plan • Management and Maintenance of proposed streets.
National Highways (NH)	<p>No Objection - Following the submission of the applicant's Highway Technical Note, National Highways' previous holding recommendation, which related to insufficient information to understand the level of traffic impact of the proposal on the strategic road network at M6 junction 34, has been removed. NH commented that the proposal in isolation (200 dwellings) would not have a material impact upon the safe operation of the Strategic Road Network (SRN) at Junction 34.</p> <p>Following the June 2025 amendments, NH note the reduced quantum of development and maintain their position of no objection.</p>
Active Travel England (ATE)	<p>No objection, subject to the local planning authority being satisfied the internal layout of the development is designed to meet the key principles of the National Design Code, Inclusive Mobility and LTN 1/20 (Cycle Infrastructure).</p>
North Lancashire Bridleways Society (NLBS)	<p>Comments as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Views of horse riders need to be taken into account, particularly given the current use of Powderhouse Lane by horse riders. • Pedestrian/cycleways in the development should be more widely accessible. Multi-use paths would be better, catering for pedestrians cyclists and horse riders and these paths should be dedicated under Section 31 of the Highways Act. • Horse riding has considerable health benefits. Equestrians should not be prevented from enjoying open air exercise and recreation by failure to provide safe routes. • Policy DM57 requires development to be designed to promote the health and well being of communities, ensuring development is designed to promote physical activity. • NLBS would be happy to engage in accessibility discussions between interested parties.
Network Rail (NR)	<p>Comments as follows:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Works on this site must be undertaken with the supervision of NR via their asset protection team to ensure works do not impact the integrity, stability and safe operation of the railway and its boundary and requests planning conditions to protect the railway and its boundary. • The applicant must review the title to the property to observe any obligations, rights, exceptions and reservations for the benefit of NR's land and if the proposal would breach these obligations, the scheme must be amended. • NR state that it is imperative developers/applicants consult neighbouring/affected statutory undertakers in advance of any construction work, to identify and mitigate potential risks to both sites including people using or working on the sites, in line with CDM 2015 and HSW 1974 legislation. • It is for the developer and LPA to ensure noise and vibration from the railway and any nearby rail depots can be mitigated prior to construction. • Applications likely to generate an increase in trips under railway bridges may be of concern to NR and consultation with their asset protection team is necessary to understand if this is a problem. • A Risk Assessment and Method Statement (RAMS) is recommended as a planning condition to safeguard NR's assets and operations. • Fencing - trespass fencing to be provided adjacent to the boundary with NR's land. • Fail safe use of cranes and plant - details to be agreed with NR. • Measures addressing encroachment onto NR's land. • No overspill of lighting onto NR assets and makes several recommendations. • Glare and glint study from any solar PV panels to be undertaken considering the impacts on the existing operational railway. • Recommends a condition to address potential effects arising from impact vibration during construction. • A list of drainage recommendations are provided to ensure NR's land and operations are not impacted by the proposed drainage strategy, and recommends a drainage condition. • NR wish to review any earthworks or loading within 10m and 15m respectively of their assets and recommend a condition relating to proposed ground levels. • Guidance provided in relation to tree planting close to NR assets.
Dynamo Cycle Campaign	<p>Objection. A summary of the grounds for opposition are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy DM29 requires developments to maximise opportunities for cycling and walking linkages though and to/from a site to promote sustainable healthy travel – this is not adequately covered in the developer's current plan. • Although access to the development via Powder House Lane looks reasonable on paper, the reality is different as the lane is narrow and compromised by hedgerows. It is also not enough to link to the rest of the district. <p><i>No further comments to the June 2025 amendments.</i></p>
Environment Agency	<p>No objection subject to the development proceeding in strict accordance with the submitted and amended Flood Risk Assessment (Ref: NO/2024/115788/03-L01) dated 28 February 2025 and the mitigation set out therein. The EA are satisfied the development would be safe without exacerbating flood risk elsewhere. The EA advise consultation is undertaken with the local Emergency Planning team regarding safe access and egress in flood events.</p>
Lead Local Flood Authority	<p>No objection - Following the submission of the amended information, the LLFA has now withdrawn their initial objection noting their original concerns have been overcome and an acceptable site specific FRA supports the application. In response to the June 2025 amendments, the LLFA maintain their position of 'no objection'.</p> <p>The following conditions are recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final Surface Water Drainage Strategy based on the amended FRA (083436.500-CUR-00-XX-T-C-00001, Rev P05, Dated 9/05/2025 and Drainage Strategy and indicative surface water sustainable drainage strategy (083436.500- CUR-00-XX-T-C-00102, Rev P04, Dated 29/05/2025).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction Surface Water Management Plan • Sustainable Drainage System Operation and Maintenance Manual • Verification Report of Construction Sustainable Drainage System. <p>The following additional advice is provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land Drainage Consent would be required in certain circumstances and that applicants should avoid crossing, diverting and/or culverting an ordinary watercourse. • Watercourses should be protected, where appropriate enhanced, and incorporated into the design of the development. • The LLFA provide advice and information to inform the layout such as easements to the watercourse and requirements for coordinated management and maintenance of watercourses. • At detailed design stage the applicant is expected to consider the design standard tidal flood event within the surface water drainage system as well as the impact of high ground water levels. • Technical comments provided in relation to the gradient of slopes to any swales to and that all SUDS features to be included within the development site.
United Utilities (UU)	<p>No objection in principle but note insufficient information has been provided in relation to the drainage design and recommends a condition for the surface water drainage scheme and a separate condition for future management and maintenance of the approved drainage scheme.</p> <p>In response to the further information, UU note their previous comments stand. No further comments to the June 2025 amendments.</p>
Natural England (NE)	<p>No objection. Following the submission of the applicant's shadow Habitats Regulation Assessment (HRA) and addendum report, NE have raised no objection subject to securing the following mitigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Homeowner packs • Landscape Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) • Provision of on-site open space
Greater Manchester Ecology Unit	<p>Following the submission of further information and amendments, GMEU have removed their objection.</p> <p>The reasons for the initial objection included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient assessment of the impact of the development on the designated sites - further consideration of wintering birds. • Insufficient information to be certain the development will not have an impact on GCNs. • Insufficient assessment of the potential impact on bats. • Inadequate assessment of the impact of the development on breeding birds. • Inaccurate baseline habitat baseline assessment in relation to ditches, which distorts the BNG and concerns meaningful BNG could be delivered on site. • Unacceptable loss of hedgerow loss – the hedgerows are more distinct (cultural heritage and biological value than presented). <p>Following the amendments, GMEU have confirmed no objection subject to the following requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GCN Method Statement and additional surveys (2026) if development has not commenced before Mid-April 2026. • Bats Method Statement and re-assessment (for bats) of any trees to be removed, including compensatory measures. • Prior to reserved matters stage further bird survey work and impact assessment be undertaken to inform appropriate mitigation. • Protection of nesting birds on site – limiting vegetation clearance to avoid bird nesting seasons (March – August) unless competent ecologist has undertaken assessment and confirms no harm to birds/appropriate measures in place to protect nesting birds. • Clarification of the hedgerows mapped for the BNG baseline and post-development plans.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BNG to be delivered on site (or off-site) and to be updated at reserved matters stage and will be subject to a BNG Plan and final metric to satisfy the BNG condition. • Due to significant net-gains on-site, a habitat monitoring and management plan will be required and should be secured by s106.
Arboricultural Officer	<p>Objection. A summary of the main reasons for opposition are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater consideration needs to be given to the existing landscape, notably the historic hedgerows and ditches which divide the site. • The AIA indicates that a mature oak (T3) has veteran characteristics. Development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats such as veteran trees should be refused. T3 needs to be clearly identified within the proposals and suitably buffered. • No formal landscaping proposals have been submitted with this outline application. That shown on the masterplan is not sufficient to determine the impact of the development and is indicative. <p>The Arboricultural Officer notes conflicts between the AIA and the masterplan. No comments provided in response to the June 2025 amendments.</p>
Historic England	<p>No objection - Some limited additional impact on the already compromised setting of the Torrisholme Round Barrow, which would not be sufficient to justify the refusal of planning permission on heritage grounds, particularly if the mitigation measures suggested are implemented. HE has provided further comments following the appeal decision associated with the Fulwood Drive development and maintain their position. They have confirmed no changes in their position following the amendments (June 2025) to reduce the scheme.</p>
County Council Planning (Archaeology)	<p>No objection - Following the submission of the final report setting out the findings of the field investigations, the County Archaeologist has withdrawn their objection. They concur with the findings of the investigation and confirm no further archaeological work is required on site and no archaeological conditions are considered necessary. In response to the June 2025 amendments and ES addendum, changes are recommended to the text of the ES to reflect the investigations undertaken, but the overall position has not changed.</p>
Council's Conservation Officer	<p>Not providing heritage comments as there are no historic buildings or areas within the vicinity of the site. The Conservation Officer acknowledges Torrisholme Barrow is a Scheduled Monument and its setting would be affected. However, given this is an archaeological site, the significance of the barrow and the contribution of setting to that significance, is a matter for Lancashire County Council Historic Environment Team who provide archaeological advice. In response to the June 2025 re-consultation, the Conservation team has confirmed they are not commenting on this application but note this should not be construed as a 'no objection' response.</p>
Environmental Health Services (EHS)	<p>No objection, subject to the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction Environmental Management Plan • Travel Plan • EV Charging provision • Full ground gas assessment and radon hazard assessment and identification of any recommended protection measures • A detailed noise report, with noise modelling, to assess and inform the layout of the development and necessary mitigation • Hours of construction <p>In relation to contaminated land, the Environmental Health Service has reverted to the Environment Agency as a statutory consultee.</p> <p>Emissions Assessment and Concentration Assessment is required.</p> <p>Awaiting comments from June 2025 re-consultation.</p>
Lancashire Constabulary	<p>Comments - A summary of the main comments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bespoke advice to be provided at the reserved matter stage. • General recommendations include: -

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Scheme should be designed to secure by design standards (SBD) ○ Suitable permeability integrated into design to reduce risk of crime and anti-social behaviour. ○ Public paths to be avoided to rear of gardens/yards or dwellings. ○ Where possible, paths to be at least 3 metres wide. ○ Good natural surveillance and safe access routes to public open space. ○ Secure gardens with suitable boundary treatments. ○ Building security measures (physical security/windows/alarms/lighting) ○ Landscaping and future maintenance to be carefully considered in design to maintain natural surveillance of property. ○ Site construction security required. <p>Awaiting comments from June 2025 re-consultation.</p>
Lancashire Fire and Rescue Services	No objection - Standing advice provided in relation to Building Regulations Approved Document B, Part B5 (Access and facilities for the Fire Service).
National Health Service (NHS)	No objection subject to securing a financial contribution of £101,088 towards a new health care centre for Lancaster Medical Practice in Bailing. The exact figure would need to be recalculated at reserved matters stage when the final number of dwellings is determined.
Lancashire Education School Planning Team	No objection - No education contribution required (updated 16 June 2025)
Public Realm	No objection , subject to securing the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On-site Equipped Children's Play Area • On site Young Persons Play Provision • On-site Amenity Greenspace • Off-site contributions towards outdoor sports provision at Salt Ayre towards athletics and football provision. The final sum to be calculated at reserved matters stage. At this stage the figure is £220,740.
Waste and Recycling	No objection. The Waste & Recycling Team raise some important points regarding the indicative layout and suitable design for collection services and provision for suitable refuse storage. Further comments provided in response to the June 2025 amendments include refuse storage requirements for all houses and communal development.
Electricity North West (ENW)	ENW have provided details of the affected assets on site and have shared standing advice and conditions for working close to underground and above ground electrical infrastructure.
National Grid	Notes that there are no National Grid Electricity Transmission assets affected in the area and that the overhead lines will be owned by the local Distribution Network Operator.
Cadent Gas	Holding Objection until Cadent engineers review the proposal. Advised to consult HSE in relation to high pressure pipelines.
Health & Safety Executive	HSE confirms the site does not lie within a distance of a major hazard or major hazard pipeline therefore, HSE does not need to be consulted nay developments on this site.
Secretary of Statement - National Planning Caseload Unit	Confirmed no comments on the Environmental Statement.
Office of Nuclear Regulation (ONR)	At the time of writing this report, no comments received.
Lancashire County Council Resilience Team (Emergency Planning)	The LCC Resilience Team has consulted with the following agencies and organisations in relation to the proposed development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • EDF Heysham Power Stations • Lancashire County Council Planning • Lancaster City Council Emergency Planning • Lancashire Fire and Rescue Service • Lancashire Constabulary • North West Ambulance Service

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> UK Health Security Agency (UKHSA) <p>Following these consultations, the Resilience Team confirms that there are no objections to the development. All consulted agencies have confirmed they are able to accommodate the proposed changes within the existing Heysham Power Stations Off-site Emergency Plan.</p>
Lancaster Civic Vision	<p>Objection. Lancaster Civic vision strongly object to this application and urge Lancaster City Council to refuse it, noting the proposal is unsustainable and contrary to the adopted Lancaster Local Plan. It is unsurprising it is unsurprising that significant local opposition exists.</p> <p>The mains concerns are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is not allocated for development and contradicts the Local Plan's spatial strategy. The site is protected as part of a Key Urban Landscape and should be protected to provide a green buffer to the Bay Gateway to allow a network of habitat, landscape and biodiversity to mature The scheme undermines the Hest with Slyne Neighbourhood Plan and the strategic objectives of the Local Plan. The proposal also conflicts with updated NPPF guidance on housing supply, greenfield development, and agricultural land use. Slyne Road is already unsafe and flood-prone. Adding 200 homes will worsen congestion and safety risks for drivers and pedestrians. Schools and GP practices are at capacity. The development would overburden already stretched services, as noted by the NHS. The application fails to demonstrate how it would link to necessary infrastructure—transport, schools, healthcare, and open space—making it an isolated and poorly planned scheme. Development would increase flood risk, cause habitat loss, and threaten local wildlife and ecosystems. Building on such land poses a risk to the structural integrity of the dwellings and raises concerns about the long-term impact on the local environment, including soil erosion, contamination thus affecting biodiversity. Disruption to habitats would clause decline in local biodiversity Increased pollution from vehicle emission, soil and water pollution, noise and light pollution negatively impacting wildlife and directly threatening the health and well-being of our community. The scale and nature of the development would harm local character, tranquillity, and valued countryside walks, including a local memorial site. The proposal distracts from the focus on regenerating Morecambe, particularly around the Eden Project, and dilutes strategic growth objectives.
CPRE	<p>Objection. A summary of the main reasons for opposition are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is unallocated in the Local Plan and is in the Open Countryside and as protected by Key Urban Landscape. The development will cause significant harm to landscape, ecology and public rights of way. Brownfield land should be developed before green fields. Harm is identified to the valued local landscape and the KUL designation Lack of ecological information and concerns relating to the assessment and impact on protected species, important habitats and the effect on Morecambe Bay SPA and its interested features. The historical, cultural and biological value of the important hedgerows has been under-accounted for in the assessment and with significant losses proposed would be contrary to DM45. The site layout does not integrate existing biodiversity assets on the site and would lead to considerable losses. BNG undervalues existing site and over values future biodiversity value with the BNG below the mandated 10%. The metric should be updated.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposals lack consideration of the use of Powerhouse Lane for horses as well as cyclists and pedestrians. • Recommends use of renewable technology with least impact on the countryside, such as solar panels, be incorporated into the development. • Requests the application is refused. <p>In response to the further information, CPRE note that unless the amendments significantly address the objections originally submitted, CPRE maintain their position. Following the June 2025 amendments, CPRE continue to object noting they share the concerns and objections raised by GMEU and believe the benefits of the development (housing) would not outweigh the conflicts with the Local Plan and permission should be refused.</p>
--	---

4.2 At the time of compiling this report, over **270** representations had been received. Of these responses, only 2 letters of support have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority. The number of representations received is a combined total from the initial comments in early 2024, amendments in late 2024 and recent consultation in June 2025 and includes representations from households/individuals who have previously commented on the initial application.

A summary of the main reasons of opposition are as follows:

- **Housing matters:** the site is not allocated for housing; all houses should be affordable; the proposal would lead to a greater development (closer to 500-600) in the future; there is no shortfall of housing in the area; supporting housing on unallocated sites undermines the Local Plan making process and results in piecemeal development supported by necessary infrastructure; there is more appropriate land for housing than the proposed site, such as brownfield sites.
- **Highway impacts:** unsuitable and unsafe access onto Hasty Brow; approximately 400 cars would be provided for 200 homes on roads not designed to accommodate this volume of traffic; exacerbate existing problems with rat-running via Russell Drive and Hasty Brow to the M6; Hasty Brow is narrow, has blind bends and is constrained by the railway bridge and canal bridge so unsuitable for construction traffic; poor pedestrian connectivity and lack of footways to the village increasing the risk of accidents especially for children walking to school; the road network has many blind bends and suffers speeding vehicles.
- **Flood risk / drainage:** the site is susceptible to flooding and will flood more often with climate change, the development of houses on flood plain with exacerbate flood risk elsewhere, Hasty Brow already floods and causes hazards on the road, infrastructure to drain to the sea is already inadequate, loss of open watercourses is harmful to ecology and flood management.
- **Landscape impacts:** loss of Key Urban Landscape; the community have already been impacted by the incursion of the Bay Gateway, further development would be unacceptable; urban expansion and loss of village character to the area; too close to the Barrow; loss of green belt land, three storey dwellings are not in keeping with the locality, inappropriate density of development.
- **Ecology matters:** loss of wildlife and habitats are irreplaceable, unacceptable impacts on protected species, loss of trees and hedgerows not only impacts species but would impact climate change, provision for swifts should be provided as part of the development; loss of valuable green infrastructure; the ecological surveys and assessment are poor and doesn't reflect the ecological interests on the site.
- **Residential amenity:** loss of privacy, security concerns, overlooking due to level changes, loss of tranquillity (quiet), disruption during construction phases, increase in noise and pollution to local residents, grossly adverse impact on the physical, emotional and mental wellbeing of local residents, increase in vermin, health risks living close to pylons and the Bay Gateway, inappropriate location for paths and play space behind existing houses.

- **Heritage:** Views of Torrisholme Barrow, known as a historic monument and is visited daily, would be ruined by the development; the development to the North was dismissed due to the impacts on the Barrow – the same issues apply with this application and the application should be refused; the canal bridge on Hasty Brow is listed and could be damaged by the development's traffic.
- **Infrastructure:** loss of limited area of open countryside in Morecambe for residents to enjoy, unacceptable impact on education and health places/provision to support increased population, the land supports power cables and pylons with a gas pipeline to the rear of Russel Drive; existing drains unable to cope with expansion and are already overwhelmed in flood conditions; development should not impact mitigation land associated with the Bay Gateway and existing footways should be protected; cumulative impacts arising from this development and others, such as North Lancaster.
- **Other matters:** concerns over the timing of the initial consultation (over Christmas and New Year), the level of consultation undertaken, and the time allowed to make public comments; loss of valuable agricultural land, impacts on existing ground stability and foundations, inaccuracies in the submission (labelling of the A638).

4.3 At the time of compiling this report, 2 representations in support have been received. A summary of the main reasons for support are as follows:

- Provision of new homes to support younger local people in need of housing and affordable housing.
- The Torrisholme/Bare area has not seen new housing to support population growth – this development will help young people get on the property ladder and is a huge positive for many people.
- One of the more sensible applications encountered recently.
- Bus services are good locally.
- The site is preferred to previous proposals which would ruin Torrisholme Barrow
- The dedication to respecting the natural environment makes it worthy of existing within the green belt.
- Whilst acknowledging concerns by others, notes being car-centric is a sign of the times.
- Given archaeological heritage interests, council may be in for some priceless findings too.

5.0 Analysis

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

- Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA)
- Principle of residential development
- Landscape and visual effects
- Cultural heritage
- Access, traffic impacts, sustainable travel and parking
- Flood risk and drainage
- Ecology
- Residential Amenity
- Housing Need
- Open Space
- Education and health
- Sustainable design and renewable energy
- Air Quality

5.2 Environmental Impact Assessment

5.2.1 The proposed development constitutes EIA development and has been submitted with an Environmental Statement (ES), along with a subsequent ES Addendum to address changes to the proposal arising from updated policy and revisions to the flood risk baseline.

- 5.2.2 The aim of Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) is to protect the environment by ensuring that the local planning authority, when considering a planning application and determining whether to grant permission for a project, does so with a full understanding of the likely significant environmental effects. This includes taking into account the outcomes of public consultation with the public and consultation bodies and ensuring these considerations are integrated into the decision-making process.
- 5.2.3 The PPG (046 ID: 4-046-20170728) makes it clear that there are ‘*specific arrangements for considering and determining planning applications that have been subject to an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA). These arrangements include consideration of the adequacy of the information provided, consultation, reaching a reasoned conclusion on the significant environmental effects of the proposed development, publicity, and informing the consultation bodies and public of both the decision and the main reasons for it. The local planning authority must take into account the information in the Environmental Statement, the responses to consultation and any other relevant information when determining a planning application*’.
- 5.2.4 The EIA Regulations stipulate that an ES should identify, describe, and assess the likely *significant* effects of a development on the environment during the construction and operational phases and having regard to cumulative effects. Assessing EIA development is a systematic process which requires a robust methodology, including an accurate assessment and description of the baseline environmental conditions (now and in the future).
- 5.2.5 Assessing the significance of each environmental effect is generally determined by understanding the sensitivity or value of the environment and the magnitude of change to the environment as a result of development. This can vary based on relevant published guidance for individual subject areas.
- 5.2.6 The submitted ES recognises that most environmental discipline’s effects are classified as negligible, adverse, or beneficial, with the magnitude of effect, defined as minor, moderate, or major. Environmental effects are then evaluated against best practice standards, guidance legislation and informed by professional judgement, to establish whether the effects are significant or not. Consideration of mitigation and monitoring forms an important aspect of assessing whether effects can be reduced to avoid significant environmental effects overall.
- 5.2.7 The approach outlined above, along with the methodology adopted in the Environmental Statement (ES)—including the consideration of reasonable alternatives and cumulative (in-combination) impacts—has been applied consistently throughout the document and aligns with established best practice guidelines. Each chapter of the ES includes a conclusion regarding the significance of effects during both the construction phase and the first year of operation (Year 1). Residual effects are also assessed, taking into account the effectiveness of mitigation measures at Year 15 post-development.
- 5.3 **Principle of Residential Development** NPPF Sections 2 (Achieving Sustainable Development), Section 5 (Delivering a Sufficient Supply of Homes), Section 15 (Conserving and enhancing the natural environment), Section 17 (Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals) ; 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), EN3 (The Open Countryside) and EN5 (Local Landscape Designations); Development Management (DM) DPD policies: DM1 (New Residential Development and Meeting Housing Needs), DM4 (Residential Development Outside Mian Urban Areas) and DM46 (Development and Landscape Impact); Joint Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan Site Allocations and Development Management Policy: M2 (Safeguarding Minerals) and Guidance Note (December 2014).
- 5.3.1 The application site lies adjacent to the existing built-up area of Morecambe and is designated as Open Countryside and Key Urban Landscape (KUL) in the adopted Local Plan. While the Policies Map shows the site within the urban boundary of Morecambe, the Local Plan does not include a specific policy relating to urban areas. As such, for the purposes of assessing this application, the proposal is considered against Policy EN3 of the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) Development Plan Document (DPD), which relates to development within the open countryside, along with policy EN5 relating to its landscape designation.

- 5.3.2 Historically, the site was located within the North Lancashire Green Belt. However, it was removed from the Green Belt following the Green Belt Review and the adoption of the Local Plan in 2020. It was subsequently re-designated as KUL, along with adjacent land to the north and west, including Torrisholme Barrow. The current Green Belt boundary now lies to the east of the railway line.
- 5.3.3 Policy EN3 states that development proposals within the open countryside must have regard to all relevant policies within the Local Plan, particularly those in the Development Management (DM) DPD that deal with rural development. Policy DM4 supports residential development outside main urban areas only where it reflects sustainable patterns of growth and aligns with the settlement hierarchy set out in Policy SP2 of the SPLA DPD.
- 5.3.4 Policy SP3 of the SPLA DPD outlines the district's overarching development strategy, promoting an urban-focused approach, with growth directed toward the main urban areas of Lancaster, Morecambe, Heysham, and Carnforth. It also supports development in other sustainable settlements, as defined in the hierarchy. Although the application site is not located within a defined sustainable settlement, it is adjacent to one of the district's main urban areas—Morecambe—and benefits from proximity to its associated services and facilities.
- 5.3.5 The site is located in the Open Countryside and not strictly defined within a sustainable settlement. However, it is clearly adjacent to one of the main urban areas and the wider facilities and services that it provides within the district. Notwithstanding the Open Countryside and KUL designations, the site is considered to be sustainably located to support new housing growth.
- 5.3.6 Key Urban Landscape (KUL) is a local landscape designation identified in the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD. Policy EN5 seeks to conserve such areas by safeguarding their open character and natural features. The policy states that development will only be permitted where it preserves the open nature of the area and maintains the character and appearance of its surroundings.
- 5.3.7 This approach is reinforced by Policy DM46 of the Development Management (DM) DPD, which requires particular regard to be given to the historic townscape and built form of urban areas. The supporting text to Policy DM46 explains that KUL's are areas within the main urban settlements that are integral to the district's built form. They often provide an important setting for key features or heritage assets and contribute significantly to the definition and experience of the wider urban townscape.
- 5.3.8 The proposal is for *up to* 130 dwellings, which has reduced considerably from the original proposal of *up to* 200 dwellings. Whilst there has been a reduction in the number of units, the proposed residential development would fail to preserve the open nature of the area as it would result in a significant amount of new built development and associated infrastructure on a large proportion of the site which is currently open undeveloped agricultural land.
- 5.3.9 The development would include the alteration to land levels across parts of the site (although significantly less than originally proposed) resulting in the loss of some trees and hedgerows, although the full extent of tree/hedgerow loss cannot be determined until the reserved matters stage. The impact of the development on the surrounding area, including the adjacent Scheduled Monument and its setting and the effects on landscape character and visual amenity are considered in later sections of this report. However, it is clear that the development of the site for housing would conflict with its allocation as KUL (policy EN5 and DM46) and is considered a departure from the Local Plan.
- 5.3.10 Paragraph 61 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out that to support the government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed. The Council's most recent Housing Land Supply Statement (January 2025) identifies a housing land supply of 2 years, which is a significant shortfall against the required 5-year supply set out in the NPPF. Paragraph 11 of the NPPF also requires that, where a local planning authority cannot demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites, permission should be granted unless the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of importance (such as areas at risk of flooding, designated heritage assets, statutory habitat sites) provide a strong reason for refusing permission; or any

adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination.

- 5.3.11 Policy EN5 is considered the most important policy for assessing this application. However, given the current housing land supply position, the policy is deemed to be out of date, thereby triggering the application of the tilted balance in favour of the delivery of residential development, in accordance with paragraph 11(d) of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- 5.3.12 Notwithstanding its out-of-date status, weight can still be attributed to Policy EN5. This is supported by two recent appeal decisions in the district — APP/A2335/W/23/3335117 (Land north of Ashford House) and APP/A2335/W/23/3326750 (Land east of Fulwood Drive) — where Inspectors afforded full weight to Policy EN5. In both cases, the supporting evidence base for the allocation was considered robust and up-to-date, and the policy was found to be broadly consistent with the objectives of the NPPF.
- 5.3.13 The Slyne-with-Hest Neighbourhood Plan was formally made following a Full Council meeting on 27 September 2023 and now forms part of the Development Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan does not allocate land for housing within the plan area, and on the whole its policies have limited relevance to the determination of this outline application. This is primarily because of the outline nature of the proposal. The most relevant policies relate to design matters (Policy BE1), which is primarily a consideration at the reserved matters stage and policy NE2 relating to protected views within the plan area. The relevant policies will be addressed where relevant in the following sections of this report.
- 5.3.14 Loss of Agricultural Land
The loss of the agricultural land is a material planning consideration and a matter of principle. Policy DM44 states development proposals '*should avoid the use of the best and most versatile agricultural land and should, as far as possible, use the lowest grade of land suitable*'. The NPPF equally reinforces the need to protect the highest quality agricultural land. Paragraphs 187, 188 and within footnote 62 states '*planning policy and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes, sites of biodiversity or geological value and soils*'. The best and most versatile (BMV) land is defined as Grades 1, 2 and 3a. The Post 1988 Agricultural Land Classification Map identifies the application site and the surrounding field network to comprise of Grades 3a and 3b agricultural land. Grade 3b is not considered best and most versatile land (BMV).
- 5.3.15 The applicant's Agricultural Land Classification Assessment covers a larger site (20 hectares), which appears to relate to the land considered in the original EIA Screening Opinion request. The effect of the development on BMV land is outside the scope of the submitted ES.
- 5.3.16 Across this larger assessment area, the applicant's assessment determines around 14.5 hectares of Grade 3a land would be lost to development. However, most of the site affected by the development is classified as 3b. Most of the 3b land relates to the land identified for open space to the south/southwest of the proposed developable areas. The developable areas comprise larger areas of 3a agricultural land. North of the application site (up to Slyne Road) is also considered BMV land.
- 5.3.17 Policy DM44 of the DM DPD states that development proposals **should** avoid the use of best and most versatile agricultural land and should, as far as possible, use the lowest grade of land suitable. In this regard there is conflict with policy DM44. If the open space and developable areas were flipped, arguably this policy requirement could be met. However, for reasons set out later in this report, the land to the south is not considered suitable for development due to flood risks and ecological reasons.
- 5.3.18 Where development would result in the loss of 20 hectares of grades 1, 2 or 3a land, Natural England would be a statutory consultee. In the context of EIA development, the loss of 20ha is generally considered to be of minor significance. The Planning Statement indicates the proposal would result in around 5ha of BMV land being lost, therefore well below this threshold. It is agreed that the effects

arising from the loss of a small area of 3a BMV agricultural land would not be significant and would not substantiate a reason for refusal, despite the conflict with local policy DM44.

5.3.19 Mineral safeguarding

The site is also protected for its potential mineral resource. Policy M2 of the Minerals and Waste Plan seeks to prevent the sterilisation of mineral resources by non-minerals development. The Mineral Safeguarding designation extensively extends across this part of the district, particularly to the north and east of the site.

5.3.20 The site is safeguarded for sand and gravel. Policy M2 sets out that planning permission will not be supported for any form of development that is incompatible with working the minerals, unless the applicant can demonstrate that:

- The mineral concerned is no longer of any value or has been fully extracted.
- The full extent of the mineral can be extracted satisfactorily prior to the incompatible development taking place.
- The incompatible development is of a temporary nature and can be completed and the site returned to its original condition prior to the minerals being worked.
- There is an overarching need for the incompatible development that outweighs the need to avoid the sterilisation of the mineral resource
- That prior extraction of minerals is not feasible due to the depth of the deposit.
- Extraction would lead to land stability problems.

5.3.21 A Mineral Safeguarding Assessment has been submitted with the application. This falls outside the scope of the ES. The submitted report sets out that mineral resources including glaciofluvial sands and gravels deposits are considered to underlie parts of the site. It claims the development of 12 hectares of land in the wider region would not sterilise the mineral resource and considers the need for housing a matter that outweighs the need to extract minerals. The assessment also goes on to assess likely environmental impacts arising from prior extraction.

5.3.22 The site lies immediately adjacent to a relatively large residential area, with significant transport infrastructure to the east (Bay Gateway) and north (West Coast Mainline). It is low lying land supporting existing water courses which directly link to the River Lune and the nature conservation sites associated with Morecambe Bay, and is located to the east of a Scheduled Ancient Monument. It is a highly sensitive site whereby prior extraction (quarrying of minerals) would lead to significant environmental effects associated with noise, vibration, dust, potential flooding and land stability issues - impacts that would be far greater than the development of houses due to the likely depths required for the extraction of minerals on the site.

5.3.23 Furthermore, the current policy of Lancashire County Council states that new sand and gravel extraction will not be supported. This effectively precludes the extraction of glaciofluvial sands and gravels at the site, especially given the extensive quantities of such deposits already present within the Lancashire area.

5.3.24 It is therefore considered that the mineral safeguarding allocation on this site does not provide a constraint to the development.

5.3.27 Conclusion

There are several key issues discussed above to help establish whether the principle of residential development on this site is acceptable. In summary, whilst located in the open countryside, the site is located in a sustainable position on the edge of an existing urban area where housing growth in principle could be supported; whilst parts of the site are considered to be BMV agricultural land the loss would not be significant and would not constrain development, and the prospect of mineral extraction is limited. However, the development of the site for housing would conflict with the Local Plan landscape designation, as it would fail to preserve the open nature and character of the KUL.

5.4 **Landscape and Visual Effects** NPPF Chapter 8 (Promoting Healthy and Safe Communities including Open Space and Recreation), Chapter 12 (Achieving Well-Designed Places), Chapter 15 (Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment); Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD: SP8 (Protecting the Natural Environment), EN3 (The Open Countryside) and EN5 (Local Landscape Designations); Development Management (DM) DPD policies: DM29 (Key Design

- 5.4.1 Paragraph 187 of the *National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)* states that planning decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes and recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside. Paragraph 175 emphasises that Local Plans should clearly distinguish between the hierarchy of international, national, and locally designated sites and allocate land of least environmental or amenity value for development.
- 5.4.2 In preparing the Local Plan, Lancaster City Council recognised that the district contains a range of important landscapes that are valued features of the natural environment and worthy of protection. The Plan appropriately distinguishes between landscapes of national significance, such as National Landscapes (formerly AONBs), and those of local significance. It identifies several locally valued landscapes that make a positive and important contribution to the natural and built environment and to the overall uniqueness of the district.
- 5.4.3 Policy SP8 serves as an overarching policy aimed at protecting these important landscapes from harmful and inappropriate development. The Local Plan defines two types of local landscape designations: Key Urban Landscape (KUL) and Urban Setting Landscape (USL), both of which are protected and allocated under Policy EN5 'Local Landscape Designations' of the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations document. These designations were informed by externally commissioned professional evidence that formed part of the Local Plan's evidence base. They play a key role in shaping the character of the district, with many of the identified landscapes providing the setting for important areas and features that collectively contribute to the identity of Lancaster district.
- 5.4.4 Policy EN5 is explicit in its intent: landscapes identified under this policy must be conserved and protected because of the historical and ongoing role they play in defining the district's character. It states that development proposals within these areas will only be permitted where they preserve the open nature of the area and respect the character and appearance of their surroundings. The Council places strong emphasis on maintaining the openness of both KUL and USL and is committed to protecting them from inappropriate development that would compromise their character.
- 5.4.5 Additional protection is provided through Policy DM46 'Development and Landscape Impact' of the adopted Development Management DPD. This policy reinforces the requirement to conserve the contribution that KULs and USLs make to the character and setting of the district's urban areas and to safeguard important natural features. It places particular emphasis on the historic townscape and built form. It also states that only development which preserves the open nature of these areas and respects the character and appearance of their surroundings will be supported. Furthermore, Policy DM29 requires all development to contribute positively to the identity and character of the area, thereby promoting high-quality and context-sensitive design across the district. The Neighbourhood Plan also seeks to secure high quality design and to protect and enhance several key views within the Plan area.
- 5.4.6 The site is located to the east of Russell Drive, positioned between existing residential development, Powder House Lane and the embankment of the Bay Gateway. Open countryside lies to the north, northeast and northwest, including Torrisholme Barrow, providing a rural backdrop to the edge of the urban area. Torrisholme Road is situated to the south of the site. This provides a key transport route between Lancaster and Morecambe within the built-up area. The site itself consists of a mixture of grassland and arable fields, interspersed with mature trees and hedgerows that contribute to the site's semi-rural character. Overhead electricity transmission lines and a pylon are located within the site and are distraction features in the context of the rural backdrop.
- 5.4.7 Topographically, the site is relatively low-lying, generally sitting below the level of the adjacent housing to the west. The land gradually falls towards the south, influencing natural drainage patterns. To the northwest, beyond Slyne Road, the landscape rises significantly to form Torrisholme Barrow — a prominent and locally distinctive landform.
- 5.4.8 The site lies adjacent to the urban edge and falls within the *Low Coastal Drumlins* Landscape Character Type (LCT), sub-type *Carnforth–Galgate–Cockerham (12a)*, as defined in the Lancashire County Council's Landscape Strategy for Lancashire (December 2000). This landscape type is

characterised by low lying hills—typically around 40 metres in height—with broad, rounded tops, particularly prevalent toward the northwest coast of the study area. Compared to the more densely packed drumlin fields, this sub-type features a gentler, lower-lying topography with more isolated drumlins. The alignment of the drumlins imparts a distinctive grain to the landform for this LCT.

- 5.4.9 The LCT is further defined by a strong pastoral pattern, where mature, native hedgerows follow the undulating terrain. Tree and shrub cover is generally sparse, though small copses are occasionally found on the drumlin tops and flanks. Scattered large farmsteads, connected by a network of narrow, hedged lanes and tracks, are typical features of the rural character. However, this particular LCT (12a) accommodates a high level of built development, including the large settlements of Lancaster and Morecambe, as well as major transport infrastructure. As such, the landscape presents a mix of rural and urban influences, with traditional agricultural features sitting alongside modern housing estates and industrial areas.
- 5.4.10 The site does not impact any statutory landscapes (directly or indirectly) owing to the distance from the closest National Landscapes and the intervening development and surrounding countryside.
- 5.4.11 The site falls within an area identified as one of ten new local landscape designations in the *Key Urban Landscapes Review* (May 2018), prepared by landscape consultants Arcadis (at the time of the adoption of the 2020 Local Plan). This particular designation—AS-03: Torrisholme Barrow—is defined by clear physical boundaries: the railway line to the east, existing residential development to the west, and the Bay Gateway to the south. The designated area includes land both north and south of Slyne Road/Hasty Brow Road, and notably incorporates Torrisholme Barrow, a prominent local landscape feature.
- 5.4.12 The Arcadis report concluded that this area holds strong cultural heritage, a distinctive landform, and mature, well-managed landscape features. It is described as a landscape of significant quality and distinctiveness that contributes meaningfully to the setting of surrounding urban areas and the Barrow itself. Among the newly assessed sites, AS-03 received the highest overall score and was subsequently recommended for designation as a Key Urban Landscape.
- 5.4.13 Given its designation and the qualities identified in the Arcadis assessment, the site plays a crucial role in maintaining the openness and character of the urban fringe landscape, reinforcing the strategic purposes of policy EN5 relating to the protection of the districts local landscape designations. Proposed residential development across a substantial portion of the land would clearly conflict with the aims of Policies EN5 and DM46, which seek to preserve the open, undeveloped character of such areas.
- 5.4.14 The effects of the development on landscape character and visual effects form an important part of the ES. This has been updated within the ES addendum to reflect the amendments to the development. This includes a Landscape and Visual Impact assessment of the development which has been prepared in accordance with relevant best practice guidance.
- 5.4.15 Officers' own assessment of the site, having visited the site and its surroundings, consider the site to be influenced by the existing urban edge and the significant infrastructure which lies immediately adjacent to the site and through it (in the case of the pylon and overhead lines). This particularly relates to the land behind Russell Drive. It is acknowledged there are no public rights of way through the site, though footpaths route along the base of the Bay Gateway embankment along the southeastern boundary of the site. This enables views across the site towards the Barrow. The northern parts of the site begin to have a greater rural feel and character, whereby the site is considered to have a closer visual relationship to the wider KUL and Torrisholme Barrow, though the site is clearly separated (by Slyne Road) from the field enclosures which extend up towards the crest of Torrisholme Barrow. Traffic noise from the Gateway and the West Coast Mainline is audible, albeit not significant, and therefore does reduce the overall tranquillity of the site and its immediate surroundings. In light of this assessment, the conclusions within the ES for landscape quality (medium to low), value (medium) and susceptibility to change (medium to low) and landscape sensitivity (medium to low) are not contested.
- 5.4.16 The applicant's assessment considers the potential landscape and visual effects arising from the development during construction and its operational stages. In terms of landscape effects, the assessment concludes the potential effect on the landscape character of the site and immediate

area would result in moderate adverse effects, which is considered significant. This is a consequence of a permanent change from agricultural land with its replacement of up to 130 dwellings with associated infrastructure. The applicant contends that through embedded design measures, which includes the retention, bolstering and enhancement of existing landscape features, together with the provision of extensive areas of open space for public use, the residual effects would reduce the overall effects to moderate-slight adverse (and not significant). Officers are satisfied this provides a reliable and robust assessment of the landscape impacts on the site itself. However, to ensure the effects are less than moderate adverse it is imperative the identified mitigation (retention, bolstering and enhancement of high quality landscaping, provision of extensive areas of open space and new recreational routes through the site) is appropriately secured. The reserved matters will need to be prepared in accordance with the approved Parameters Plan and guided by the broad principles outlined in the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy and the Design and Access Statement, both of which promote a strong landscape-led approach to the design of the development. To minimise adverse effects during construction, adherence to a suitable CEMP will be required.

- 5.4.17 In relation to the landscape effects on the wider KUL, the level of effect is also considered to result in moderate adverse effects (therefore significant) both during construction and once operational. The residual effects, taking into account the identified mitigation, are anticipated to reduce this to slight adverse. The Parameters Plan and Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy seek to provide landscape buffers around the development to contain the new development as new planting matures. This will reduce the level of effect over time, but it does not remove the fact the development will reduce the extent and integrity of the KUL and its primary purpose to protect the setting of Torrisholme Barrow.
- 5.4.18 The effect of the development on the LCA/LCT (Carnforth-Galgate-Cockerham/Low Coastal drumlin) is considered to be slight to negligible adverse and not significant. Whilst the development will result in the loss of open arable fields and the loss of some existing landscape features, with mitigation, the introduction of built development is not unfamiliar in these LCA/LCTs and would only affect a small part of a wider landscape character area/type.
- 5.4.19 Turning to the visual effects of the development, the assessment has followed established guidance and standard methodology, considering the likely impacts on a range of visual receptors. As is typical, the greatest level of visual effect is experienced by receptors located closest to the site. In this case, both during construction and once the development becomes operational, a range of substantial to moderate adverse visual effects are predicted for key receptors. These include users of Slyne Road, the open space associated with Torrisholme Barrow (due to its elevated position and its role in the site's wider setting), users of Powder House Lane, the informal track along the southern and south-western boundaries of the site, and residents of Russell Drive, Hexham Road, and Slyne Road.
- 5.4.20 With the inclusion of proposed mitigation—namely, embedded design at the reserved matters stage including limitation on the scale of development and the delivery of a comprehensive Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy—the residual visual effects are expected to reduce to moderate slight adverse (or less) for most receptors, except for the residential receptors of Russel Drive, Hexham Road and Syne Road where moderate adverse effects will still be experienced.
- 5.4.21 The severity of these effects is principally due to the direct intervisibility between the site and the receptors mentioned. The degree of visual harm is heightened for those receptors considered to be of high sensitivity, particularly residential properties and recreational users experiencing views from Torrisholme Barrow and the nearby informal tracks and roads. From neighbouring and nearby residential properties, there will be clear views of the development. However, following the amendments to the scheme, most properties will now overlook open space, retained and bolstered landscaping, therefore filtering views of the development to the northern parts of the site. It is accepted this is not the case of the properties closer to the site access.
- 5.4.22 Overall, the proposed development is assessed to result in moderate to moderate/slight adverse effects on both the landscape character and the visual amenity of the area. As such, it would conflict with the landscape-related policies of the Local Plan. However, these impacts are expected to be localised and, on balance, are not considered significant in the context of the EIA regulations.

- 5.5 **Cultural Heritage** NPPF Chapter 16 (Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment); Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policies SP7 (Maintaining Lancaster District's Unique Heritage); Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM39 (The Setting of Designated Heritage Assets), DM41 (Development Affecting Non-Designated Heritage Assets or their Settings), DM42 (Archaeology)
- 5.5.1 Cultural Heritage forms part of the ES and includes a thorough heritage impact assessment (HIA), supported by further archaeological investigation and evaluation post submission of the application.
- 5.5.2 The proposed site is located approximately 220m from the Scheduled Monument known as Torrisholme Barrow, which is a Bronze Age bowl barrow. A bowl barrow is an inverted pudding bowl-shaped mound and Scheduled Monuments are nationally important archaeological sites. The monument, a mound some 32m in diameter and 2m high, occupies the summit of a small hill and enjoys extensive views in all directions. The proposal has the potential to impact on archaeology that may be present within the site and also the setting of this designated heritage asset. The ES and (HIM) also considers other listed buildings that may be impacted by the proposal. This includes Lancaster Canal Folly Bridge, Lancaster Canal Williamslands Bridge and Lancaster Canal Belmont Bridge (all grade II listed) and the Ashton Memorial (Grade I).
- 5.5.3 The proposal will result in urban development extending into the open pastoral fields wrapping around the southern extent of Torrisholme Barrow. This will inevitably reduce the openness of the wider landscape and have an adverse effect on the setting of the monument. The proposed urban expansion is not considered to impact the setting of the other identified listed buildings.
- 5.5.4 In relation to archaeology, the site had been identified as an area of significant archaeological potential, due to its location adjacent to the Scheduled Monument of Torrisholme Barrow and the discovery of other prehistoric and Romano-British remains in the immediate area. Accordingly, it has now been subject to an archaeological geophysical survey and a scheme of archaeological trial trenching following comments from Lancashire County Council's Historic Environment Team.
- 5.5.5 The outcomes of the additional archaeological works and evaluation confirm there is limited archaeological evidence on site and further archaeological works are not required. This has been accepted by the County Council's Historic Environment Team who no longer object to the proposal. In this regard there is no conflict with policy DM42 and the NPPF.
- 5.5.6 In relation to the setting of the Scheduled Monument, policy DM39 and DM42 are relevant. DM39 addresses the setting of heritage assets, recognising that setting can contribute significantly to an asset's overall significance. The policy states that proposals which preserve elements of a setting that make a positive contribution to, or better reveal, the significance of a heritage asset will be supported.
- 5.5.7 Policy DM42 further requires that proposals affecting Scheduled Monuments must conserve or enhance those elements which contribute to their significance. Harm to such elements will only be permitted where it is clearly justified and demonstrably outweighed by public benefits.
- 5.5.8 National policy in the NPPF reinforces this approach. Paragraph 212 makes clear that when considering the impact of development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to its conservation. Paragraph 213 adds that any harm to a heritage asset's significance—including harm arising from development within its setting—must be clearly and convincingly justified. Where a proposal results in less than substantial harm, Paragraph 215 requires that this harm be weighed against the public benefits of the development.
- 5.5.9 The HIA and ES have been updated to reflect the changes to the proposal, reducing the number of dwellings from 200 to 130. The assessment concludes that the loss of open fields to accommodate residential development, associated open space, and infrastructure would result

in a long-term, permanent change to the rural setting of Torrisholme Barrow—particularly in relation to views to and from the monument itself.

- 5.5.10 However, with mitigation measures such as the retention of mature trees across the site and the inclusion of a landscape buffer along the northern and north-eastern boundaries, the ES concludes that the effects on the setting of Torrisholme Barrow fall within the negligible range. This represents a reduction from the previously assessed slight adverse effects associated with the earlier 200-dwelling scheme. During construction, there will be slight to negligible adverse effects. These are capable of mitigation through an effective CEMP to manage noise, dust and traffic impacts. Such effects are short-lived and temporary and therefore not significant.
- 5.5.11 Nonetheless, given the location of the developable areas as shown on the Parameters Plan, this reduction—from slight adverse to negligible—is not considered to be sufficiently justified. Whilst it is acknowledged that the amendments secure a landscape buffer, officers maintain the view that the level of effect remains slight adverse as the encroachment of built development ultimately remains the same (except a narrow buffer along the northern boundary). When viewed from the Barrow the urban edge will markedly encroach into the existing undeveloped landscape and will, due to the position of the open space, have a slightly detached relationship to the existing urban area.
- 5.5.12 Whether assessed as slight adverse or negligible, it is agreed that the proposal results in less than substantial harm to the setting of the designated heritage asset which is not considered significant in EIA terms.
- 5.5.13 In line with national policy, this harm must be balanced against the public benefits of the proposal. Lancaster City Council currently faces a significant shortfall in the supply of deliverable housing sites. Paragraph 61 of the NPPF highlights the government’s objective to significantly boost the supply of homes, making clear that it is essential for a sufficient amount and variety of land to come forward where it is needed.
- 5.5.14 This site is highly sustainable, located adjacent to the existing urban area of Morecambe and would deliver up to 130 new homes, including policy-compliant affordable housing. In addition, the proposal will provide extensive areas of new public open space and will provide meaningful improvements to infrastructure to support active travel. The proposal represents a notable public benefit, particularly in the current housing context. When considered in the round, the public benefits arising from the development are judged to outweigh the less than substantial harm identified to the setting and significance of the Scheduled Monument. The proposal would not therefore conflict with policy and the impacts on the setting of Torrisholme Barrow Scheduled Monument would not provide a strong reason for refusing permission. Therefore, the tilted balance remains engaged.
- 5.5.15 The conclusions above are consistent with the officer recommendation in considering the proposals at Fulwood Drive. However, it is acknowledged that the Inspector, in dismissing that appeal, considered the harm to the setting of the Scheduled Monument a clear reason for refusing permission and noted the benefits did not outweigh the harm.
- 5.5.16 The dismissed development off Fulwood Drive and the proposed development are similar in terms of the quantum of development being sought and both fall within the Key Urban Landscape (KUL), which positively contributes to the setting of the Scheduled Monument. Nevertheless, there are distinctions between the two sites, namely that the proposed site is physically separated from the drumlin feature which accommodates the Scheduled Monument, whereas the scheme off Fulwood Drive clearly encroached upwards and around the base of the drumlin itself.
- 5.5.17 Furthermore, and material in this recommendation, is the fact that Historic England are a statutory consultee to this application. They have raised no objection to the development on heritage grounds and have commented as follows: *‘Historic England considers that, while there would be some limited additional impact on the already compromised setting of the Torrisholme*

Round Barrow, this would not be sufficient to justify the refusal of planning permission on heritage grounds, particularly if the mitigation measures suggested were implemented’.

5.5.18 Historic England have been made aware of the appeal decision at Fulwood Drive and maintain their position having visited the site to make their assessment. In particular, they are of the opinion that despite the extension of development to the north, west and south of the Barrow’s location, it remains possible to appreciate its position overlooking the surrounding landscape (due to its elevated position), and to appreciate why its builders would have chosen to construct it there.

5.5.19 Consequently, it does not follow that the outcome of the Fulwood Drive appeal should automatically lead to a refusal of this permission on heritage grounds. Whilst it is a matter of judgement (as to the level of harm and the heritage planning balance), given Historic England’s position, it is considered that the development (with mitigation) complies with both local and national planning policy in relation to the conservation of designated heritage assets.

5.6 **Access, traffic impact, sustainable travel and parking** NPPF section: 9 (Promoting Sustainable Transport); Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policy: SP10 (Improving Transport Connectivity); Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM29 (Key Design Principles), DM57 (Health and Well-being), DM58 (Infrastructure Delivery and Funding), DM60 (Enhancing Accessibility and Transport Linkages), DM61 (Walking and Cycling), DM62 (Vehicle Parking Provision), DM63 (Transport Efficiency and Travel Plans) and DM64 (Lancaster District Highways and Transport Masterplan); Slyne-with-Hest Neighbourhood Plan Project (not policy) CC2 Road Safety.

5.6.1 The district’s development strategy (policies SP2 and SP3) aims to manage growth in the most sustainable way possible by directing growth to the main urban areas and to the identified rural sustainable settlements. This provides the greatest opportunities for people to travel by alternative sustainable transport modes rather than by private car. The proposed site, despite straddling the Slyne-with-Hest parish, is on the edge of one of the larger urban areas of the district and is considered to be sustainable in this regard.

5.6.2 The NPPF (paragraph 115) requires applications for development to ensure:

- sustainable transport modes are prioritised taking account of the vision of the site, the type of development and its location;
- safe and suitable access can be achieved for all users;
- the design of streets, parking areas, other transport elements reflects standards in national guidance, including the National Design Guide and National Model Design Code;
- any significant impacts from the development on the transport network (in terms of capacity and congestion), or on highway safety, can be cost effectively mitigated to an acceptable degree through a vision-led approach.

This criterion is reflected and expanded upon within policies DM60-DM63 of the DM DPD. Policy DM29 also requires development to be located where the environment and infrastructure can accommodate the impacts of expansion and new development is well connected to existing settlements and services.

5.6.3 Transport and Access is a matter scoped into the ES and ES Addendum.

5.6.4 Access Strategy

The applicant is seeking approval of access details in full as part of the outline planning application. The development shall be served by a new vehicular access and egress off Slyne Road. An emergency access is proposed off Powder House Lane which will also provide an active travel connection.

5.6.5 The surrounding highway network comprises Slyne Road, Powder House Lane and Lancaster Road. The Bay Gateway runs along the eastern boundary and is raised above the site. From the application site, Morecambe Road provides the closest connection to the Bay Gateway. Alternative connections could be made via Slyne Road (Hasty Brow) to the A6 (via Hest Bank Lane).

- 5.6.6 Slyne Road, In the vicinity of the application site, is rural in character, comprising a single carriageway two-way road with no footways and no street lighting. It is subject to a 30mph speed limit, which reverts to the national speed limit north of the proposed site access. South of the proposed access, as Slyne Road enters the existing built-up area, the speed limit reduces to 20mph. Footway provision begins on the southern side of the carriageway at this point, although it is relatively poor. Approximately 60 metres south-west of the site, Slyne Road connects with Russell Drive. Russell Drive links to Lancaster Road to the south and is subject to a 20mph speed limit. It is lit, includes footways on both sides of the carriageway, and has unrestricted on-street parking.
- 5.6.7 Lancaster Road is one of the main routes between Lancaster and Morecambe. It is lit, has footways on both sides, and is subject to a 30mph speed limit up to just beyond the junction with Russell Drive. Regular bus services operate along this route. Powder House Lane, which connects Barley Cop Lane to Slyne Road beneath the Bay Gateway, is a single-track rural lane. It is bound by mature hedgerows, unlit, has no footways, and is subject to a 60mph speed limit. Due to its low usage and lack of natural surveillance, it is frequently subject to fly-tipping.
- 5.6.8 The proposed access comprises a new junction into the site off Slyne Road with a ghost island right turn lane. The access comprises a 7.3 metre wider carriageway and an 8 metre kerb radius with visibility splays of 43 metres in both directions. The access arrangements would include an extension of the existing 20mph limit on Slyne Road to incorporate the new development.
- 5.6.9 The scheme also includes the re-alignment of Slyne Road in the vicinity of the proposed access, extending westwards towards the junction with Hexham Road. This supports the provision of the ghost island right turn lane and enables new and improved footways to be provided towards Torrisholme village.
- 5.6.10 An emergency access is proposed from Powder House Lane, located at the south-east corner of the development site. The precise design and specification of this access will be secured by planning condition but will include physical deterrents—such as bollards—to prevent unauthorised or improper use by general traffic.
- 5.6.11 The scheme also incorporates new active travel connections, including pedestrian and cycle access via the main vehicular entrance onto Slyne Road, and via the emergency access onto Powder House Lane. Additionally, the development will provide links to the existing east-west footway located immediately to the south of the site, adjacent to the base of the Bay Gateway embankment. This route connects Lancaster Road to Powder House Lane, further enhancing connectivity. The final details of these access arrangements will be subject to approval through planning condition.
- 5.6.12 Despite the strong opposition to the access arrangements by members of the public, the proposed access strategy is considered acceptable to the Local Highway Authority and would not conflict with requirements of planning policy in respect of providing a safe and suitable access for all users.

5.6.13 Sustainability

The Chartered Institution for Highways and Transportation (CIHT) sets out suggested walking distances between sites and key services based on desirable, acceptable and preferred maximum distances. This are set out below:

	Town Centres (m)	Commuting/School/ Sightseeing (m)	Elsewhere/Local Services (m)
Desirable	200	500	400
Acceptable	400	1,000	800
Preferred Maximum	800	2,000	1,200

Source: Applicant's Transport Assessment.

- 5.6.14 The proposed site is located on the edge of the existing built-up area of Torrisholme. Torrisholme village (as it is locally known) serves as the nearest local centre. The closest primary school—Torrisholme Community Primary School—is situated off Low Road.

- 5.6.15 The applicant's Transport Assessment includes a walking catchment plan, which demonstrates that the local centre lies largely within 1,000 metres of the site's centre, while the nearest primary school is within approximately 2,000 metres. It is also acknowledged that Lancaster and Morecambe College, Aldi on Lancaster Road, and parts of the White Lund employment area fall within preferred maximum walking distances.
- 5.6.16 Local pedestrian infrastructure is considered adequate, with continuous, lit footways provided along residential streets and Lancaster Road, with the exception of footway provision on Slyne Road up towards Hexham Road. The area's topography does not present any significant constraints, and walking between the site and nearby facilities would not be unduly lengthy or strenuous.
- 5.6.17 When considered alongside the proposed improvements to Slyne Road—designed to enhance access for all users—and the inclusion of a new active travel connection to the south of the site, the development is considered to be located in an accessible location. It would provide future residents with a genuine opportunity to make regular, everyday journeys on foot.
- 5.6.18 There are cycle routes in the surrounding the area including on road routes and off-road cycle tracks which provide connections to the city centre, major employment areas and leisure and education facilities. Most notable would be the Greenway (linking Lancaster and Morecambe) and along the Bay Gateway. Subject to safe connections to these routes (and others), it is considered cycling could also be a realistic mode of travel for future residents. Whilst this is the case, it is acknowledged connections to the wider more strategic cycle network are generally unlit and will not be attractive to all users, including those less confident or vulnerable.
- 5.6.19 The proposal includes improvements to the existing informal track located in the southwest corner of the site, providing a connection to Lancaster Road. These improvements are expected to include resurfacing and lighting, although the final details would be subject to a planning condition and separate approval by the local highway authority. The applicant is also committed to supporting the improvements to the surfacing of Powder House Lane (to support the active travel connections in this location) and the potential implementation of an "access only" or "except access" scheme for this road. The final scheme would be secured by condition and should ensure use by horse riders is not compromised.
- 5.6.20 In terms of public transport, the area is well served by existing bus services. The closest bus stops are located on Lancaster Road close to the junction with Hyde Road. There are regular daytime, evening and weekend services running between Lancaster University and Overton via the city centre, Morecambe and Heysham. The CIHT recommend a 400m walking distance between new residential development and a bus stop/services. The applicant's submission acknowledges the nearest bus stop is closer to c500-600m and is above the recommended distance for parts of the site. Although this is the case, given the good level of bus services operating in the area and with the upgraded active travel connections to the south of the site, travelling by bus is also a genuine option for future residents.
- 5.6.21 Access to rail services would require walking to Bare Lane Station, which is located around 1.2km from the centre of the site or alternatively using bus services to access Lancaster Railway Station. Services from Bare Lane to Lancaster are hourly (Mon-Fri) and 2 hourly (weekends). Lancaster railway station offers regular rail connections regionally and nationally. Whilst the walking distances to Bare Lane station is above the preferred maximum distances, it remains an option for some future residents wishing to travel potentially further afield via rail.
- 5.6.22 Active Travel England (ATE) are a statutory consultee for developments over 150 housing units. ATE raised initial concerns to the original submission due to the lack of detail over the active travel access points and routes and the quality of such routes. Following consideration of the applicant's submitted Highway Technical Note and the amendments to the scheme, ATE raise no objection to the proposal. This is subject to a requirement to ensure the internal layout meets the requirements of the National Design Mode, Inclusive Mobility and LTN 1/20. The layout is not a consideration at this stage. Notwithstanding this the applicants Design and Access Statement supports consideration of LTN 1/20, which is included as a recommended condition.
- 5.6.23 A Travel Plan will be required for the scheme of development proposed in order to encourage and incentivise active travel. An Interim Travel Plan has been provided with the application, which is

reasonable and proportionate given the outline nature of the scheme. A full Travel Plan shall be secured by planning condition with a contribution required towards Travel Plan mentoring. This is agreed with the applicant.

- 5.6.24 Overall, the development is considered to be sustainability located to support and encourage the use of alternative sustainable modes of transport and therefore accords with planning policy in this regard. There are no significant adverse effects arising from the development on the pedestrian and cycle environment. In fact, betterment will be provided through the proposed off-site improvements works.
- 5.6.25 Traffic Impacts
The proposed development will give rise to increased traffic during construction and once operational. There is strong opposition to the development on the grounds of highway safety particularly given the current highway constraints along Slyne Road/Hasty Brow.
- 5.6.26 The submitted TA and the Traffic chapter of the ES has robustly considered the impacts of additional traffic having regard to the existing and future baseline scenarios, existing highway constraints and accident data. The methodology and outcomes of the amended TA and that set out in the ES are not disputed by the Local Highway Authority or National Highways and are therefore considered robust in assessing the significance of the effects arising from the development. The baseline data has also informed the noise and air quality sections of the ES.
- 5.6.27 The submitted Transport Assessment predicts a total of 74 two-way trips in the AM peak and 70 in the PM peak. This has reduced by approximately 40 trips following the amendment to the development. These trip rates have been used when modelling the effects on the local highway network. A detailed assessment of the increase in traffic on the local network at key junctions, based on existing and future traffic flows, is provided in the ES.
- 5.6.28 The highway impacts of the traffic predicted to be generated by the development have been properly assessed at key junctions within the local road network, as set out in the submitted Transport Assessment. For all junctions assessed, the development is considered acceptable from an operational highways perspective, with residual traffic effects classified as negligible.
- 5.6.29 The local highway authority has raised no objection to the proposed development, subject to mitigation in the form of a financial contribution towards improvements to the wider highway infrastructure, as set out in the Lancaster Travel and Transport Infrastructure Strategy. the assessment of the development in isolation is agreed to cause a negligible adverse effect. However, when taking into account the growth ambitions within the Local Plan and the wider strategic highway infrastructure constraints, the level of effect could arguably be greater than predicted in the ES. Nevertheless, with mitigation (the highways contribution), the effects arising from the development on the wider network would be negligible.
- 5.6.30 The local highway authority has advised that the contribution figure has been calculated using a gravity model, which assesses the development's impact on various parts of the network based on the scale, type, and location of the development in the context of the adopted Local Plan. This model also incorporates the estimated costs of the associated infrastructure works. The funding will support the delivery of strategic improvements aimed at increasing network capacity and promoting sustainable travel.
- 5.6.31 The requested contribution equates to **£4,386.66** per dwelling. Based on a development of 130 dwellings, this would total approximately **£570,266**. The final figure would be confirmed at the reserved matters stage and apportioned across the five key initiatives identified within the Infrastructure Strategy. These initiatives include:
- The City Centre Gyratory
 - A6 Slyne Road and other key feeder roads
 - The local highway network surrounding M6 Junction 34
 - Strategic highway improvements across Lancaster and Morecambe
 - Wide-load route management enhancements
- 5.6.32 Given the likely distribution of trips generated by the development, these initiatives are considered directly related to its impacts. The contribution would also support local improvements, such as those

to the Shrimp Roundabout, which the submitted Transport Assessment acknowledges will operate over capacity.

- 5.6.33 Without contributions to mitigate the impacts of the development and support the delivery of strategic highway infrastructure, it is anticipated there would be severe impacts in terms of both safety and congestion around Lancaster and Morecambe's highway network. Policy DM58 and DM64 also support contributions to mitigate impacts to highway infrastructure.
- 5.6.34 The Local Highway Authority's contribution request is supported by the applicant and is proposed in addition to the off-site highway improvement works proposed to enhance active travel between the site and the local area and deliver the proposed new access. In light of this, the proposed development is considered compliant with the Local Plan policies and the NPPF in relation to traffic impacts.
- 5.6.35 National Highways are responsible for the strategic road network (SRN). Following further information (Technical Note) and the amendments to the scheme, National Highways have confirmed they have no objection to the development, noting the development will not have a material impact on the safe operation of the SRN and junction 34.
- 5.6.36 During construction, there will be a requirement to secure a Construction Method Statement dedicated to ensuring the local highway network is not unduly compromised during this phase of development. This will aim to control matters pertaining to construction access and egress, the location of site compounds, operative parking, loading and unloading, wheel washing (to avoid debris on the highway) and construction vehicle routing. In this case, the concern will relate to ensuring larger HGV avoid Hasty Brow/Slyne Road due to the bridge restrictions. The ES assessment concludes the effects arising from construction traffic will be short term and temporary and therefore negligible. There are no reasons to dispute this, despite the valid concerns from local residents.
- 5.6.37 Parking
Policy DM62 sets out the Council's maximum parking standards for new development. The submission indicates the development will be designed to meet the requirements of policy DM62 with the details provided as part of the layout considerations through reserved matters. Parking is not explicitly a reserved matter, therefore a condition is recommended to control the provision of the parking prior to occupation of respective dwellings, together with access and turning provision via the internal estate roads. There is an expectation for all roads (subject to the street hierarchy and design at reserved matter stage) to be designed to adoptable highway standards.
- 5.6.38 Conclusion
In conclusion, the proposed access strategy—including pedestrian and cycle connections—together with the proposed mitigation measures to enhance active travel opportunities from the site towards Torrisholme village and Lancaster Road (via the existing built environment), and the financial contribution towards strategic highway infrastructure improvements, enables officers to conclude that, on balance, the proposal is acceptable.
- 5.6.39 The applicant has robustly demonstrated that safe and suitable access can be provided for all modes of transport and that the additional traffic generated by the development can be safely accommodated on the local highway network without resulting in significant adverse impacts. There are no highway safety objections from the statutory consultees. Therefore, despite concerns raised to the contrary, there are no technical highway grounds on which to withhold planning permission.
- 5.7 **Flood Risk and Drainage** NPPF Chapter 14 (Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change); Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policy SP8 (Protecting the Natural Environment); Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM33 (Development and Flood Risk), DM34 (Surface Water Run-off and Sustainable Drainage), DM35 (Water Supply and Waste Water) and DM36 (Protecting Water Resources and Infrastructure).
- 5.7.1 Strategic policy seeks to ensure that new growth within the district is located in the areas at least risk of flooding (following a sequential approach), does not create new or exacerbate existing flooding, and aims to reduce flood risk overall. Both Local Plan policy DM33 and the NPPF require a sequential approach to development in respect of flood risk. If a site contains areas of medium or high risks of flooding, taking into account all sources of flood risk, a sequential test would be required

to demonstrate that there are no sites at a lower risk of flooding where the development could be located. The NPPF and the above referenced DM DPD policies require development to be in areas at least risk of flooding (following the sequential and exception tests) and for major proposals to ensure surface water is managed in a sustainable way accounting for climate change.

- 5.7.2 A Flood Risk and Drainage Assessment (FRA) has been produced which informs the Water ES chapter. This has been amended in response to the revised scheme and changes in policy and flood date during the determination of the application. The application is also supported by an updated and flood risk sequential test (FRST).
- 5.7.3 The applicant's FRA clearly identifies that the proposed development lies within Flood Zone 1 and is therefore suitable to support residential development. However, the SFRA recognises that the EA flood maps for planning do not address climate change. Accordingly, the FRA has appropriately had regard to the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment identifying the site is at risk of tidal flooding in the future scenario (within the lifetime of development) as well as increased future surface water flood risk in the areas around the existing watercourses. These watercourses are identified as Flood Zone 3B (in the SFRA). The applicant has satisfactorily demonstrated the site is not at risk of groundwater flooding through detailed site investigations. The applicant's site specific FRA contends the flood risks are low for all sources except tidal flooding. For this reason, a FRST accompanies the application.
- 5.7.4 In accordance with the PPG, the broad scope of the assessment was discussed and agreed with the local planning authority before submission. Given the scale of the development and the nature of the proposal (housing to meet a district need), it was agreed that the area of search to review alternative sites could be limited to the main urban areas and sites on the edge of the urban areas within Lancaster district (Lancaster, Morecambe, Heysham and Carnforth).
- 5.7.5 The purpose of the sequential test is to consider whether there are any reasonably available sites suitable to accommodate the proposed development that are at a lower risk of flooding than the application site. PPG (028) states '*reasonably available sites*' are those in a suitable location for the type of development with a reasonable prospect that the site is available to be developed at the point in time envisaged for the development [our emphasis]. These could include a series of smaller sites and/or part of a larger site if these would be capable of accommodating the proposed development. Such lower-risk sites do not need to be owned by the applicant to be considered 'reasonably available'.
- 5.7.6 The applicant has undertaken a robust FRST looking extensively at other sites, drawing reasonable comparison in relation to their respective flood risks, and assessing whether any alternative sites are available. Given the amendments to the development, now largely avoiding the areas at risk of future tidal flooding, of the sites assessed there are few sites that could be considered sequentially preferable in flood risk terms, including Lundsfield Quarry given the extent of groundwater flood risk across the whole site. For all remaining sites, the applicant has demonstrated the sites are also unavailable to the applicant. Officers are therefore satisfied the FRST is passed in accordance with policy DM33 and the NPPF.
- 5.7.7 Having passed the FRST, it still needs to be demonstrated that the development is safe for its lifetime and does not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere.
- 5.7.8 Paragraph 181 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) requires applicants to demonstrate, through a site-specific Flood Risk Assessment (FRA), that:
 - The most vulnerable development within the site is located in areas of lowest flood risk, unless there are overriding reasons for an alternative location;
 - The development is appropriately flood-resistant and resilient, such that it can be brought back into use quickly after a flood event without significant refurbishment;
 - Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) are incorporated, unless there is clear evidence that this would be inappropriate;
 - Any residual flood risk can be safely managed; and
 - Safe access and escape routes are included where appropriate, as part of an agreed emergency plan.

- 5.7.9 Paragraph 182 further requires that applications with potential impacts on drainage should incorporate SuDS to control flow rates and reduce runoff volumes. These systems should be proportionate to the scale and nature of the development and, wherever possible, deliver multiple benefits. For major developments, SuDS should:
- Take into account advice from the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA);
 - Have appropriate minimum operational standards;
 - Include maintenance arrangements to ensure effective operation for the lifetime of the development.
- 5.7.10 Policy DM34 of the Development Management DPD sets out that surface water must be managed sustainably in all new development. The Council expects proposals to utilise SuDS as a priority, particularly naturalistic solutions integrated into the site's soft landscaping, delivering multifunctional benefits as part of a high-quality green and blue environment.
- 5.7.11 The SFRA has designated all ordinary watercourses, potential culverts, drainage channels and flood risk management features as Flood Zone 3b which, by definition, is functional floodplain. Therefore, development within floodzone 3b is prohibited unless there are exceptional circumstances (policy DM33). Accordingly, the applicant has responded to the SFRA and has amended their proposal substantially to remove the development platforms where the watercourses are located. The original proposal including the removal and division of the watercourses, the formation of development platforms and extensive earthworks to mitigation against the tidal flood risk within the lower parts of the site. There are no proposals relating to the watercourses. These will be retained (along with the landscaping) and incorporated into the open space and BNG proposals and enhanced with additional SUDS features as part of the drainage strategy.
- 5.7.12 The main focus of the FRA is to demonstrate the development is safe and does not increase the risks off-site having regard to the future tidal flood risk. The submission outlines the proposed development would be inundated during the Undefended 1 in 200-year Higher Central and Upper End Climate Change scenarios. It has to be acknowledged, that this undefended tidal flood risk affects a much larger area of Heysham and Morecambe and not just the application site. Nevertheless, with the changes to the scheme, the flood risk affects relatively small sections of the development platforms.
- 5.7.13 The future tidal design flood level is 7.9m AOD. The revised developable platforms remove large areas of flood risk from the location where dwellings would be proposed. Only small sections of the southern and western parcels of the developable areas are affected by the Upper end Climate Change flood extent. Based on the indicative masterplan, this appears to affect around 30 dwellings. To mitigate this risk, all properties would need to have a finished floor level (FFL) of 8m AOD with residual effects managed through careful flood risk management (evacuation plans). The proposed access shall be provided at around 9m AOD therefore safe access and egress can be provided. This approach is accepted by the Environment Agency who have raised no objection to the development based on the revised proposals and the updated FRA. Having regard to the proposed flood risk mitigation, the ES concludes the development would have a negligible effect (not significant) on all potential sources of flooding and water resources. Having further regard to the comments from statutory consultees, this assessment is considered robust and reasonable. It is necessary to impose a planning condition to secure the development is built out in accordance with the specific flood risk mitigation within the FRA.
- 5.7.14 The proposed drainage strategy has been informed by the baseline flood risk conditions and a wider catchment analysis and accounts for an additional 4ha of potential run-off to be directed around the site. The proposed surface water drainage strategy looks to positively drain the impermeable areas of the development site (the precise details controlled by condition when the layout of the development is known) at a controlled greenfield discharge rate (20l/s) with capacity sufficient to meet current best practice taking into account the required climate change allowances (in this case 45%) an urban creep.
- 5.7.15 Infiltration testing has been carried out on site, though this is not extensive and requires further investigation. However, of the tests undertaken, infiltration has proven unviable as the sole method of disposing of surface water. Given the network of watercourses on site, the alternative (in full or part) would be to drain to an existing watercourse. Surface water will not drain to the existing sewer network. The proposed drainage strategy will ensure surface water flows from the development are

directed to the new drainage infrastructure, potentially reducing current flows to existing outfall pipes below Lancaster Road.

- 5.7.16 The strategy outlines a series of swale and attenuation basins across the site which positively contribute to the delivery of a genuine sustainable drainage system with multifunctional benefits (design, biodiversity flood risk and open space). The precise details of any SuDS features will be a matter secured by condition (associated with the final drainage scheme) and the layout determined at reserved matters stage.
- 5.7.17 Despite local concerns over the increase in potential flooding arising from the development, the applicant has provided technical evidence to demonstrate the development can be drained without increasing the risk of flooding on or off site. The Lead Local Flood Authority has no objection to the development subject to the imposition of conditions to secure the final drainage scheme (based on the broad principles of the submitted and amended drainage strategy, a surface water construction management plan, a detailed management and maintenance plan for the approved scheme and a verification condition to demonstrate the approved drainage scheme has been installed.
- 5.7.18 Non permeable areas would naturally drain into the existing network on site and any land drainage requirements would be managed separately from the designed system. Foul drainage will connect to the public sewer to the satisfaction of United Utilities, who have raised no objection to the development.
- 5.7.19 Considering the above, and with the imposition of suitable flood risk and drainage planning conditions, it has been demonstrated that the development can be safe from flood risk and that the development would not result in a flood risk elsewhere over the lifetime of the development. It is contended that there are no flood risk or drainage grounds to resist the proposal and that the development accords with the NPPF and Local Planning policies in this regard. Impacts are not therefore considered significant in the context of the EIA regulations.
- 5.8 **Biodiversity and Trees** NPPF section: 15 (Conserving and enhancing the natural environment); Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policies: SP8 (Protecting the Natural Environment and EN7 (Environmentally Important Areas); Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM29 (Key Design Principles); DM43 (Green and Blue Infrastructure), DM44 (Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity) and DM45 (Protection of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland).
- 5.8.1 Strategic policies SP8 and EN7 both recognise the importance and value of biodiversity within the district and expects development proposals to protect, maintain and enhance biodiversity. This policy position is reflected in the Development Management DPD policies. Policy DM44 states development proposals should protect and enhance biodiversity and, as a principle, there should be net gain of biodiversity assets wherever possible. The policy goes on to state that where harm cannot be avoided, it should be mitigated and as a last resort compensated for, and where a proposal leads to significant harm, planning permission should be refused. Policy DM45 identifies the importance of retaining trees, woodland and hedgerows where they positively contribute to visual amenity, landscape character and/or the environmental value of an area. This policy expects new development to positively incorporate existing trees and hedgerows and where this cannot be achieved, the losses must be justified and mitigated. Policy DM45 seeks to maximise and encourage new tree and hedgerow planting of indigenous species to mitigate the wider impacts of climate change and to enhance the character and appearance of the district.
- 5.8.2 Ecology forms one of the chapters of the submitted ES and has been updated in the ES Addendum to reflect the changes to the proposal. The ES seeks to provide an objective and transparent assessment to the ecological effects of the development having regard to relevant policy, published guidance and legislation relating to the nearby designated sites and protected species. A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) report and Metric inform the impact assessment (as part of the ES).
- 5.8.3 Designated Sites
The site is located within 1.4km from Morecambe Bay and Duddon Estuary Special Area of Protection (SPA), Morecambe Bay Special Area of Conservation (SAC) and Morecambe Bay Ramsar site, in addition to the Morecambe Bay Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI). Given the proximity of the site to the designated areas, there is the potential for the development to have an

adverse impact on their integrity both during construction and operational phases of the development. A shadow Habitats Regulations Assessment has been submitted with the application. It is considered that mitigation is required in relation to potential adverse effects and therefore an Appropriate Assessment has been undertaken.

- 5.8.4 The Local Planning Authority has adopted the submitted shadow Habitat Regulations Assessment (and Appropriate Assessment) to fulfil its duty as the competent authority. In relation to potential effects the applicant has sufficiently demonstrated, to the satisfaction of Natural England and our own ecologists (GMEU), that the development would not directly impact the designated sites and is not considered to be functionally linked land. This is in the knowledge of low numbers of some qualifying species being recorded on the site, such as Lapwing. The potential for likely significant effects on the integrity of the designated sites therefore arises from indirect effects arising from the development. This includes pollution pathways and recreational disturbance.
- 5.8.5 The Appropriate Assessment concludes that the proposal will not result in adverse effects on the integrity of any of the designated areas subject to appropriate mitigation being secured by condition. For potential impacts during construction, the submission acknowledges mitigation in the form of good pollution control is embedded into the scheme. Once operational, the sHRA notes the proposed sustainable drainage strategy (a series of swales) will attenuate flows and mitigate pollution outflows, providing further embedded mitigation. Whilst the recommendations of the sHRA do not explicitly require a construction method plan or sustainable drainage scheme, these are standard requirements for any development and will support and help mitigate against any residual risk to the designated sites. These measures shall be controlled by planning condition.
- 5.8.6 In relation to recreational disturbance, whilst there are no direct routes to the designated sites from the application site, the site is close enough to result in the potential uplift in use of the coastal area for recreational purposes. To mitigate against this residual risk, homeowner packs will be required. The purpose of such is to highlight the importance of the designated sites, set out relevant codes of conduct and share details of alternative areas for recreation away from the designated site. The provision of homeowner packs can be secured by planning condition.
- 5.8.7 Additional mitigation will be achieved through the provision of on-site public open space. The development includes extensive open space, as outlined in the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy. This comprises large areas of semi-natural green space, along with other open space typologies, offering opportunities for informal recreation, walking, and dog exercise. Furthermore, the development integrates active travel links that connect well to a broader network of footpaths, supporting accessible and convenient circular routes for regular recreational use. To ensure the proposed open space is sufficiently protected, safeguard and managed and maintained to provide long term mitigation against recreational disturbance, a Landscape and Ecology Management Plan (LEMP) is proposed. This is capable of being secured by condition or as part of the wider Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) management and maintenance obligations in the s106 legal agreement.
- 5.8.8 Without mitigation, the proposed development could have detrimental impacts upon Morecambe Bay SAC, Morecambe Bay and Duddon Estuary SPA and Morecambe Bay Ramsar site. The ES considers this to be a moderate to minor adverse significance of effect. However, with the implementation of the mitigation outlined above, it is considered that the proposed development will have no significant adverse effects (negligible) on the integrity of the designated sites, their designation features or their conservation objectives, through either direct or indirect impacts either alone or in-combination with other plans and projects. Officers are satisfied with the assessment and concur with the outcomes of the sHRA, for which the LPA will adopt as its own, in exercising its duty under the Habitat Regulations. The mitigation measures can be adequately covered by a condition attached to any planning consent. Both GMEU and Natural England concur with the conclusions of the sHRA and the need to secure the mitigation identified.
- 5.8.9 In this regard, it is considered the development, with mitigation, would accord with the requirements of the Habitat Regulations, strategy policy SP8 and policy DM44 of the DM DPD.
- 5.8.10 Ecological Impacts
The application has been supported by a preliminary ecological appraisal (PEA), which has been updated during the determination of the application to address concerns raised by the Council's ecology advisors, GMEU. This has informed the Ecology section of the ES and ES Addendum.

- 5.8.11 The site comprises arable, modified and neutral agricultural grassland with hedgerows and scattered trees which divide the site into numerous fields. The field pattern and hedgerows on site appear to be historic. Around 172 metres of hedgerow are described as species rich with the remaining 1759 metres considered to be species poor. Nevertheless, these are considered to be priority habitat with greater than local value. There are also a number of ditches/watercourses within the site.
- 5.8.12 The development of the site will inevitably result in the loss of existing habitats and some disturbance to species currently using the area. A number of public objections have been received, raising concerns about the potential loss of biodiversity and impacts on protected species. The original submission also attracted an objection from the Local Planning Authority's ecologist (GMEU).
- 5.8.13 However, the amended proposal represents a significant improvement in terms of its ecological impact. While some habitat loss and the potential for disturbance associated with the introduction and extension of the urban edge remain, the revised scheme demonstrates a more sensitive and considered approach to ecology and biodiversity.
- 5.8.14 The PEA and the ecology chapter of the ES and ES Addendum consider the effects on protected species and habitats during construction and once operational. It is recognised the loss of habitat (grassland and hedgerows) will result in permanent effects of moderate-minor adverse significance. However, with the incorporation of mitigation (retention of habitat where possible, provision of bird and bat boxes, sensitive lighting, species rich landscaping) the adverse effects will be minimised. In the case of amphibians (great Crested Newts) and despite objections to the contrary, the risk of GCN being on the site is considered low following the results of the eDNA surveys and given that further habitat is now retained. The application sufficiently evidences the impact of the development on these species is not considered to be harmful and would arguably result in minor beneficial residual effects once mitigation is provided. Mitigation will be in the form of new waterbodies and SuDS features provided on the site.
- 5.8.15 GMEU are now satisfied that the development will not cause significant harm to protected species subject to conditions requiring suitable method statements to safeguard protected species during habitat clearance and construction and to secure appropriate ecological enhancement measures, as set out in the submitted PEA. Some additional survey effort is required to inform accurate mitigation when the detailed scheme is known (at reserved matters stage).
- 5.8.16 Subject to conditions securing the above mitigation, it is contended the development would not conflict with policy DM44 and mitigation can be secured to ensure there is no significant adverse effect to protected species or priority habitat. The landscaping scheme, which will form part of the reserved matters application, must have regard to the requirements of the PEA and the relevant ecological conditions. The layout of the development should be based on a greater level of retention of the historic hedgerows.
- 5.8.17 The residual effects identified in the ES are agreed and considered robust, noting there is no permanent significant adverse effect on ecology arising from the development. The residual effects range between minor adverse and moderate-minor beneficial.
- 5.8.18 Trees and Hedgerows
The application has been supported by an Arboricultural Impacts Assessment (AIA) and Tree Survey. This has been updated during the consideration of the application to reflect the amended proposals.
- 5.8.19 The field pattern appears to have changed little since the site was surveyed in 1891, indicating that the hedgerows could be of historic 'importance'. The hedgerows, which have developed into attractive linear features, are shown on the OS map Lancashire sheet 30, published in 1895. The site is outside any conservation area and no trees are currently covered by a tree preservation order.
- 5.8.20 The AIA identifies 17 individual trees, 18 groups and 14 hedgerows, both within and bordering the site. Trees and hedgerows are an important feature of the site, all contribute to the character of the local area and are of notable wildlife and public amenity value, being visible from a range of public

domains. The hedgerows also form the backdrop to neighbouring properties off Russel Drive. One tree T3, a mature oak, is identified as having veteran features.

- 5.8.21 The largest volumes of mature tree stock are located in the southern section of the site. This area is indicated as open space within the Parameters Plan and therefore provides good opportunities for substantial tree and hedgerow retention. With the developable areas, the existing trees and hedgerows should guide the layout of the development, though it is expected some removals will be required to create the development platform to mitigate against flood risk and to secure the access proposals.
- 5.8.22 Approximately 120m of hedgerow and several trees will need to be removed to facilitate the access point off Slyne Road and deliver the off-site highway works. These losses will be compensated by substantial new tree and hedgerow planting across the Site. Any further losses will need to be justified, and appropriate mitigation put in place as part of the landscape proposals at reserved matter stage. The AIA indicates there may be scope to translocate some roadside hedgerows. Details of this would be expected within Arboricultural Method Statement controlled by planning condition.
- 5.8.23 The Parameters Plan provides the potential to support the retention and protection of important category A and B Sycamore trees in the southwestern part of the site, though careful attention will be need at reserved matters stage to ensure these trees are successfully integrated into the design of the development. A detailed impact assessment, including tree protection plans and method statements will be required. This can be secured by planning condition.
- 5.8.24 The Council's Arboricultural Officer has not raised an objection, but does stress the need for the layout of the development at reserved matters stage to work with and around existing landscape features. The officer positively comments on the desire (within the AIA) to try and preserve historically important boundaries but, without the precise details, it is difficult to ascertain if this proposal will positively incorporate existing trees and hedgerows. Given the outline nature of the proposal, an updated AIA will be required to set out clear tree protection measures and any necessary method statements for works within close proximity to trees and hedgerow planned for retention.
- 5.8.25 Overall, it is considered that the tree losses and hedgerow removals required to form the site access would not lead to unacceptable impacts, with the losses capable of being compensated for as part of the landscaping proposals at reserved matters scheme. Except where it is not possible for justified reasons, the application has demonstrated the subsequent reserved matters application can positively incorporate existing trees and hedgerows within the development. Where this is not possible, there is sufficient space on the site to accommodate the losses to comply with policy DM45 of the DM DPD.
- 5.8.26 Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG)
The submitted application is not subject to mandatory BNG and is exempt because of when the application was submitted. However, the NPPF and Local Plan policies still encourage new development to make positive contributions towards BNG.
- 5.8.27 The application has been supported by an updated Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (Version 6 dated July 2025) following the amendments to the scheme and comments received from GMEU in response to earlier consultations.
- 5.8.28 The site currently comprises a mix of area habitat (36.17 biodiversity units), linear habitat (17.83 biodiversity units) and includes on-site watercourses (1.37 watercourse units). Following the amendments, there is now a significantly greater level of on-site habitat retention, though losses are still anticipated to accommodate the site access and the off-site highway works and the formation of the development platforms. The greatest impact is on existing hedgerows, though the full extent is unknown and would be determined through the reserved matters application.
- 5.8.29 Despite these potential losses, the submitted BNG report and metric demonstrates the site is capable of delivering significant net gains in biodiversity. The assessment indicates the potential to secure

30.5% net gains in area habitat and 39% net gains in watercourse units. Based on the assessment at this stage, it is anticipated a net loss of -3.23% in linear habitat. The post-development BNG metric will be subject to change and refinement as landscaping forms part of the reserved matters. Subsequently, there is an expectation that any forthcoming landscaping design for the site firstly aims to retain as much habitat as possible and adequately mitigates the losses, especially in relation to in hedgerows. Overall, officers are satisfied that there is scope within the site, or potentially off-site (and in the applicant's control) to ensure that a minimum of 10% net gains in biodiversity (across all unit types) can be secured. The level of on-site BNG would be considered significant and therefore will be secured via planning obligation, alongside a habitat management and monitoring plan.

5.8.30 Our ecology advisors, GMEU, have now removed their initial objection and are satisfied meaningful net gains in biodiversity can be secured as part of this development proposal. GMEU has also confirmed acceptance of the BNG baseline metric to inform the BNG plan at reserved matters stage and echo the requirements for the BNG to be secured, managed and maintained (for 30 years) by planning obligation.

5.8.31 Subject to the imposition of planning conditions and a planning obligation to secure net gains in biodiversity on this site, it is contended that proposals accord with the requirements of policy DM44 and the Framework.

5.8.32 Overall, the development is not considered to give rise to significant environmental effects in relation to ecology provide the identified mitigation is appropriately secured, including long term habitat and landscape management and monitoring. The level of effect is ranges between slight-adverse to moderate-minor beneficial when taking into account the potential for ecological enhancements and BNG on site.

5.9 **Residential Amenity** NPPF sections: 8 (Promoting healthy and safe communities), 12 (Achieving well-designed places), 15 (Conserving and enhancing the natural environment - noise and pollution); Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM29 (Key Design Principles), and DM57 (Health and Well-Being).

5.9.1 Paragraph 198 of the NPPF requires planning policy and decisions to ensure new development is appropriate for its location, taking into account the likely effects of pollution on health, living conditions and the natural environment. To achieve this, it is necessary to avoid noise impacts giving rise to significant adverse effects and to mitigate and reduce potential adverse effects resulting from noise from new development. Policy DM29 of the DM DPD and paragraph 135 of the NPPF is also relevant in the context of assessing the effects of development on residential amenity. Both strongly advocate the need for new development to be of high standard of design ensuring high standards of amenity are maintained and secured for existing and future users. Policy DM29 specifically state that new development must ensure there is no significant detrimental impact to amenity in relation to overshadowing, visual amenity, privacy, overlooking, massing and pollution.

5.9.2 There are two main factors to consider in the assessment of amenity in this case. The first is the effect of the development on the amenity of existing residents. The second relates to the standard of amenity for future occupants of the development. In the case of the latter, noise considerations are important given the position of the site adjacent to the surrounding transport network.

5.9.3 Effects on existing residents
The application site is located on the eastern edge of Torrisholme, adjacent to the urban area of Morecambe. The surrounding area is predominantly residential in character, with Russell Drive being the most directly affected. A significant proportion of the objections received have come from residents living adjacent to, or in close proximity to, the site, expressing concerns about potential loss of amenity resulting from the proposed development.

5.9.4 As the application is submitted in outline, matters relating to the scale, appearance, and layout of the proposed residential development are not for determination at this stage. Consequently, specific impacts on individual properties cannot yet be fully assessed. These details will be considered at the reserved matters stage. However, the submitted Parameters Plan and Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy establish a framework that allows for an initial assessment of the potential effects on nearby residents.

- 5.9.5 The submitted Design and Access Statement indicates the dwellings proposed would be predominately 2 - 2.5 storey dwellings. This is reflected in the landscape and visual impact assessment. This scale of development would reflect the typical character of surrounding residential development and does not pose a significant concern. To comply with policy DM1 (housing need) there is a policy requirement to provide bungalows as well as conventional housing. The submission suggests there is some potential for 3-storey buildings (such as an apartment block) therefore a maximum parameter of three-storey property is proposed. While there are isolated examples of three-storey development in the wider locality, any such proposals would need to be limited in number and carefully assessed at the reserved matters stage against design quality, townscape character, and residential amenity considerations.
- 5.9.6 While many concerns from neighbouring residents remain, the amended Parameters Plan has significantly reduced the potential impacts on residential amenity compared to the initial proposals. The revised plan now removes the developable areas from immediately behind most properties on Russell Drive. Whilst this amendment may not fully address all concerns raised, it does represent a notable improvement in the potential outlook existing residents may experience should the development proceed.
- 5.9.7 The final two pairs of semi-detached dwellings at the northern end of Russell Drive (Nos. 77–63) will, however, back onto the proposed developable area. A buffer of approximately 13–15 metres of open space is proposed between the development platform and these existing properties. The exact nature and treatment of this open space will be determined at the reserved matters stage. Importantly, the 13–15 metre separation refers to the distance between the developable area and the existing properties, not necessarily building-to-building distances, as the developable area may include further open space and landscaping.
- 5.9.8 Ultimately, any reserved matters application will be required to demonstrate that an appropriate level of separation is maintained between new and existing dwellings in this location to ensure acceptable standards of privacy and amenity are achieved, in accordance with Policy DM29. Officers are satisfied the site can accommodate the proposed development and adhere to these standards.
- 5.9.9 The potential impact on residential amenity extends beyond the physical presence of new buildings. It is acknowledged that the character of the site would change significantly—from open fields and arable land to a new residential development incorporating substantial areas of open space. This transformation in land use raises understandable concerns among existing residents, particularly in relation to the interface between the proposed open space and existing properties. Key issues include perceived impacts on security, overlooking, loss of privacy, and noise.
- 5.9.10 The proposed Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy goes some way to alleviate concerns. This demonstrates a commitment to retain existing trees and hedgerows where possible outside the developable areas. These existing landscape features, which can be bolstered as part of the landscaping proposals at reserved matters stage, can help enclose and create separation between play provision and existing dwellings.
- 5.9.11 Active travel routes are identified within the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy, including pedestrian connections through the site and along the western boundary. The precise alignment and design of these routes will be determined at the reserved matters stage as part of the site layout considerations. It is acknowledged that some objectors have expressed concerns about pedestrian routes running along the rear boundaries of existing properties. These concerns—particularly relating to privacy, safety, and security—are understandable and valid.
- 5.9.12 However, any future detailed design would need to ensure that the safety and security of existing residents is not compromised, and that the development incorporates appropriate levels of natural surveillance across areas of open space, consistent with principles of good design. Whilst these matters will need to be carefully addressed at the detailed design stage, they are not considered to be grounds to withhold outline planning permission on residential amenity grounds.

5.9.13 A new housing estate to the rear of Russell Drive will also alter the character of the area by introducing lighting, noise and traffic. Precise details of all external lighting will be a matter controlled by planning condition. The design of lighting not only needs to ensure there is no adverse effect on existing and future residential property, but also needs to ensure retained landscape features and habitats are protected from excessive light pollution. Given the location of the developable areas to the retained habitats and existing residents, officers are satisfied light pollution can be minimised and would not lead to significant adverse effects on the environment or the amenity of residents.

5.9.14 Noise and Vibration

The submitted Environmental Statement (ES) provides a comprehensive and robust assessment of the potential noise and vibration impacts arising from the proposed development. The assessment identifies the existing dominant sources of noise at the site as traffic associated with the Bay Gateway, Slyne Road, and the West Coast Mainline.

5.9.15 Construction Phase

The ES acknowledges that the construction phase will result in a degree of disruption and harm to the amenity of existing residential properties and the wider community. This is primarily due to increased noise levels from construction traffic and on-site activities. While some exceedances of acceptable noise thresholds are anticipated, these are identified as minor adverse effects that are short-term and temporary in nature and can be potentially mitigated through considerate working practices, controlling working hours and the use of silencers etc on plant and equipment. Specific measures can be secured by condition requiring a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP). This will also address the identified minor to moderate adverse impacts (along the western boundary) associated with potential impacts arising from vibration caused through construction activities.

5.9.16 Operational Phase (existing residents)

The operational phase noise impacts are largely associated with changes in traffic patterns along surrounding roads. This chapter of the ES has accounted for the traffic generation anticipated from the original proposal (up to 200 dwellings) and therefore represents a worst-case scenario. The increase in traffic is considered to have a long-term adverse impact at the local level but given the background noise levels and the scale of development, this is predicated to be negligible and not significant.

5.9.17 Operational Phase (future residents)

The noise and vibration assessment has been undertaken in accordance with best practice guidance and relevant national policy, including:

- The Explanatory Note of the Noise Policy Statement for England (Defra, 2010);
- BS 8233:2014 – Guidance on Sound Insulation and Noise Reduction for Buildings;
- Comparable criteria from the World Health Organisation (WHO).

5.9.18 The assessment provides a detailed assessment of the baseline conditions during the daytime and night-time periods. During the daytime, noise levels range between 53dB and up to 60dB. Most of the site is considered to be at negligible risk, with areas alongside the Bay Gateway and Slyne Road at low risk. For the low risk areas, good acoustic design can minimise the level of effect. During the night-time the noise levels range between 48dB and up to 55dB, resulting in most of the site between low risk and medium risk. The medium risk areas are closest to the adjacent highways where mitigation will be required to avoid unacceptable noise impacts.

5.9.19 The ES concludes that good acoustic design should form the basis of mitigation at the reserved matters stage. This includes:

- Informing the layout and orientation of buildings and garden spaces;
- Provision of acoustic fencing, where necessary;
- Whole-house ventilation systems to enable windows to remain closed without compromising internal comfort.

The use of enhanced glazing is not considered necessary across the site, as internal exceedances are only predicted in scenarios where windows are open and directly face existing noise sources. A negligible adverse impact is predicted in the long term, provided the above mitigation is implemented. A planning condition is therefore recommended to secure a site-specific noise mitigation scheme at the reserved matters stage, based on the final layout.

- 5.9.20 The Council's Environmental Health Officer has reviewed the Noise and Vibration chapter of the ES and concurs with its methodology and conclusions. The EHO supports the need for:
- A detailed noise assessment at the reserved matters stage for individual plots;
 - A CEMP to manage construction noise and vibration;
 - Controls on working hours; and
 - Participation in the Considerate Contractors Scheme.
- 5.9.21 The ES has demonstrated that the proposed development can be delivered without resulting in significant adverse effects in relation to noise and vibration. Appropriate mitigation measures have been identified and can be secured through condition.
- 5.9.22 The proposal is therefore considered to be compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Policies DM29 (Protection of Residential Amenity) and DM57 (Health and Wellbeing) of the Development Management Development Plan Document (DM DPD).
- 5.10 **Housing needs, affordable housing, housing standards and mix** NPPF Chapter 5 (Delivering a sufficient supply of homes); Development Management (DM) DPD policies: DM1 (Residential Development and Meeting Housing Needs), DM2 (Housing Standards) and DM3 (The Delivery of Affordable Housing).
- 5.10.1 Paragraph 61 of the NPPF sets out that to support the government's objective of significantly boosting the supply of homes, it is important that a sufficient amount and variety of land can come forward where it is needed. The Council's most recent Housing Land Supply Statement (January 2025) identifies a housing land supply of only 2 years (reduced since the earlier resolution), which is a significant shortfall against the required 5-year supply requirement. Paragraph 11 of the NPPF (the presumption in favour of sustainable development) also requires that, where a local planning authority cannot demonstrate a 5-year supply of deliverable housing sites, permission should be granted unless the application of policies in the NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance (such as heritage assets and areas at risk of flooding) provide a clear reason for refusing permission, or any adverse impacts would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal, when assessed against the policies in the Framework, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well designed places and providing affordable homes.
- 5.10.2 Given the acute under supply of deliverable housing against our housing requirements, the provision of new residential development (in this case up to 130 dwellings) is a significant benefit of the proposal that must be given significant weight in the overall planning balance. The ES sets out an anticipated delivery programme which indicates, subject to the development getting planning permission, construction is anticipated to start on the site in Spring 2027. With homes potentially being built out at approximately 30 dwellings per year, with the development is anticipated to be completed in Summer 2030. Whilst this is not fixed and could potentially change, delivery of housing could be provided relatively promptly should permission be granted.
- 5.10.3 Policy DM1 requires new residential development to meet identified housing needs that accords with the Council's latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). The required housing mix will be based on the district wide housing needs set out in the SHMA and the indicative mix within table 4.1 of the Development Management DPD (copied here).

Property Type	Market (%)	Affordable (%)
House (2 bedrooms)	20	30
House (3 bedrooms)	35	20
House 4+ bedrooms	25	5
Bungalow	10	10
Flat/apartment (may include 1 bedroom houses)	10	35
Total	100	100

Table 4.1: Table to show the indicative approach to housing mix across the District (Lancaster CC 2018)

- 5.10.4 The application is in outline with no specific details of the housing mix, tenures and size provided at this stage. To ensure compliance with policy DM1, it is necessary to impose a planning condition to

require the precise details of the housing mix, types, and sizes to be agreed concurrent with the reserved matters application.

- 5.10.5 Policy DM2 relates to housing standards, requiring all new dwellings to meet the Nationally Described Space standards and at least 20% of new affordable housing and market housing to meet building regulations M4(2) Category (accessible and adaptable dwellings). To secure these standards at the detailed design stage (reserved matters), planning conditions are proposed as part of this recommendation.
- 5.10.6 Policy DM3 sets out the target requirements for affordable housing for all new residential development in Lancaster District. In this case, the site straddles two parish areas with different affordable housing requirements. In Morecambe the target is 15% of all homes to be affordable homes and in Slyne the target is 30%. Whilst this is an added complication, the final details and the number of affordable homes can be determined at reserved matters stage when the layout and housing mix is understood. The applicant is committed to providing policy-complaint affordable housing across the site and accepts this shall be secured by s106 legal agreement. Given the acute need for affordable housing in the district, the provision of policy-compliant affordable housing also weighs significantly in favour of the proposal.
- 5.11 **Open Space** NPPF Chapter 8 (Promoting Healthy and Safe Communities including Open Space and Recreation), Chapter 12 (Achieving Well-Designed Places); Development Management (DM) DPD policies: DM27 (Open Space, Sports and Recreational Facilities), DM29 (Key Design Principles) and DM57 (Health and Well-Being).
- 5.11.1 The provision of open space forms an important aspect in place-making and securing high quality design. It also potential contributes to the health and well-being of communities. It is strongly advocated within the NPPF, in particular sections 8 and 12. Given the scale of the proposed development, the inclusion of substantial areas of open space—across a range of typologies—is essential to ensure the scheme is policy-compliant (specifically with DM27) and to support the delivery of a well-designed, inclusive, and attractive residential environment.
- 5.11.2 Although the application is in outline form, the Parameters Plan clearly identifies significant areas of open space. The broad design principles for these spaces are outlined in the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy and the Design and Access Statement. These documents present a positive, landscape-led approach to design, which is particularly important given the site's location within the KUL, where embedded landscape mitigation is necessary.
- 5.11.3 Overall, the submission demonstrates that the site can deliver policy-compliant on-site open space, including natural and semi-natural green space, amenity green space, equipped play areas, and provision for young people. While detailed matters such as layout and appearance will be addressed at the reserved matters stage, the open space provision will be secured through a legal agreement linked to the outline permission
- 5.11.4 In terms of off-site provision, policy DM27 sets out the planning policy position in relation to 'Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities' stating that 'development proposals located in areas of recognised open space, sports and recreational facility deficiency will be required to provide appropriate contributions toward open space, sports and recreational facility provision, either through provision on-site or a financial contribution toward the creation of new or the enhancement of existing open spaces, sports and recreational facilities off-site'.
- 5.11.5 There are recognised deficiencies in the provision of playing pitches and athletics facilities within the local area. Accordingly, a financial contribution towards improvements to these facilities will be required as part of the proposed development. As this is an outline application, the final contribution will be calculated at the reserved matters stage, once the number, type, and size of dwellings are confirmed.
- 5.11.6 The Council's Public Realm team has been consulted and raises no objection to the development, subject to securing appropriate on-site and off-site contributions to public open space. Specifically, contributions will be sought towards the athletics track, football pitches, and associated ancillary

facilities at Salt Ayre. These contributions will be secured through a legal agreement with the final figure calculated at reserved matter stage.

- 5.11.7 The on-site open space provision will be publicly accessible, thereby enhancing the recreational offer for the wider community in the immediate vicinity of the site. When considered alongside the proposed off-site improvements to local sports facilities, these elements are regarded as a positive benefit of the scheme.
- 5.12 **Education and Health** NPPF section: 8 (Promoting healthy and safe communities - services and school places; Development Management (DM) DPD policies: DM57 (Health and Wellbeing) and DM58 (Infrastructure Delivery and Funding)
 - 5.12.1 Paragraph 100 of the NPPF requires local planning authorities to take a proactive, positive and collaborative approach to ensuring there is sufficient choice of education places available and great weight should be given when there is a need to create, expand or alter educational facilities in plan-making and decision-taking. Accordingly, the local planning authority has consulted Lancashire County Council Schools Planning Team who have confirmed there is no requirement for an education contribution at this stage. The School Planning Team advise a final position of the impact of the development on school places should take part as the committee process. Their position was shared in June 2025 and is therefore considered a final up to date position.
 - 5.12.2 The NHS Integrated Care Board has made representations on the application and seeks a contribution towards local health care infrastructure. The response sets out that the proposal will generate approximately 312 new patient registrations based on an average household size of 2.4, which generates a contribution of £101,088.
 - 5.12.3 The site falls within the catchment area of Lancaster Medical Practice and they have advised that this need, along with other new developments in the area, can only be met through the development of a new practice premises in order to ensure sustainable general practice. The response sets out that the physical constraints of the existing site at Owen Road (this being the closest to the site) that the current premises cannot be extended and opportunities to re-configure existing space to accommodate current growth have already been undertaken. However, the response goes on to say that the growth generated from this development would not trigger consideration of the commissioning of a new general practice but would trigger a requirement to support the practice to understand how the growth in the population would be accommodated and therefore premises options. Therefore, from this response, it is not clear how the contribution would be used.
 - 5.12.4 However, additional supporting comments indicate the NHS Integrated Care Board could accommodate growth through the development of a new health centre at Bailrigg. It remains unclear where exactly the health centre would be located, but based on comments relating to other applications, it is understood this relates to the site secured for the hospital. Given the lack of specific details regarding the proposed new health centre — including its location and the expected delivery timescales — there remains significant uncertainty as to whether the NHS request is directly related to the proposed development. As such, and with some reluctance, the local planning authority cannot be satisfied that the contribution would meet the statutory tests set out in legislation and in paragraph 58 of the NPPF. Therefore, the authority is unable to support the NHS's request at this time.
- 5.13 **Sustainable Design and Renewable Energy** NPPF sections: 12 (Achieving well-designed places) and 14 (Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change); Development Management (DM) DPD policies: DM29 (Key Design Principles), DM30a (Sustainable Design and Construction), DM30b (Sustainable Design and Construction – Water Efficiency), DM30c (Sustainable Design and Construction – Materials, Waste and Construction) and DM53 (Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation).
 - 5.13.1 In the context of the climate change emergency that was declared by Lancaster City Council in January 2019, the effects of climate change arising from new development in the District, and the possible associated mitigation measures, will be a significant consideration in the assessment of development proposals.
 - 5.13.2 The Council is committed to reducing its own carbon emissions to net zero by 2030 while supporting the district in reaching net zero within the same time frame. Buildings delivered today must not only

contribute to mitigating emissions, but they must also be adaptable to the impacts of the climate crisis and support resilient communities.

- 5.13.3 The Climate Emergency Review of the Local Plan (CERLP) was adopted in January 2025 and provided a partial review of the DM DPD and the SPLA DPD. This introduced policies DM30a, DM30b and DM30c which provide specific requirements in relation to sustainable design and construction and also made changes to some other policies.
- 5.13.4 The application was submitted prior to the adoption of the CERLP. However, in response to the changes in policy the applicant has provided an updated Energy Statement. This statement acknowledges the application is in outline form and full SAP calculations to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of policy DM30a are not possible. Nevertheless, the proposed energy strategy provides a clear commitment to meet the required standards in accordance with the energy hierarchy. Policy DM30a requires a fabric first approach to be used in new development, reaching a minimum of 75% reduction in carbon emissions against Part L of the Building Regulations 2013 (expressed as a % uplift of the dwellings Target Emission Rate (TER). It should be noted, any development build after 1 January 2028 would need to deliver a 100% reduction, opposed to 75%.
- 5.13.5 The submitted Energy Strategy focuses heavily on the Future Homes Standards (FHS) rather than the specific requirements of DM30a. This is not a significant problem as the pre-2028 requirements set out in policy DM30a align with what is anticipated for the FHS. Importantly, the Energy Statement supports the approach set out in DM30a to adopt a fabric first approach and proposes to meet the requirements through well insulated buildings with high degree of air tightness and the provision of decentralised/low carbon heating systems (Air Source Heat Pumps). This sufficiently demonstrates compliance with policy DM30a (pre-2028) is possible. The applicant's Energy Statement does not, however, address water consumption (policy DM30b), how the development would meet the net zero requirements set out in policy DM30a if development did not commence until after 1 January 2028 and provide substantive evidence for the life cycle carbon assessment. Given the outline nature of the application, officers consider that these requirements can be appropriately secured by condition. This would require the submission and approval of a Sustainable Design Statement — including an Energy and Carbon Statement — prior to the commencement of development.
- 5.14 **Air Quality** NPPF section: 15 (Conserving and enhancing the natural environment); Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policies: EN9 (Air Quality Management Areas); Development Management (DM) DPD policies: DM31 (Air quality management and Pollution) and DM57 (Health and Wellbeing)
- 5.14.1 Policy DM31 requires all development proposals to demonstrate that they have sought to minimise the levels of air polluting emissions generated and adequately protected their new users, and existing users from the effects of poor air quality. It goes on to state:
'Development which is located within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA), or any development which has the potential to, individually or cumulatively, contribute to increasing levels of air pollution, will be required to demonstrate how either on-site or offsite mitigation measures will be put in place to reduce the air quality impact. Any proposal must not significantly worsen any emissions or air pollutants in areas where pollution levels are close to objective / limit value levels'.
- 5.14.2 The closest Air Quality Management Area relates to Lancaster City Centre. This is approximately 1.7km from the application site. An Air Quality Assessment supports the application and forms part of the ES. This has been undertaken in accordance with best practice guidance and regulation and sets out a clear methodology for assessing the significance of effects in the context of the EIA. The Air Quality chapter of the ES has not been updated to reflect the lower quantum of development now proposed, and therefore provides a worst-case scenario. The ES considered the effects arising from the construction and operation phases of development, with regard to future scenarios. Fundamentally this relates to the effects during construction activities and the impact arising from additional traffic flows once operational. The assessment considers the effects on nearby receptors as well as considering the potential effects on the AQMA. Exceedances of pollutants are only experienced (based on relatively old data) in certain locations around the city centre gyratory.
- 5.14.3 During construction and based on the ES assessment results, there is a major adverse risk of dust soiling and moderate adverse risk of human health impacts as a result of fugitive dust emissions associated with the construction of the development. With mitigation – in the form of a CEMP – the

effects are considered to reduce considerably to have a negligible effect. Whether the CEMP provides sufficient mitigation to reduce the effects to negligible effect is perhaps optimistic, but even if slight adverse effects are experienced, this is short-lived and temporary and would not lead to significant effects and a reason to withhold permission.

- 5.14.4 The effects on air quality once operational is directly linked to traffic, with dispersal modelling undertaken to information the level of impact. The assessment is thorough and demonstrated that predicted impacts on annual mean NO₂, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} concentrations were predicted to be negligible at all receptor locations (including nearby residential property and streets). As such, overall air quality effects associated with operational phase road vehicle exhaust emissions are predicted to be not significant.
- 5.14.5 The ES chapter has regard to the Councils' planning Advisory note in relation to the requirements for an Emissions Assessment and commits to provide this upon reserved matters when the final quantum of development is understood. The Emissions Assessment seeks to quantify a monetary value of the predicted emissions from the proposal, which have found to be not significant. This shall inform mitigation equivalent to the damage costs of key pollutants which can be secured by planning condition. Typical forms of mitigation would include the provision of EV charging points (now a matter dealt with by building regulations) and cost initiatives in Travel Plans (provision of bus passes, cycle vouchers etc).
- 5.14.6 The ES has sufficiently demonstrated there would be no significant adverse effects arising from the respective phases of development and having regard to the residual effects once mitigation is in place. The Councils' Environmental Protection Officer raises no objection on air quality grounds subject to the additional condition relating to the emissions assessment.

6.0 Overall Conclusion and Planning Balance

- 6.1 The Local Plan sets out the district's housing requirement at policy SP6. This sets a requirement of 10,440 new homes over the plan period (2011-2031) based on a stepped requirement from 400 dwellings per annum (2011/12-2018/19) up to 695 dwellings per annum (2029/30-2030/31). The Council's Housing Land Monitoring Report (HLMR) (July 2024) confirms only 214 net dwelling completions for the monitoring period (1 April 2023 to 31 March 2024). The HLMR concludes that as of the 1 April 2024 the outstanding commitment for the district stood at 2,662 dwellings (including student accommodation and older people accommodation). This demonstrates a significant shortfall in housing delivery in the district. This is reflected in the latest Housing Land Supply Statement which confirms the Council cannot demonstrate a five-years supply of housing sites and in fact is only able to demonstrate a 2 years' worth supply of housing. It has been acknowledged that the current supply position has been described as 'acute' and 'woeful' by Inspectors in recent appeals.
- 6.2 Paragraph 11 of the NPPF sets out the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Footnote 8 of the NPPF which relates to paragraph 11(d) confirms that the lack of a five-year supply renders the policies most important for determining applications out-of-date. Limb 11(d) states where policies are out-of-date, planning permission should be granted unless the application of policies in NPPF that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a strong reasons for refusing the proposed development; or any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as a whole, having particular regard to key policies for directing development to sustainable locations, making effective use of land, securing well-designed places and providing affordable homes, individually or in combination. The assessment above has confirmed there are or are no strong reasons for refusing the development and the presumption in favour must be engaged.
- 6.3 The development strategy for the District, as outlined in Policy SP3 of the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations Development Plan Document (SPLA DPD), promotes an urban-focused approach, directing growth towards the main urban centres of Lancaster, Morecambe, Heysham, and Carnforth. Whilst the proposed site lies within open countryside, it is immediately adjacent the existing built-up area of Morecambe and benefits from proximity to its services and facilities. The locational sustainability of the site is a significant benefit of the scheme, particular in an area where little housing growth has occurred or is planned.

- 6.4 However, the site is designated as Key Urban Landscape in the Local Plan, alongside a larger area to the north and northeast. Development of this site for up to 130 dwellings would conflict with the purpose of this designation, as described in Policies EN5 and DM46, particularly in terms of protecting the area's open character. As such, the proposal represents a departure from the Local Plan.
- 6.5 Consequently, the development of the site for housing will lead to moderate-slight adverse impacts on the landscape character and moderate adverse effects on visual amenity of the area, resulting in conflicts with policy DM46. Though, the level of effect is not significant in EIA terms with the greatest identified harm contained to the immediate site and its surroundings.
- 6.6 The scheme would result in harm to the significance of the Torrisholme Barrow Scheduled Monument due to development within its setting. However, this harm has been partially mitigated by the provision of structural landscaping and landscaping buffers to contain the built development. Whilst some level of harm remains, it is considered to be outweighed by the wider public benefits of the proposal—particularly the delivery of a significant number of homes in a sustainable location amid a recognised housing shortfall, therefore no resulting in a conflict with heritage policy.
- 6.7 It is recognised the development will result in minor conflict with policy DM44, in relation to the loss of Best and Most versatile agricultural land, however the losses are not significant.
- 6.8 The development will lead to a change in outlook and amenity to existing residents, though this is largely a consideration for reserved matters. The proposed parameters plan provides sufficient opportunity to ensure new development will not significantly adversely impact the amenity of future residents.
- 6.9 The proposed access strategy is deemed safe and suitable to the satisfaction of the local highway authority. The extent of off-site highway works will provide improvements to the walking and cycling environment locally and are considered a benefit to the scheme. The highways contribution will enable suitable mitigation to ensure the highway network can accommodate the growth associated with the development. These measures make the development acceptable in planning terms and provide wider public benefits. These benefits are given moderate weight in the planning balance.
- 6.10 The application has also demonstrated that the development would be acceptable in terms of flood risk, ecological impacts, sustainable design and infrastructure/pollution matters and it is recognised the development will also make positive contributions towards open space provision on and off-site. The open space contributions provide wider public benefits and are afforded moderate weight. The other matters hold neutral weight as they are matters required to make the development acceptable in planning terms. There are also social and economic benefits from the provision of employment and upskilling through the construction phases and the knock-on effect to the supply chain (securing short-term economic benefits), though these benefits are relatively small overall and therefore afforded limited weight
- 6.11 The proposed development will provide up to 130 dwellings with policy compliant affordable housing. As the presumption in favour of development applies, the housing benefits are given significant weight in the planning balance.
- 6.12 In the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development, the assessment of this proposal against the NPPF taken as a whole, concludes there are no clear reasons for refusing the application which would effectively disengage the tilted balance. Therefore, in applying the titled balanced, the test is whether any adverse impacts arising from the development would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal. This is a matter of planning judgement.
- 6.13 In light of the assessment above together with the content of the submitted ES, given the significant undersupply of housing within the district, it is considered that the benefits of the proposal do outweigh the identified harm and permission ought to be granted.

Recommendation

That Outline Planning Permission **BE GRANTED** following the satisfactory completion of a Legal Agreement within 3 months of the date of this Committee meeting, and the condition listed below. In the event that a

satisfactory Section 106 Agreement is not concluded within the timescale above, or other agreed extension of time, delegate authority to the Chief Officer – Planning and Climate Change to refuse planning permission on the grounds that the obligations which make the development acceptable have not been legally secured and the following planning conditions:

The legal agreement shall secure:

- Provision of a policy-compliant (DM3 of the DM DPD) Affordable Housing (to be provided on site) in accordance with an Affordable Housing Scheme to be submitted with Reserved Matters and approved by the Council before the commencement of development.
- Provision of on-site Amenity Greenspace, Equipped Alay Area and Young Peoples Provision based on the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy and DAS.
- Off-site Public Open Space Contribution to be calculated at Reserved Matters Stage (in accordance with methodology in DM DPD or any successor document) towards athletics facilities, playing pitch improvements and associated facilities at Salt Ayre.
- Setting up of a Management Company; and
- Management and Maintenance of all landscaping, unadopted roads, lighting and drainage infrastructure and on-site open space.
- Provision of on-site Biodiversity Net Gain in accordance with an approved BNG Plan and Landscape and Ecological Creation and Management Plan.
- Highways Contribution
- Travel Plan Contribution

List of conditions:

Condition no.	Description	Type (indicative)
1	Timescale for submission of reserved matters application (2YRS)	Standard
2	Development in accordance with Approved Plans (Location plan, Parameters plan and Access Plan)	Standard
3	Reserved Matters to be based on the broad principles set out in the submitted Design and Access Statement and the Green and Blue Infrastructure Strategy.	Control
4	Phasing condition	Pre-Commencement
5	Final surface water sustainable drainage strategy	Pre-Commencement
6	Construction Surface Water Management Plan	Pre Commencement
7	Construction Environmental Management Plan	Pre Commencement
8	Construction Method Statement including construction working hours	Pre Commencement
9	Precise construction details of main vehicular site access and associated off site highway improvements including timetable for implementation.	Pre Commencement
10	Precise design and construction details of all other site access points (except main vehicular access) including active travel routes and emergency access.	Pre Commencement
11	Submission of a Sustainable Design Statement including Energy and Carbon Statement.	Pre Commencement
12	Employment and Skills Plan	Pre Commencement
13	Precise scheme for ecology mitigation based on submitted ecological appraisal and comments from GMEU.	Pre Commencement
14	Contaminated Land Assessments – further assessment as identified by the Phase II report and EHO comments.	Pre Commencement
15	Prior to any vibro-impact works on site, a risk assessment and method statement shall be submitted to the LPA and Network Rail.	Pre Commencement of any vibro-impact works.
16	Air Quality Mitigation Scheme in accordance with the ES.	Pre Commencement and concurrent with first reserved matters

17	Acoustic Design Statement setting out precise scheme for noise mitigation based on the recommendations of the Noise Assessment	Pre Commencement and concurrent with first reserved matters
18	Arboricultural Implications Assessment/ Tree Protection Plan	Pre Commencement and concurrent with first reserved matters
19	Scheme for M4(2) accessibility and adaptability dwellings	Pre-commencement concurrent with first reserved matters
20	Details of housing mix to accord with policy DM1	Pre Commencement and concurrent with first reserved matters
21	Construction details of the internal estate roads, private drives, footways and other active travel routes to be designed to the adoptable standards and LTN 1/20.	Prior to commencement of estate roads
22	Scheme for external lighting (street lighting and lighting of any open space)	Above Ground
23	Precise details of all play equipment, street furniture, signposting and interpretation boards.	Before the installation of play equipment/street furniture/sign posting/boards
24	Sustainable drainage system operation and maintenance manual.	Pre Occupation
25	Contaminated land verification report based on Site Investigation and unforeseen contamination.	Pre Occupation
26	Verification report of constructed sustainable drainage system.	Pre Occupation
27	Details of the homeowner packs	Pre Occupation
28	Travel Plan	Pre Occupation
29	In accordance with the specified mitigation set out in the approved Flood Risk Assessment.	Control
30	All new residential developments must achieve, as a minimum, the optional requirement set through the Building Regulations Requirement G2: Water Efficiency	Control
31	NDSS standards	Control
32	Provision of turning and parking	Control
33	Limit to maximum of 3 storey	Control
34	Protection of visibility splays	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	24/00597/VCN
Proposal	Erection of 9 dwellings (C3) with associated detached garages, formation of a new access and associated estate roads and landscaping (pursuant to the variation of conditions 2-14 and 18 on planning application 21/01370/FUL)
Application site	Land Rear Of Ingleborough View Station Road Hornby
Applicant	M Fleuriot
Agent	Deborah Smith
Case Officer	Mr Andrew Clement
Departure	None
Summary of Recommendation	Approval

(i) Procedural Matters

Whilst the parent consent was determined under the scheme of delegation, the proposed variation of conditions application includes over 1,000sq.m development floorspace, and has a single objection, and therefore falls outside the scheme of delegation.

1.0 Application Site and Setting

- 1.1 The application site comprises 0.70 hectares of agricultural grassland located behind existing residential property (Ingleborough View), on the southern outskirts of the village of Hornby. The site lies south of the disused railway line, which previously separated Hornby from the cluster of development at Butt Yeats. The site is located within the northern fringe of the Forest of Bowland National Landscape (NL) within the Valley Floodplain and Undulating Lowland Farmland with Wooded Brooks character types. The site is designated as Open Countryside under policy EN3 of the local plan, whilst Hornby's Conservation Area lies to the north of the disused railway line circa 80 metres north of the site. Whilst existing trees are on-site and implicated by this proposal, none are protected trees.
- 1.2 The site relates to the eastern part of a larger pastoral field. It is bound by the B6480 Wennington Road to the south; the remaining part of the field to its western boundary. The disused railway line, Mears Beck and the residential development at Station Court form the sites northern boundary. A row of semi-detached and terraced 2-storey houses, known as Ingleborough View, Low Barn (a residential property) and a sub-station all fronting Station Road to the site's eastern boundary. There is an area of public open space to the north of the site situated between Station Court and Station Way Industrial Estate. A small cluster of development around the Butt Yeats junction is located to the south-east of the site on the south side of Wennington Road, with a further small residential

complex, known as Lunesdale Court, around 180m to the south-west of the site.

- 1.3 Land levels rise gradually from an elevation around 35.8m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD) in the south-eastern corner of the site (close to the southern field access) to approximately 38.5 AOD at the top of this drumlin at the mid-point along the proposed western boundary of the site. At this highest point the levels then drop steeply towards the northern boundary where the site is elevated at approximately 29m AOD. The site is outside of flood zones 2 and 3, but highly susceptible to groundwater flooding, with surface water flood risk along the northern boundary where Mears Beck runs in an east-west direction. The site is located in a Mineral Safeguarding Area.

2.0 Proposal

- 2.1 The proposal seeks planning permission for Seven (7) detached dwellinghouses and pair of semi-detached units, with associated access, garages and supporting landscaping. The 9 units in total are predominantly two storeys in height, with a bungalow of the southmost unit of the proposal, and second floors of the next two southern units in the roofspace, all finished in natural stone walls under natural slate roofs.
- 2.2 In terms of tenure, the two smaller semi-detached dwellings are proposed to be affordable housing, and the remaining seven units would be open market. The two proposed affordable homes from Station Road towards the entrance to the site. The ground floor snug room within the 199.9sq.m dormer bungalow and 266sq.m dwellinghouse are considered to form bedrooms due to the size and location of these within the properties, and availability of multiple other living spaces on the ground floors of these large, detached properties.
- 2.3 Plots 3 and 8 seek detached garages, with plots 4, 5, 6, 7 and 9 designed with integral garage spaces, and semi-detached plots 1 and 2 having driveways to the front and side. The new access to the site will be positioned to the south of the existing humpback bridge, and it is 5.5m wide with a 2.9m wide footpath on its southern boundary. Visibility splays of 2.4m x 43m are required in each direction, and these appear to be deliverable given the absence of third-party landowners.
- 2.4 Areas of public open space and landscaping are proposed to the northwest and southwest of the site. Although this landscaping forms part of the general layout, precise details of landscaping have yet to be received, with further indicative landscaping within gardens to proposed dwellinghouses.

3.0 Site History

- 3.1 A number of relevant applications relating to this site have previously been received by the Local Planning Authority. These include:

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
21/01370/FUL	Erection of 9 dwellings (C3) with associated detached garages, formation of a new access and associated estate roads and landscaping	Approved
22/00137/REM	Reserved matters application for the erection of 8 dwellings	Withdrawn
20/01060/FUL	Planning application for the erection of 9 dwellings (C3) with associated detached garages, formation of a new access and associated estate roads and landscaping	Refused
17/01327/OUT	Outline application for the erection of up to 11 dwellings and creation of a new access and associated landscaping	Approved
17/00170/OUT	Outline application for the development of up to 11 dwellings and creation of a new access and associated landscaping	Refused
16/00745/OUT	Outline application for the development of up to 11 dwellings and creation of a new access and associated landscaping	Withdrawn

16/00780/EIR	Screening request for the development of 11 residential dwellings and creation of a new access	Not EIA development
15/00117/OUT	Outline application for the erection of a single 3-bed dwelling with associated access	Approved

4.0 Consultation Responses

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

Consultee	Response
Hornby Parish Council	Support the amended proposals
County Highways	Recommend conditions are reattached unaltered, as no details of lighting columns and warning signs have been submitted, and no visibility splay plan provided, to justify altering the related conditions as proposed.
GMEU	No objection , however the landscaping plan lacks required details, and installation of bat and bird boxes remains relevant
Tree Officer	To vary conditions as sought, some additional details to the arboricultural method statement are required. The proposed planting/landscaping scheme is appropriate as indicative information, but full details of planting and maintenance are still to be provided, which should be reflected in attached/varied conditions.
Environmental Health	No adverse comment
Coal Authority	No adverse comments, informative for Coal Authority's Standing Advice
Sustrans	No objection subject to securing an active travel route through the site as part of the Lune Valley Greenway
United Utilities	No objection
Natural England	No adverse comment
Waste and recycling	No adverse comment
LLFA	No adverse comment
Engineers	No adverse comment, submitted drainage scheme is acceptable
Fire Safety	No adverse comment, informative regarding emergency vehicle access and water provision
FoB NL team	No observation received
Conservation Team	No observation received
Cadent Gas	No observation received
RSPB	No observation received
PROW	No observation received
Ramblers Association	No observation received
Planning Policy	No observation received
Property	No observation received
Constabulary	No observation received
Electricity NW	No observation received

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

Three support – Standard and quality of development, good for the area, promptly required, amendments have addressed concerns.

One objection - The access and egress to the site is dangerous, with restricted visibility by the old railway bridge

5.0 Analysis

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

- The principle of development
- Housing mix and affordable housing
- Design and impact on the National Landscape

- Residential amenity
- Biodiversity and surface water drainage
- Highways, open space and accessibility matters

5.2 **The principle of development** Development Management (DM) DPD DM1 (New Residential Development and Meeting Housing Needs), DM4 (Residential Development outside Main Urban Areas), DM6 (Housing provision within the Forest of Bowland AONB), Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD SP1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development), SP2 (Lancaster District Settlement Hierarchy), SP3 (Development Strategy for Lancaster District), SP6 (The Delivery of New Homes), SP9 (Maintaining Strong and Vibrant Communities) and H2 (Housing Delivery in Rural Areas of The District), and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Section 2 (Achieving sustainable development), Section 4 (Decision-making), Section 5 (Delivering a sufficient supply of homes) Section 11 (Making effective use of land)

5.2.1 A Section 73 application seeks permission to carry out development without complying with planning conditions imposed on a previous planning permission, but to vary the details controlled through planning conditions, and comply with such varied details and conditions. Permission granted under Section 73 takes effect as a new, independent permission to carry out the same development as previously permitted, subject to new or amended conditions. The new permission sits alongside the original planning permission, which remains intact and unamended. It is ultimately open to the applicant to decide whether to implement the new permission or the one originally granted. Section 73 provides a mechanism to consider and assess material amendments (i.e. the changes sought via the Section 73 application) to an earlier planning permission.

5.2.2 A Section 73 application does not provide an opportunity to re-examine the principle considerations associated with the approved development, which were considered to be acceptable through permission granted in December 2022. This variation seeks to amend approved plans, which implicates the majority of planning conditions attached to the permission. However, the variation has no implication upon the flood risk, archaeology, mineral safeguarding, energy efficiency and contaminated land considerations made under the original permission, nor the principle of the development of 9 dwellinghouses at this site. These latter elements of the permission will not be reassessed, and have already be found acceptable. The impacts of the altered proposal will be considered as part of this variation of conditions application. However, the acceptability of the principle of development and some other considerations have already been established through the permission, and remain unaltered within this proposed variation.

5.3 **Housing mix and affordable housing** Development Management (DM) DPD DM1 (New Residential Development and Meeting Housing Needs), DM2 (Housing Standards), DM3 (The Delivery of Affordable Housing), DM4 (Residential Development outside Main Urban Areas), DM6 (Housing provision within the Forest of Bowland AONB), DM46 (Development and Landscape Impact), Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD SP3 (Development Strategy for Lancaster District), SP6 (The Delivery of New Homes), SP9 (Maintaining Strong and Vibrant Communities), H2 (Housing Delivery in Rural Areas of The District) and EN2 (Areas of Outstanding Natura Beauty), and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Section 2 (Achieving sustainable development), Section 4 (Decision-making), Section 5 (Delivering a sufficient supply of homes) Section 11 (Making effective use of land)

5.3.1 The National Landscape (NL) is a protected landscape, within which sites that are suitable for housing should be developed specifically to meet local affordable or other locally identified housing needs. To do otherwise would, ultimately, fail to address these needs, which could then only be met by releasing more sensitive sites, causing harm and compromising the primary purpose of the NL designation. Policy DM6 seeks to ensure that the approach to housing delivery in the NL reflects the local needs within the NL, and better ensures that new development supports the NL's primary purpose and Special Qualities.

5.3.2 The proposal seeks the housing mix below, shown in the table between the approved housing mix and policy position on housing mix. This policy acknowledges that providing a broad range of housing may be limited on smaller developments of fewer than 10 units, such as this.

Unit Size	Approved housing mix	Proposed housing mix	% required by DM1
1-bed/apartment	0	0	10%
2-bed semi	2 (affordable) - 22%	1 (affordable) - 11%	20%
3-bed semi	0	1 (affordable) - 11%	35% (semi and detached)
3-bed detached	3 – 33%	2 – 22%	35% (semi and detached)
3-bed bungalow	1 - 11%	1 - 11%	10%
4-bed detached	3 – 33%	4 – 44%	25%
Total	9	9	

5.3.3 The proposed 3-bed dwellings include an upper floor study room, which is slightly too small to be considered a habitable bedroom. Two of the proposed 4-bed properties include an additional ground floor room that is large enough to form a bedroom, and for the purposes of the above housing mix is therefore considered to be a bedroom. Ground floor bedrooms and WCs/bathrooms provide positive accessibility layout for more than half of the units proposed, which is an improvement on the previously approved scheme.

5.3.4 Whilst the above housing seeks a larger proportion of 4-bed properties, given that these all have a ground floor bedroom, it is feasible these could be occupied as 3-bed with large home offices, particularly given modern working practices. This is particularly so for the slightly smaller (but still large 189sq.m GIA dwelling) of these 4-bed units. Combined with an improved affordable housing mix offering variety at the site, the proposed housing mix is considered to meet local needs equally as well as the previously approved scheme does.

5.3.5 In addition to the altered housing mix, the gross internal area (GIA) has increased for the majority of proposed dwellings, and cumulative across the development, in comparison to the previously approved scheme. The proposal for larger dwellings justifies reassessing the level of affordable housing that can viably be provided at the site, as the previous permission for smaller dwellings and development reduced the obligated amount from 50% to just 22% (two dwellings). This matter has been explored comprehensively, with independent viability and quantity surveyor assessment, which ultimately concurs with the applicant's case.

5.3.6 The increased sales values of the proposed larger units offsets the additional cost of development, due to increase costs of development of this scheme, but also due to wider inflation of construction and associated costs. On this basis, it is considered on balance that the scheme delivers a mix and tenure of units that would be acceptable in consideration of DM3 and DM6. The increased scale of proposed housing units is justified to maintain the previously agreed degree of affordable housing, for 2 dwellings (22%). This affordable housing obligation should be controlled through a new legal agreement to tie such obligations to this varied permission, if granted.

5.4 **Design and impact on the National Landscape** Development Management (DM) DPD DM29 (Key Design Principles), DM46 (Development and Landscape Impact), Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD EN2 (Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty) and EN3 (The Open Countryside), and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Section 12 (Achieving well-designed places), Section 15 (Conserving and enhancing the natural environment), National Model Design Code (NMDC) and Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty Management Plan 2019 - 2024

5.4.1 The application site lies within the Forest of Bowland NL, and paragraph 189 of the NPPF states that "great weight" should be given to conserving and enhancing such landscapes and scenic settings. This requirement is reflected through policy DM46 of the DM DPD, elaborating that this should be achieved through positive contributions to the NL through development siting, scale, massing, materials, landscaping, vernacular style and design. The potential impact of the development upon the prevailing protected landscape is a key consideration.

5.4.2 The proposed designs have been considerably revised since the previously approved scheme. In terms of the mass and height, the ridgeline will now be no higher than 8.3m, which combined with reduces finished floor levels (FFL) centrally within the site (36.45m AOD FFL), this reflects the

summary of the original LVIA, as all ridgelines in this central area will be 44.75m AOD or less. For comparison, the proposal is akin to those previously approved in terms of ridge height, with the existing dwellinghouses running parallel to the east proposal having ridge heights circa 43.6m.

- 5.4.3 The taller properties are located centrally, with lower properties north and south along this west facing row, facilitated by FFLs and habitable spaces within the roofspaces, and a bungalow to the southmost property. At the northern end of the site, proposed properties are taller than those previously approved, with a 1.5 storey dwelling (habitable rooms in the roof space) replacing a split-level property, largely offset by the lower (34m AOD) FFL. Whilst the semi-detached affordable homes are marginally taller and proposed a higher AOD, resulting in a circa 0.5 metre increase ridge height that previously approved, these located to the west of the site and in the context of existing dwellings of similar ridge height, therefore this change would not exacerbate visual or landscape harm.
- 5.4.4 Despite significant design changes, the amended scheme has a sufficiently slightly reduced height in key areas, with the ridge heights continuing to follow the general drumlin topography. It is considered that this offsets the impacts of these larger footprint, and more densely spaced dwellings. Combined with woodland features to the north and south to frame the drumlin and hedgerow planting to be controlled through planning condition, the proposal would define some key characteristics of the landscape character, reducing the visual impact from wider views. Full details of landscaping should be controlled through planning condition, to ensure planting in communal areas to soften the broader appearance of the development, particularly when views from the west.
- 5.4.5 The external elevations of dwellings are largely considered to be well-designed and congruent interpretation of existing dwelling design. The proposed bungalow has an unusually low pitch north side projection, which would likely appear odd. However, due to orientation and position within the site, this is considered unharmed in the broader context of the proposed development and wider landscape.
- 5.4.6 Some samples of external materials have been provided. However, these are not sufficient for the purpose of agreeing such details, nor altering previously attached planning condition. Whilst a roof slate has been provided, the Spanish slate provided is considered too reflective, shiny and flat in this setting and for such large roofscapes proposed. This slate was similarly rejected at a nearby development 'The Meadows'. Other details submitted are insufficient, but acceptable materials and boundary treatments could be agreed later through a planning condition, notwithstanding the details provided, to be agreed prior to development of dwellings above ground level.
- 5.4.7 Subject to agreeing these details, the proposal is considered to only modestly detract from the National Landscape from proximate viewpoints. Great weight is attached and amplifies the harm identified; however this is no additional weight beyond that attached to the approved fallback scheme that this submission seeks to vary.
- 5.5 **Residential amenity Development Management (DM) DPD DM2 (Housing Standards), DM29 (Key Design Principles), DM57 (Health and Well-Being), National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Section 8 (Promoting healthy and safe communities) and Section 12 (Achieving well-designed places), and Nationally Described Space Standards (NDSS).**
- 5.5.1 The submitted layout plan indicates that the proposed gardens are suitably compliant, and all dwellings proposed exceed Nationally Described Space Standards, with most units far exceeding these minimums. The split-level gardens to the semi-detached dwellings is not ideal, but is an improvement upon the previously approved scheme. It is considered that the large size mitigates the split level required to accommodate the existing topography of this area. The scheme would be a habitable, and high quality, environment for future occupants. There are sufficient separation distances between clear glazed windows of existing and proposed dwellings to avoid privacy, overbearing or overshadowing existing dwellinghouses.
- 5.5.2 The site is within close proximity to residential dwellinghouses, in a rural location at the edge of a village. Whilst it has been concluded that the development itself would avoid undue adverse harm to neighbours, construction phases can be disruptive, particularly in quiet rural locations such as this. Construction management information has been submitted as part of this application, which are largely agreeable, but omits restrictions on hours of construction. Subject to a planning condition to

ensure avoidance of construction activities at unsociable hours (early mornings, late evenings and anytime on Sundays and public holidays), in addition to the submitted information, this is considered to minimise and mitigate such disturbance to an acceptable degree.

5.6 **Biodiversity, trees and surface water drainage** 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), DM36 (Protecting Water Resources and Infrastructure), DM43 (Green Infrastructure), DM44 (Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity), DM45 (Protection of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland) and DM57 (Health and Wellbeing), Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policy SP8 (Protecting the Natural Environment), National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Section 14 (Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change), Section 15 (Conserving and enhancing the natural environment)

5.6.1 The proposed biodiversity impacts are unaltered from the previously approved development, which can be implemented as a fallback (subject to discharge of conditions/obligations). This proposal provides a landscaping scheme, which raises no issue in itself, although the details are insufficient in themselves to control implementation and maintenance of these, which should be controlled through planning condition. Details of bat boxes have been provided, which can be controlled for implementation through planning condition. Subject to such conditions, the development will achieve ecological enhancement.

5.6.2 The submission includes drainage details, which are for infiltration as the optimal solution within the SuDS hierarchy. These details are considered to be acceptable for implementation and maintenance, although a condition requiring verification of the implementation of these remains a requirement prior to first occupation. Subject to such conditions, the proposal will be sustainably drained through an appropriate infiltration scheme.

5.6.3 Some further landscaping and tree impact documentation has been submitted as part of this application. Unfortunately, these do not sufficiently address the requirements of existing planning conditions to vary these. The proposed landscaping is agreeable as an indicative scheme, but lacks precise details of what would be planted and how this would be maintained. In terms of impacts on existing trees, the submitted arboricultural information details retention of trees conflicting with the sought vehicular access, confusing details of precisely where tree protection measures would be located, and no details of how works within such protection areas would be carried out.

5.6.4 It is anticipated that an updated Arboricultural Method Statement will be submitted prior to committee date, which can be reported as a verbal update. If this is not received, or matters protected existing trees are not satisfactorily addresses, related conditions could be re-attached as prior to any commencement for tree protection measures. The full details of landscaping can be controlled through pre-occupation/completion for full landscaping details and maintenance, as this mitigation can only realistically be provided on-site in the first planting season following completion of development, once construction activities have ceased.

5.6.5 The National Landscape is a 'sensitive area' in the EIA Regulations 2017, and therefore must be screened to determine whether the proposal is EIA development. This has been undertaken separately, concluding that the potential for likely significant effects in EIA terms is limited, and impact upon the landscape can be addressed through the planning process without the submission of an Environmental Statement.

5.7 **Highways, open space and accessibility matters** Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM27 (Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities), DM29 (Key Design Principles), DM57 (Health and Well-being), DM58 (Infrastructure Delivery and Funding), DM60 (Enhancing Accessibility and Transport Linkages), DM61 (Walking and Cycling), DM62 (Vehicle Parking Provision), DM64 (Lancaster District Highways and Transport Masterplan), Appendix D (Open Space Standards and Requirements) and Appendix E (Car Parking Standards), Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policies SP10 (Improving Transport Connectivity), T2 (Cycling and Walking Network), National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Section 9 (Promoting sustainable transport)

5.7.1 The proposed access point to the broader cul-de-sac development seeking consent is similar in location and design to that previously approved as part of the parent consent. Beyond the site access, within the development the proposed cul-de-sac narrows slightly to 5 metres wide, with a

pavement on the southern side. Given the edge of village location, and cul-de-sac road arrangement, this is considered to be an acceptable approach, subject to full details of surface materials. Surface material should suitably differentiate the narrower road, and use of this for pedestrians, along with some differentiation of the paved area. This is necessary to ensure vehicle speeds will be suitable for the arrangements proposed. Parking provision and EV charging can be controlled through condition to ensure implementation.

- 5.7.2 Beyond the site, whilst pavements along Station Road had originally been sought, these are not feasible due to highway and bridge width. The side walking area has been repainted within the last few years, and the conditional requirement for this within the parent consent is no longer necessary. Limited details of signage for the bridge narrowing, other signage and street lighting for the proposed access and highway junction have been detailed as part of this application, which should continue to be controlled through planning condition for further details. Whilst the inability to improve walking facilities along Station Road is unfortunate, walking provision around the site is anticipated to improve through a progressing Lune Valley Greenway project. This project is beyond the development site, and being brought forwards by other organisations, however the application positively incorporates this project. This is through an obligation to allow non-motorised movements through the site, to ensure the proposed development can link into this wider project if this comes to fruition in the medium term. This obligation, combined with cycle parking to still be provided, is considered suitable encouragement of sustainable travel methods in this rural location.
- 5.7.3 The aforementioned access route is expected to traverse secured public open space (POS) areas and the proposed cul-de-sac private road, with no implication on private domestic gardens and dwellinghouses within the proposed layout. The POS provision and contributions can similarly be controlled within a new legal obligation, to be delivered triggered to occupation and completion, with details of maintenance and access to these communal areas in perpetuity through this mechanism

6.0 Conclusion and Planning Balance

- 6.1 In conclusion, the proposal continues to provide 9x dwellings of an appropriate mix within the sustainable rural village of Hornby, improving pedestrian linkages over the existing bridge between the southern (Butt Yeats) area and the northern area of Hornby. Significant weight is given to the provision of housing in a sustainable rural location, particularly given the lack of 5-year housing supply within the district. Whilst the affordable housing provision is beneath the policy requirement of 50%, this proportion has been demonstrated as unviable. The only viable provision of 2x shared-ownership affordable dwellings also ways in favour of the proposal, providing much needed affordable provision within a rural village location, with positive mix between the two units. The inclusion of a bungalow within an appropriate housing mix to address local needs weighs further in favour of the proposal, with economic and social benefits of housing provision.
- 6.2 The development within the Forest of Bowland NL will result in localised landscape harm, which has been minimised through the varying heights of housing reflecting the parallel drumlin, with natural materials and high-quality landscaping to be controlled through planning condition. It is worth noting that there is an extant consent for a similar housing proposal within this site area. Whilst great weight is attached to the localised landscape harm to the protected landscape, this has been minimised to modest harm through design and conditions. Even once amplified by the great weight attached to such landscape harm, the aforementioned social and economic benefits of housing provision in this location is considered to outweigh this harm at a time of housing shortage.
- 6.3 Although larger and higher density dwellings are proposed, the design and external appearance of dwellings is largely congruent and appropriately high quality. Subject to details of external materials and landscaping, the sought variations do not materially diminish the previously approved scheme. The proposal causes no undue harm to ecology, amenity and drainage. The proposal is considered to weigh in favour of approval.

Recommendation

That Planning Permission **BE GRANTED** following the satisfactory completion of a Legal Agreement within 3 months of the date of this Committee meeting, and the conditions listed below. In the event that a satisfactory

Section 106 Agreement is not concluded within the timescale above, or other agreed extension of time, delegate authority to the Chief Officer – Planning and Climate Change to refuse planning permission on the grounds that the obligations which make the development acceptable have not been legally secured and the following planning conditions:

The legal agreement shall secure:

- Provision of two shared-ownership Affordable Housing units (to be provided on site) in accordance with an Affordable Housing Scheme to be submitted and approved by the Council
- Provision of on-site Amenity Greenspace.
- Setting up of a Management Company; and
- Management and Maintenance of all landscaping, unadopted roads, lighting and drainage infrastructure and on-site open space.
- Securing a public access route for non-motorised walking, wheeling through the site if this links to public access through land immediately adjacent to the site.

List of conditions:

Condition no.	Description	Type
1	Timescale	Control condition backdated to original permission
2	Accord with amended plans	Control condition
3	Details and sample external materials, windows (incl setback), rainwater good etc pre-commencement	Pre-commencement above ground
4	Off-site highway improvement details and implementation pre-commencement	Details prior to implementation/first use/completion
5	CMP (including pre-works photographic survey and s/w management) pre-commencement – detail construction hours	Control condition, implemented throughout construction
6	AIA mitigation, submit TPP and AMS	Pre-commencement
7	S/W drainage scheme and maintenance	Control condition, implemented prior to first use
8	S/W drainage verification	Details prior to first use/completion
9	Foul drainage scheme	Control condition, implemented prior to first use
10	Landscaping and maintenance pre-commencement details, implemented first planting season	Details prior to implementation/first use/completion
11	Visibility splays pre-commencement details, implemented prior to first use	Details prior to first use/completion
12	EV charging details pre-commencement	Control condition, implemented prior to first use
13	Implement boundary treatments	Details prior to implementation/first use/completion
14	Waste collection area for plots 1 and 2, details,	Control condition, implemented prior to first use
15	Parking and access provision prior to first use and retention	control condition
16	Implement and retain field access prior to first occupation and retain	control condition
17	Watching brief and unforeseen contamination, accordance with submitted report	control condition

18	Ecology mitigation accordance with report	control condition
----	---	-------------------

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

21/01370/FUL – Delegated Report

DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT: DELEGATED REPORT

APPLICATION DETAILS

Application Number:	21/01370/FUL	Date Valid:	30.11.2021
Case Officer:	Mr Stuart Hammond	Decision Target:	25.01.2022
Site Address:	Land Rear Of Ingleborough View Station Road Hornby Lancashire		
Proposal:	Erection of 9 dwellings (C3) with associated detached garages, formation of a new access and associated estate roads and landscaping		

DESCRIPTION OF SITE AND PROPOSAL

The application site comprises 0.70 hectares of agricultural grassland located behind existing residential property (Ingleborough View), on the southern outskirts of the settlement of Hornby. The site lies beyond the disused railway line, which previously separated Hornby from the cluster of development at Butt Yeats. The site is located within the northern fringe of the Forest of Bowland Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) within the Valley Floodplain and Undulating Lowland Farmland with Wooded Brooks character types. The site is designated as Open Countryside under policy EN3 of the local plan, whilst Hornby's Conservation Area lies to the north of the disused railway line circa 80 metres north of the site. There are no protected trees affecting this proposal.

The site relates to the eastern part of a larger pastoral field. It is bound by the B6480 Wennington Road to the south; the remaining part of the field to its western boundary. The disused railway line, Mears Beck and the residential development at Station Court form the sites northern boundary, and a row of semi-detached and terraced 2-storey houses known as Ingleborough View, Low Barn (a residential property) and a sub-station all fronting Station Road to the site's eastern boundary. There is an area of public open space to the north of the site situated between Station Court and Station Way Industrial Estate. A small cluster of development around the Butt Yeats junction is located to the south-east of the site on the south side of Wennington Road, with a further small residential complex, known as Lunesdale Court, around 180m to the south-west of the site.

Land levels rise gradually from an elevation around 35.8m Above Ordnance Datum (AOD) in the south-eastern corner of the site (close to the southern field access) to approximately 38.5 AOD at the top of this drumlin at the mid-point along the proposed western boundary of the site. At this highest point the levels then drop steeply towards the northern boundary where the site is elevated at approximately 29m AOD. The site is not located in an area identified as being susceptible to water flooding, other than a surface water flood risk along the northern boundary where Mears Beck runs in an east-west direction. The site is located in a Mineral Safeguarding Area.

The proposal seeks planning permission for x7 detached dwellinghouses and pair (x2) of semi-detached units, with associated access, garages and supporting landscaping. The 9 units in total are predominantly two storeys in height, with one bungalow and one split level property, all finished in natural stone and slate, although the precise external materials is yet to be confirmed. The proposed mix of units is as follows:

Unit Size	Quantum	Plot Numbers
2-bed semi-detached	2	8 & 9
3-bed	3	2, 3 & 6
3-bed bungalow	1	1
5-bed	2	4 & 5
3 to 5-bed split-level	1	7

In terms of tenure, the x2 2-bed units are proposed to be shared ownership and the remaining units would be open market. With regards to the x2 2-bed units these are on plan 2bed units with a further room to enable working from home, which is beneath the minimum floor standards for NDSS to be considered a bedroom, and therefore these small upper floor rooms are considered domestic office/study rooms. The two proposed affordable homes from Station Road towards the entrance to the site. Whilst the split-level property on unit 7 includes a study and lounge on the top floor, accessed level with the ground floor at the front, given the scale of this property and location of other bedrooms, these rooms could be used and considered as bedrooms as part of a 5-bed unit.

Plots 1, 2, 4, and 5 will have shared freestanding garages. Plot 7 will have its own free-standing double garage and the remaining 3-bed dwellings have internal single garages within the unit design. The semi-detached 2-bed dwellings have a shared drive/courtyard parking.

The new access to the site will be positioned to the south of the existing humpback bridge and it is 5.5m wide with a 2.9m wide footpath on its southern boundary. Visibility splays of 2.4m x 43m are proposed in each direction and these appear to be deliverable given the absence of third-party landowners.

Areas of public open space and landscaping to the northwest and southwest of the site are also proposed and this comprises a linear buffer zone with a soft edge landscape on the boundary line and clusters of native trees to the north and south of this zone. The effect of these clusters would be to help screen the development from views west to east. Further trees are proposed along the boundary line to the south with the B6480 and boundary line to the east with the rear gardens of the Station Road residential development. Although this landscaping forms part of the general layout, precise details of landscaping have yet to be received.

RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

- 22/00137/REM: Reserved matters application for the erection of 8 dwellings - **CONCURRENT**
- 20/01060/FUL: Planning application for the erection of 9 dwellings (C3) with associated detached garages, formation of a new access and associated estate roads and landscaping. **Refused.**
 - Design impacts
 - Non-compliant Housing Mix and Tenure
 - No ecology information
- 17/01327/OUT: Outline application for the erection of up to 11 dwellings and creation of a new access and associated landscaping. **Approved.**
- 17/00170/OUT: Outline application for the development of up to 11 dwellings and creation of a new access and associated landscaping. **Refused.**
- 16/00745/OUT: Outline application for the development of up to 11 dwellings and creation of a new access and associated landscaping. **Withdrawn.**
- 17/00487/REM: Reserved matters application for the erection of a 3-bed dwelling with associated access. **Approved.**
- 16/00780/EIR: Screening request for the development of 11 residential dwellings and creation of a new access. **Not EIA development.**
- 15/00117/OUT: Outline application for the erection of a single 3-bed dwelling with associated access. **Approved.**
- 14/01030/FUL: Erection of 9 dwellings and associated access. **Approved.**

RELEVANT DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND NATIONAL POLICY

National Planning Policy Framework 2021

- Chapter 2: Achieving sustainable development
- Chapter 4: Decision making
- Chapter 5: Ensuring a sufficient supply homes
- Chapter 11: Making effective use of land
- Chapter 12: Achieving well designed places
- Chapter 14: Climate change

- Chapter 15: Conserving and enhancing the natural environment

Strategic Policies and Land Allocations Document (SPLA DPD)

- SP1: Presumption in favour of sustainable development
- SP2: Settlement hierarchy
- SP6: Delivery of new homes
- SP8: Protecting the natural environment
- EN2: Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty
- EN3: The open countryside
- T2: Cycling and walking network

Development Management Policies Document (DM DPD)

- DM1: New residential development
- DM2: Housing standards
- DM3: The delivery of affordable housing
- DM4: Residential development outside main urban areas
- DM6: Housing provision within the Forest of Bowland AONB
- DM27: Open space provision
- DM29: Design principles
- DM30: Sustainable design
- DM34: Surface water run-off and management
- DM35: Water supply and wastewater
- DM38: Development effecting Conservation Areas
- DM39: The setting of designated heritage assets
- DM43: Green infrastructure
- DM44: Biodiversity
- DM45: Protection of trees and hedges
- DM45: Landscape impact of development
- DM61: Walking and cycling
- DM62: Parking provision

CONSULTATION AND PUBLICITY RESPONSES

The application was consulted upon in December 2021, and then again in February 2022 and July 2022 in response to further information submitted to address initial comments. The table below sets out where each consultee now stands:

Consultee	Response
Parish Council	Objection <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of public footpath to the centre of the village • Height of the proposed new houses and impact on the AONB
Fire Officer	No objection Highlighted relevant building regulations for fire safety
Conservation Officer	No comment Little or no heritage impact
Housing Officers	No objection / Comments Accepts independent viability report, would seek the affordable units to be 1x 2bed and 1x 3bed, but would accept 2x 2/3bed as proposed.
Arboricultural Officer	No objection The AIA should be updated, relocation of affected hedgerow instead of

	<p>replacement, increase sporadic tree planting @20m spaces along open space boundary, details on planting mix and species</p> <p>Subject to condition on final landscaping details and plan including specifics and movement technique of hedgerow and planting deadlines</p>
Cadant Gas	No response
County Highways	<p>No Objection</p> <p>Subject to conditions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey of existing highway to remedy any constructional impacts • CEMP • Wheel washing • Visibility splays • Off-site highway works
Local Lead Flood Authority	No objection – provided standing advice
LPA Engineers	<p>No objection</p> <p>Subject to conditions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final Surface Water Drainage Scheme – Details Required • Surface Water Lifetime Management & Maintenance Plan • Construction Phase Surface Water Management Plan
Forest Of Bowland AONB	No response
Environmental Health Officer	<p>No objection</p> <p>Subject to following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The impact on local air quality of this development can be mitigated by the standard measures detailed in the Low Emissions and Air Quality PAN. • Watching brief inline with Phase 1 assessment by MES ref 2032-1 and notification/remediation of unforeseen contamination • Provision of EV charging points
Planning Policy Team	No response
Coal Authority	No comments/Beyond remit
Natural England	<p>No objection</p> <p>Development will not have significant adverse impact on statutorily protected nature conservation sites.</p>
Property Services	<p>Comments</p> <p>The city council own the verge and hedge fronting station road and note that the proposed footpath adjoins this land, as long as the proposals do not affect this land, then we have no objections.</p>
Public Realm Officer	No response
United Utilities	<p>No objection / Comments</p> <p>Subject to condition requiring:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • details of the surface water drainage • foul and surface water be drained on separate systems • management and maintenance of SuDs system <p>Further comments based on adjacent assets: <i>According to our records there is an existing water main within the site boundary,</i></p>

	<p><i>which impacts on Plot 1. The house design should not encroach on either the water main or the associated easement strip.</i></p> <p><i>The applicant should also be aware that the existence of the water main may also necessitate the reconfiguration of their drainage proposals. It is our recommendation that this matter is resolved prior to the determination of the planning application to ensure no further unnecessary delays or expense is incurred on their behalf.</i></p>
RSPB	No response
Waste and Recycling	No response
Public Rights of Way	No response
Ramblers Association	No response
Lancashire Constabulary	No response
Greater Manchester Ecology Unit (GMEU)	<p>No objection – However there are opportunities to enhance wildlife value so recommend conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fully detailed landscape plan with species proposed • SuDs features to benefit wildlife • New hedgerow planting to compensate for any lost for access etc. • No tree, shrub or hedgerow works during nesting season

Further to the above, there were public objections received from 11 responders to the application which raised the following matters:

- **Landscape and visual impacts:** development would be too visible and would not be appropriate for context. Dwellings are too large and dominate the landscape impacting the village and AONB. Dwellings are harmful to character and would be poor additions to the existing locality. Open space should be adjacent to properties on Station View to act as buffer.
- **No need for housing/impact to infrastructure:** scheme fails to address local needs and existing infrastructure has no capacity.
- **Offsite Footpath and highways:** provision of footpath over railway to provide safe pedestrian access across the bridge, conflict between pedestrians and vehicle traffic
- **Planting:** the proposed planting is poor, alien and fails to integrate the scheme with the wider locality
- **Unsafe access:** the proposed access is not safe or suitable for the traffic generated by 9 additional dwellings and the proposed footpath is not wide enough
- **Disruption:** during construction and operation this would cause significant impacts to amenity in terms of noise and pollution.
- **Lack of ecology information:** concerns over the ecology information

PLANNING ASSESSMENT

The main issues to consider within the determination of this planning application are:

Preliminary matters

- EIA Screening
- Paragraph 177 of the NPPF and whether the development is 'major' within the FoB AONB

Main determination matters

- The principle of development
- The provision of affordable housing
- Design and impact on the AONB
- Residential amenity and open space

- Biodiversity impacts
- Surface water drainage
- Highways and accessibility matters
- Mineral safeguarding

EIA Screening and scale of development in an AONB:

The application is located on the same site as and broadly reflects that of the refused application 20/01060/FUL, which was screened (21/01340/EIR) against the EIA Regulations 2017. The reason for screening was because this site is within the AONB, which is deemed to be a 'sensitive area' in the EIA Regulations 2017. The conclusion of the screening 21/01340/EIR was that the proposed development was not EIA development.

Given the similarities in the developments across both applications, and the conclusion was made only last year (2021), it is not deemed necessary to undertake a new separate screening this application, and it is considered that again the development is not EIA development on the basis of the recent screening opinion.

The development is located within an AONB, and the NPPF Paragraph 177 set out that 'major' development should be refused unless in exceptional circumstances. Again, this was a consideration undertaken in the determination of 20/01060/FUL to which the officer concluded the proposed development was not major. Indeed, the application is for 9 dwellings, which falls beneath that understood to be classed as a 'major application'. As discussed, given the similarities, the same conclusion is reached on this matter.

Principle of development

The NPPF was revised in July 2021, but the objective to 'significantly boost' the supply of homes remains, and this is reflected in paragraph 60 of the Framework. Chapter 5 of the Framework sets out that the needs and types of housing to address different groups of the community should be reflected through adopted planning policies. In addition, from a local perspective, with respect to the broad principle of residential development, policy DM1 of the DM DPD provides that the LPA will support proposals for new dwellings whereby they use land effectively, taking into account the character of locality and where such proposals can be accommodated by the natural environment without unacceptable impacts upon services and infrastructure arising.

Despite the broad degree of support offered to the principle of residential development by policy DM1, in considering the acceptability of the principle of development, policy SP2 of the SPLA must also be considered. Policy SP2 sets out the settlement hierarchy for the district and in doing so, it highlights the broad locations where residential development is and is not acceptable with respect the locality's overarching sustainability credentials.

In this instance, policy SP2 clarifies that Hornby is considered to be a sustainable rural settlement within the Forest of Bowland AONB, and is therefore capable of accommodating a degree of growth. The Sustainable Settlement Review (2018) reiterates this and illustrates that Hornby's ability to offer key services is such that the village is deemed to be sustainable. However, this does not offer a *carte-blanche* for all development and policy SP2 of the SPLA clarifies that the support offered is subject to the constraints of the AONB's protected landscape credentials. In this regard, the core principles in the 2021 National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 174) indicate that the planning system should recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment. Consequently, development of this site should relate well to the existing urban form and preserve the countryside and the landscapes contained within it.

The support offered to residential development outside of the main urban areas by policy SP2 (as above) is further reflected through policy DM4. This policy clarifies that council will support proposals for rural housing provided that they are well related to the existing built form, they remain proportionate to the character and scale of the existing settlement, and they do not demonstrably undermine the prevailing landscape. In addition to the overarching support offered by policies DM1, DM4 and SP2, policy DM6 of the DM DPD supports the principle of residential development within the Forest of Bowland AONB provided that the local housing needs are being addressed/met by the proposal. This is discussed further below.

In addition, as set out within the site history, outline planning permission has previously been granted for the development of up to 11 units on this site. This outline permission remains valid having only been issued on 26

February 2019, and with a concurrent reserved matters to this application. This, accordingly, adds a further degree of support to the principle of development.

At this juncture, having established that the broad principle of development here can be supported, the impact of the tilted balance pursuant to paragraph 11 of the NPPF should be considered. Given that the LPA cannot currently demonstrate an up to date 5-year housing supply, the tilted balance would typically be engaged for such a residential proposal. However, footnote 7 of the NPPF advises that the presumption in favour of sustainable development will **not** apply where the application of policies within the NPPF which protect areas or assets of particular importance provide a clear reason for refusal. In this regard, the application is considered against paragraph 176 of the framework within the “*Design and impact on the AONB*” section of this report and this identifies harm to the AONB landscape such that the tilted balance is **not engaged**.

Despite the tilted balance not being engaged, given the site’s history and the provisions of policies SP2, DM1, DM4 and DM6, the principle of development here can be supported subject to the material considerations discussed below. Furthermore, whilst the tilted balance is not engaged, the provision of dwellinghouses in a sustainable rural settlement offers social and economic benefits that weigh moderately in favour of the proposal, as does the provision of affordable homes, albeit at a level below the policy stipulation due to a verified viability assessment.

Local Housing needs in the Forest of Bowland AONB and Viability

As noted above, the broad principle of residential development here is acceptable. However, because the AONB is a protected landscape, sites which are suitable for housing should be developed specifically to meet local affordable or other locally identified housing needs. To do otherwise would, ultimately, fail to address these needs, which could then only be met by releasing more sensitive sites, causing harm and compromising the primary purpose of the AONB designation. Policy DM6 seeks to ensure that the approach to housing delivery in the AONB reflects the local needs within the AONB and better ensures that new development supports the AONB’s primary purpose and Special Qualities.

The housing mix proposed is set out in the following table:

Unit Size	Proposed housing mix	% of total units	Plot Numbers
1-bed/apartment	0	0%	N/A
2-bed semi	2	22%	8 & 9
3-bed bungalow	1	11%	1
3-bed detached	3	33%	2, 3 & 6
5bed	3	33%	4, 5 & 7
Total	9	100%	

With regards to the 2-bed units proposed, the intent is that the units are primarily 2-bed properties, with additional space for a home office given the Covid 19 impact to the ways of working. Given the proposed home office/study rooms are beneath the minimum space required for a bedroom, these cannot be considered as anything greater than 2-bed properties. Given the increased demand for home-working, particularly in rural locations, it is reasonable to provide an additional small upper floor room to meet this demand, outside of the bedroom provision within a dwellinghouse. These units would be offered as shared ownership units and comprise an affordable offer of 22% by unit. Given they would be affordable, they would be managed in part by a Registered Provider, who therefore could control the units to ensure they would be used as proposed.

Policy DM6 advises that proposals within the FoB AONB should “*closely*” reflect identified needs in accordance with the most up to date and available evidence at the time of the application being made. Regarding viability policy DM6 of the DM DPD clarifies that proposals for new housing development will be supported where they

deliver *no less than 50%* affordable housing. Only where this is demonstrably unachievable will a lower percentage be supported.

The site is located within the Upper Lune Valley and the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2018) clarifies that the need for housing in this locality, alongside the adopted housing mix requirement, is as follows:

House type	% required by SHMA	% required by DM1	Proposed by scheme
2 bed dwelling	11.3%	20%	22%
3 bed dwelling	34.6%	35%	33%
4+ bed dwelling	26.9%	25%	33%
Bungalows	19.5%	10%	11%
1 bed or apartment	4.7%	10%	0%
Other	2.9%	0%	0%
TOTAL	100%	100%	100%

The mix is slightly weighted towards larger units, although one of these is a split-level bungalow (two storeys to the rear, access at upper floor level at the front due to topography of the plot), which could be feasibly used as a 3, 4 or 5-bed property, depending on the occupants and whether they'd prefer the two front rooms facing the highway to form bedrooms or additional living/study space. The applicant has outlined that the sought housing mix and slight weighting to larger units is due to viability constraints.

The housing mix and tenure has been amended since the refusal of 20/01060/FUL, which solely comprised open market dwellings and 3 and 5 bed units. The housing mix and tenure of 20/01060/FUL was one of the grounds of refusal.

Since then, the mix and tenure has been amended as part of this application, with 2 shared ownership units being proposed. The Housing Officers would primarily seek an affordable mix of 1x2bed and 1x3bed but would accept the 2x 2/3beds given the flexibility offered by the product in terms of the upper floor home office.

In terms of viability, the applicant's report accepted the Benchmark Land Value and a number of other inputs proposed by the LPAs assessor as part of the 20/01060/FUL response. The applicants report still concluded it was unviable to provide any affordable units but would provide 2x units as shared ownership. Given the amendments, the housing mix and tenure was again reviewed and tested by the independent LPA appointed viability assessor. The viability assessor undertakes a conflict-of-interest check and acts under the remit of the Professional Body of the Registered Institute of Chartered Surveyors (RICS). With the inclusion of the 2 units as shared ownership, the LPAs assessor shows a residual land value of £636,835. As this is above the benchmark land value of £624,250 this is shown to be viable (albeit with only a small surplus).

Overall, the mix has been revised to include fewer 5 bed units, with a mix reflective of local need with the inclusion smaller units to better meet the housing need within the AONB. Whilst the mix is marginally focussed towards larger units, the applicant outlined that this was due to viability, and the proposed housing mix is considered to suitably reflect local demand, particularly given the provision of a bungalow and split level property, with an acute demand for such units in this area. Whilst the inclusion of x2 2-bed shared ownership units remains viable, the surplus is insufficient to push for further affordable units and outlines that amended the mix to better reflect the SHMA would undermine the viability. On this basis, it is considered on balance that the scheme delivers a mix and tenure of units that would be acceptable given DM6.

Design and impact on the AONB

As noted earlier in this report, the application site lies within the Forest of Bowland AONB and paragraph 176 of the NPPF advises that "*great weight*" should be given to conserving and enhancing such landscapes and scenic settings. This requirement is reflected through policy DM46 of the DM DPD, which provides that development proposals should seek to contribute positively to the conservation and enhancement of the protected landscape and its setting, through their siting, scale, massing, materials, landscaping, vernacular style and design. Proposals which fail to do this will be refused. Given the verdant nature of the locality and the site's location within the Forest of Bowland AONB, the potential impact of the development upon the prevailing landscape is a key consideration. The importance of protecting and preserving valued landscapes is set out within paragraphs 130, 145, 174, 176 and 177 of the NPPF. This is consistent with policy EN2 of the SPLA DPD and policies DM29, DM46 and DM52 of the Development Management DPD.

The application 20/01060/FUL was refused on the following grounds:

By virtue of the site's position on the north and east sides of a drumlin, the development which would be partially elevated above surrounding built form, would result in overly-prominent development that poorly relates to the existing built form of the settlement and as a consequence will unacceptably encroach into the countryside to the detriment of the natural beauty, character and appearance of the AONB and the visual amenity of the countryside area, therefore failing to represent sustainable or beautiful development as required by the NPPF. This is exacerbated by the use of large scaled dwellings with complicated roof forms and multiple dormers which are overtly urban in their style, appearance and character. The proposed dwellings fail to respect to the locality's prevailing simple form and therefore appear as visually jarring, incongruous and discordant additions to the landscape. The proposal is therefore contrary to policies SP1, EN2 and EN3 of the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations Document and policies DM4, DM6, DM29 and DM46 of the Development Management Development Plan Document, and the aims and objectives of the NPPF, in particular paragraphs 8b, 126, 176 and chapters 12 and 15.

The proposed designs have been considerably revised from the designs refused in 20/01060/FUL. In terms of the mass and height, the ridgeline will now be no higher than 8.04m, which reflects the LVIA upon which the outline consent was based, with a maximum ridge height of 45.3m AOD, in comparison to the existing 43.6m AOD ridge heights of the existing dwellinghouses running parallel to the proposal. The adjacent drumlin itself peaks at a height of circa 41m AOD, and largely conceals views of the existing row of dwellinghouses along Station Road beyond 300 metres to the west, although the roofscape and rear elevations become more visible at lesser distances travelling eastwards towards the site along the B6480 Wennington Road.

In terms of the architectural design, the elements considered to be modern and jarring with the character of the area have been removed, and the rooflines have been simplified. In addition, the design on plan has been amended to follow the residential development along Station Road, so you would not see the rear façade as you turned into the site, and the amendment in mix results in smaller units on plan, giving a slight increase in separation distances between units. Further to this the materials palette proposed is natural stone and slate, which is reflective of the area subject to precise details by planning condition. Most importantly, the height and scale of the units has been amended to reflect the adjacent landscape and topography of the site. The tallest and largest properties are located adjacent the where the land naturally rises through the adjacent drumlin landscape, with the southern-most property being a subservient bungalow and neighbouring two proposed dwellings gradually stepping up towards the aforementioned larger units. Furthermore, on plot 7 where there is a large topographical change within the plot, this has been reflected in the proposed split-level design, whereby from the proposed streetscene to the south this appears as a bungalow, whilst taking the appearance of a two storey property from northern aspects viewing the rear of the proposed dwelling.

Officers have assessed the application based on the LVIA, the design addendum and updated plans, having regard to the relevant landscape policy, guidance and management plans, including those referred to above and also Section 85 of the Countryside and Rights of Way Act, which places a statutory duty on the local planning authority when assessing and determining a planning application within the AONB, to have regard to the purposes of conserving and enhancing the natural beauty of the AONB.

On review of the LVIA, given the proposed height and location of the site, the massing will be visible. However, given the development would be view in the context of existing residential properties at Butt Yeats, with a natural topography plus a buffer of landscaping to the west controlled through planning condition, combined with the concealment of private domestic gardens from wider views and parking predominantly to the sides of proportionate dwellings finished in natural materials, these all offer a strong degree of mitigation to landscape impact upon the Forest of Bowland AONB. The development will result in a localised landscape impact, especially in views towards the site from the west where the roofscape of the development would protrude above the crest of the drumlin across its entire north-south axis. The provision of landscaping is unlikely to mitigate these localised impacts in the short-term, although impacts would be softened in the medium to long term from this perspective. However, it is accepted that the development would not remove the existing landscape feature (drumlin) within these particular views and will be viewed against the backdrop of existing development.

The limiting of the north and south most properties to single storey, and heights of other proposed units generally following the natural drumlin topography, significantly reduces the visual impact of the proposed roofscape, particularly given the existing impacts of visibility from the west of the rear elevations and garden boundaries dwellinghouses fronting Station Road. Combined with woodland features to the north and south to frame the drumlin and hedgerow planting to be controlled through planning condition, the proposal would

define some key characteristics of the landscape character, reducing the visual impact from wider views. On balance and subject to conditions regarding planting and external materials, the proposed development overall would avoid significantly adversely the quality and natural beauty of the AONB or countryside area. However, the localised landscape impacts and development of this greenfield site would modestly detract from the AONB landscape at more proximate viewpoints. Whilst this harm is considered to be modest, great weight is attached to this harm in planning balance.

Residential amenity and open space

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.

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, the proposed development would be adjacent to the existing dwellings on Station Road. 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 32m distance between the existing rear elevations and those proposed under this application. Undue and harmful overlooking is not therefore judged to arise.

With regards to private amenity space, 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, increasing by 10sqm area for each additional bedroom over 2-bed units. Small north facing gardens should also be avoided.

The submitted layout plan indicates that the proposed gardens are suitably compliant with this requirement. In addition to private amenity space, the proposal reflects the open space offer of 20/01060/FUL which was deemed to be acceptable and is again in this instance. Accordingly, the scheme is not judged to give rise to significant amenity impacts upon existing residents or potential future occupiers. There are sufficient separation distances between clear glazed windows of existing and proposed dwellings to avoid privacy, overbearing or overshadowing existing dwellinghouses. Whilst proposed unit 2 has an upper floor side facing window toward bungalow unit 1, this would predominantly face over the roofscape of this single storey unit, with the nearest opening of the bungalow further east of the neighbours and obscure glazed serving a bathroom. Whilst there are two small north facing clear glazed openings to the living room of this bungalow, the visibility angle is far more acute, and these form secondary openings. Therefore, given the angles and distance of any potential viewpoint, and the fact this overlooks parking and driveway space as opposed to private garden area, it is considered that the upper floor side facing window of Unit 2 does not cause any undue harm to the privacy standards of any future occupant of Unit 1.

Biodiversity impacts

As required by the National Planning Policy Framework at paragraphs 8c, 174, 179 and 180 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. 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.

The applicant has provided an ecology appraisal dated 22nd December 2020. The report was undertaken by Envirotech who were commissioned for both 20/01060/FUL and 17/01327/OUT. The application is supported by an Arboricultural assessment which has been reviewed by the LPA's Tree Officer. The minor loss of the site's existing hedging is noted (another reason that the ecology reports should be updated) but overall the degree of protection offered to existing/retained trees is considered acceptable.

The appraisal included a phase 1 habitat survey, assessment of habitats, evaluation of ecological significance, identification of mitigation and further surveys that may be required prior to commencement. Advice on the matter by the Chartered Institute of Ecology and Environment Management advise¹ suggest a consideration of factor such as what the site is deemed to support, significant changes to habitats on and around the site and whether local distribution of species in the wider area. Whilst the date of the ecological appraisal is now 24 months old, no objection has been raised during consultation, which included Natural England, Greater Manchester Ecology Unit (GMEU) and the arboricultural officer. The appraisal sets out that the site is not designated for its nature conservation value and is not close to any designated sites. It is dominated by species-poor improved agricultural grassland of limited ecological value, and on the whole the site has very limited potential to support any specially protected or priority species. This is accepted, and given this, the lack of considerable change since the appraisal was undertaken on site and within the area, the appraisal is accepted. Whilst no objection was raised, both the arboricultural officer and GMEU identified that there are opportunities to enhance the wildlife value of the site through new landscaping in order to achieve a potential net gain in biodiversity, in addition, the removal of hedgerows being as minimal as they are such should be translocated back into the landscaping. Consequently, given the provision of policy DM30 which seeks to secure opportunities to support sustainable design, a condition on such will be added to control the precise details of proposed landscaping, from both a visual impact and biodiversity net gain perspective. Subject to such planning conditions, the application is considered to comply with policies DM30, DM44 and the wider NPPF.

Surface water and Foul Drainage

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

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)

Further to this, the use of SuDs can provide additional ecological value which was flagged by GMEU as a further opportunity in the landscaping.

The application is supported by a surface water drainage scheme on the basis that the applicant does not wish to have pre-commencement conditions imposed. The surface water drainage scheme seeks to demonstrate why infiltration is not considered appropriate for the site. Given the information provided LPA Engineering team have not yet been convinced this is the case and SuDs may still be possible to some degree.

Notwithstanding this, if infiltration is shown not to work, attenuation and discharge into the adjacent watercourse would be acceptable but at present, insufficient information has been submitted to allow this conclusion to be reached. On this basis, the final drainage strategy will be controlled through planning condition, as sufficient space on site remains to provide a workable solution if SuDs is possible. The site is adjacent to a pumping house with a fould drainage infrastructures running through the northeast corner and accessway to the site, and the application form stipulates connection to this mains sewerage system. Subject to foul and surface water being drained on separate systems, foul drainage mains connection is considered to be acceptable.

Highways and accessibility matters

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 – where possible. The application proposes a new vehicular access onto Station Road adjacent to the existing sub-station. The proposed location is the same as that originally approved pursuant to 17/01327/OUT and outlined in 20/01060/FUL.

The access arrangement has been designed in accordance with Lancashire Highways discussions and requirements. Their formal comments raise no objections to the arrangement of access shown in GA3345-PSP-003E (dated March 22). To facilitate this access point, an existing lighting column and highway sign will be relocated. Further to this, the internal layout outlined in GA3345-PSP-003L (dated July 22) has also been found acceptable.

The highway capacity has been considered by Lancashire Highways and the level of trip generation from the 9 dwellings has been found to cause no undue harm to the public highway.

As raised by public consultation comments, a critical consideration here is the site's poor pedestrian linkage to the village. To facilitate and improve pedestrian movements along Station Road, the application includes a number of proposed improvements as shown in the amended drawing GA3345-SK01 (received on 3rd May 2022). The proposals include:

- 2m wide footway along the site's frontage with Station Road up to the existing bridge.
- The existing red contras footway over the bridge is restored.

In addition to the works shown on the submitted drawing Lancashire County Council Highways request that as part of the section 278 works the following is included and secured through a planning condition:

- The existing red contras footway from the bridge to Station Way is restored
- Improved highway warning signs (slow markings and pedestrians in the road signs) in both directions approaching the bridge.

The highways drawings, access arrangement, visibility splays and offsite works will all be controlled through planning condition. The provision and retention of parking space will also be provided, and amended plans received ensure suitable internal garage spaces and external parking driveways to provide 2 parking spaces to all 2 and 3 bed properties, and at least 4 spaces to the three larger dwellinghouses, modestly exceeding the minimum requirements. Subject to EV charging point provision controlled through planning condition, it is considered that the proposal provides suitable parking provision and would have no undue impact upon highway safety or on-street parking locally.

In summary, the scheme is considered compliant with policies DM29 and DM61 of the DM DPD and section 9 of the NPPF, which seeks to promote sustainable travel and ensure development can provide safe and suitable access for all. There are no highway objections to the proposal subject to the imposition of conditions securing the provision of the access and the associated off-site highway works. Whilst the pedestrian links to Hornby are unideal, the provision of a raised pavement between the site access and the narrowed bridge, and public highway improvements to signage in the vicinity and re-marking of red contras footways is considered to be an acceptable arrangements for future occupants, and a modest highway safety improvement upon the existing arrangements for the existing residents in Butt Yeats. As such, the proposal is considered to be acceptable from a highway perspective.

Mineral safeguarding

The application site (and surrounding land) is located within a Mineral Safeguarding Area under Lancashire's Waste and Minerals Local Plan. Policy M2 of the Waste and Minerals Plan states that planning permission will not be supported for any form of development that is incompatible by reason of scale, proximity and permanence with working the minerals. The policy sets out circumstances where the Local Planning Authority may accept incompatible development, for example where there is an overriding need for the incompatible development that outweighs the need to avoid mineral sterilisation. It requires proposals for development other than non-mineral extraction, to demonstrate that they will not sterilise the resource or that consideration has been given to prior extraction, on site constraints and the need for the proposed development. The NPPF

states that local planning authorities should not normally permit other development proposals in mineral safeguarding areas where they might constrain potential future use for these purposes.

The application site partially covers the eastern edge of the mineral safeguard area, and whilst this would modestly reduce the theoretical potential area of extraction, this would not restrict extraction from the wider safeguarded area. Furthermore, given the topography of the site; its position in relation to surrounding land also allocated for mineral safeguarding, which is dissected by rural roads and scattered development; its sensitive location within the FoB AONB, and; the proximity of the site to residential property, that the application site is highly unlikely to attract significant commercial interest in the land for mineral extraction. As such, the proposal is considered to cause no undue harm to the very limited potential for mineral extraction locally.

Archaeology

At the time of granting permission for 17/01372/OUT, Lancashire Archaeology Advisory Service (LAAS) raised no objections to the proposal and were satisfied no further archaeological investigation would be required. The LAAS have not provided formal comment on this application, but based on the previous determination and the content with the submitted archaeological assessment, the proposal is not judged to conflict with national or local heritage based policies.

Summary and Conclusion

In conclusion, the proposal would provide 9 dwellings of an appropriate mix within the sustainable rural village of Hornby, improving pedestrian linkages over the existing bridge between the southern (Butt Yeats) area and the northern area of the village. Whilst a tilted balance is not engaged, significant weight is given to the provision of housing in a sustainable rural location, particularly given the lack of 5-year housing supply within the district. Whilst the affordable housing provision is beneath the policy requirement of 50%, this has been demonstrated as unviable, and the provision of two shared ownership affordable dwellings also ways in favour of the proposal, providing much needed affordable provision within a rural village location. The inclusion of a bungalow and split-level property with an appropriate housing mix to address local needs also weighs in favour of the proposal, with economic and social benefits of housing provision.

The development within the Forest of Bowland AONB will result in localised landscape harm, which has been minimised through the varying heights of housing reflecting the parallel drumlin, with natural materials and high-quality landscaping to be controlled through planning condition. It is worth noting that there is an extant consent for a similar housing proposal within this site area. Whilst great weight is attached to the localised landscape harm to the protected landscape, this has been minimised to modest harm, and even once amplified by the great weight attached to such landscape harm, the aforementioned social and economic benefits of housing provision in this location at a time of housing shortage is considered to outweigh this harm. The proposal cause no undue harm to ecology, amenity and drainage, with a modest highway/pedestrian benefit of footway improvement, and as such the proposal is considered to weigh in favour of approval.

RECOMMENDATION

Recommend that the application is **APPROVED** subject to the following conditions

1. Timescale
2. Accord with amended plans
3. Details and sample external materials, windows (incl setback), rainwater good etc pre-commencement
4. Off-site highway improvement details and implementation pre-commencement
5. CMP (including pre-works photographic survey and s/w management) pre-commencement
6. AIA mitigation, submit TPP and AMS pre-commencement
7. S/W drainage scheme pre-commencement
8. S/W drainage maintenance pre-commencement
9. Foul drainage scheme pre-commencement
10. Landscaping and maintenance pre-commencement details, implemented first planting season
11. Visibility splays pre-commencement details, implemented prior to first use, retain
12. EV charging details pre-commencement, implement prior to first use
13. Implement boundary treatments implement prior to first use
14. Waste collection area for plots 1 and 2, details, implemented prior to first use
15. Parking and access provision prior to first use and retention control condition
16. Implement and retain field access prior to first occupation and retain control condition

17. Watching brief and unforeseen contamination, accordance with submitted report control condition
18. Ecology mitigation accordance with report control condition

Informative

Coal Authority standing advice

Fire safety advice

Officer Use Only

Has the application been subject to the necessary publicity arrangements?	Y
Have all the constraints been identified?	Y
Has the statutory consultation period(s) and site notice expired?	Y
Did the application require EIA Screening?	Y – completed as part of previous application
Following assessment, is the application still able to be determined under the Scheme Of Delegation?	Y
If approved, do all the conditions meet the 6 tests of paragraph 56 of the NPPF?	Y

Agenda Item	A7
Application Number	24/01171/FUL
Proposal	Erection of self-storage units with associated security building, boundary fencing and creation of access roads/parking
Application site	Former Builders Merchants Yard New Quay Road Lancaster Lancashire
Applicant	New Quay Lancaster Ltd
Agent	Mrs Hayley Knight
Case Officer	Mr Andrew Clement
Departure	None
Summary of Recommendation	Approval subject to S.106

1.0 Application Site and Setting

- 1.1 The application site comprises circa 2.6 hectares of previously developed (brownfield) land located at the western end of New Quay Road immediately south of the River Lune. The site was once the location of Lancaster's Isolation Hospital, and was more recently a Builders Merchants (Use Class B8). This use ceased a few years ago, with buildings on-site demolished a couple of years ago. The site now comprises circa 1.2ha of cleared hardstanding and rubble, bound by existing palisade fencing and stone walls. The site also extends to circa 1.4ha of land between this previously developed site and the banks of the River Lune, on greenfield land that contains rights of way, flood defence bunds and vegetation.
- 1.2 Public open space and rights of way bound the northern, eastern and southern perimeter of the site, forming designated open spaces and blue/green corridors around the site. A narrow footpath to the east of the site leads to the Coastal Walk along the Lune to the north, with the frequently walked/cycled bridleway of the Millenium Path to the south, beyond which is Freemans Wood. Freemans Wood is a historic landfill site, but is now used as outdoors sports provision, with additional areas of the woodland recently made more accessible as usable outdoor space. The site is within the regeneration priority area for Luneside, which seeks a range of both employment and residential uses for the wider New Quay Road area. A more localised Development Opportunity Area for the site and Lune Industrial East to the southeast seeks a mixed-use regeneration of this previously developed site, to include a range of residential, employment and economic uses.
- 1.3 The majority of the site to the south of the bunds are protected by these flood defences, but remain within Flood Zone 3 due to high risk of flooding from the River Lune, and the site is understood to have historically flooded in 2002. There are smaller pockets of low and medium surface water flood risk, projected to become high risk in the future due to climate change. The River Lune is of regional and international environmental interest, as a biological heritage site and marine conservation zone, with the site just 500 metres upstream of the Morecambe Bay Special Area of Conservation (SAC),

2.0 Proposal

- 2.1 The proposal seeks planning permission for the erection of self-storage units on the 1.2ha previously developed area of the site, with associated security building, boundary fencing and creation of access roads/parking. The greenfield land to the north is included within the development area for associated drainage works, biodiversity net gain area and boundary treatments. The proposal seeks a total of 21 blocks of storage units, the longest being approximately 77 metres long, all single storey under 4 metres tall. The design are long rows of single garages with roller shutter doors under mono pitched roofs finished in metal composite cladding of dark silver and goosewing grey colours. One of the units contains indicative solar panels to the roof.
- 2.2 The proposed development would facilitate the provision of a self-storage business at the site, where customers could store possessions within individual lock-up facilities. The proposed units would be accessible to existing customers 24 hours a day. New fencing and a gate are proposed within the site adjacent to the existing site entrance, beyond which is a security building and 8 parking spaces, with another couple of parking spaces further into the site. The site plan suggests 474 individual units could be provided through the proposed development, measuring between circa 7spm and 27sq.m floorspace each, with cumulative self-storage floorspace of 4,795sq.m. A concrete hard surfacing is proposed for vehicular route and parking access to units.

3.0 Site History

- 3.1 A number of relevant applications relating to this site have previously been received by the Local Planning Authority. These include:

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
24/01225/EIR	Screening request for the redevelopment of the site to provide self storage units (B8) and associated infrastructure	Environmental Statement not required
19/00723/ADV	Advertisement application for the display of 1 non-illuminated fascia sign and 1 non-illuminated wall sign	Granted

4.0 Consultation Responses

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

Consultee	Response
Lancaster Civic Vision	Appearance of the facility will be stark and utilitarian, should seek some screening/planting. No indication of the times when access to the storage units will be afforded to users. Comments regarding loss of already demolished building and neighbour consultation.
Planning Policy	No objection in principle, drainage and landscaping would need suitable management.
Sustainable Growth	No observations received
County Highways	No adverse comment, further information has addressed previous concerns regarding access to the site, impacts on the wider highway network can be mitigated through £15,000 contribution to highway improvement projects to 13 initiatives across the district, and condition for a construction management plan.
Lead Local Flood Authority	No objection , subject to submission of a detailed surface water sustainable drainage strategy, maintenance and verification through planning conditions.
Environment Agency	No objection , the proposed development would be safe and that it would not be at an unacceptable risk of flooding or exacerbate flood risk elsewhere, informative regarding

	easement to the River Lune, associated defences and potential permit requirements.
United Utilities	Acceptable in principle , subject to condition regarding surface water drainage scheme and it's maintenance/management regime.
Canal And River Trust	No adverse comment
Engineering Team	No observation received
Natural England	No adverse comment
Lancashire Wildlife Trust	Objection to post development habitat plan, due to lack of information of how this will be delivered and maintained.
BNG Officer	Unclear whether some works would impact vegetation, or how some enhancements would be achieved or maintained. Could be addressed through condition. Accesses and boundaries suitable, habitat baseline is accepted, but further details of post-construction habitat, and requirement to maintain for at least 30 years, is still required through condition.
Tree Protection Officer	No adverse comment , trees are not a barrier to the development. The trees to be removed are in a poor condition or growing from the concrete base and boundary fence, all have a limited retention span. The proposed losses can be adequately compensated for within the proposed landscape plan. Omission of replacement fencing, or development to this area sought within this application, addresses impact on those trees.
Public Realm	No observation received
Environmental Health	No adverse comment, proposed mitigation would not likely cause obtrusive light. Dust control during construction, EV charging to mitigate air quality impacts, and submitted investigations and conditions can mitigate contamination issues.
Public Rights of Way	No objection , subject to any new fencing being set at least 1 metre into the site, and avoiding drainage/landscaping across right of way
Ramblers Association	No observation received
County Archaeology	No adverse comment, subject to written scheme of investigation controlled through planning condition programme of archaeological work being undertaken as part of the development, to be reported for the historical record.

4.2 **One objection** has been received from members of the public, raising concerns regarding traffic, associated air pollution and noise, and incompatibility of industrial with residential uses in the vicinity.

5.0 Analysis

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

- Principle of development and regeneration priorities
- Design, scale, landscape/streetscene and heritage impact
- Biodiversity, ecology and trees
- Drainage, flood risk and contamination
- Accessibility, transport, residential amenity, parking and highways

5.2 **Principle of development and regeneration priorities** Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM14 (Proposals involving Employment Land and Premises), DM28 (Employment and Skills Plans), Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD SP1 (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development), SP2 (Lancaster District Settlement Hierarchy), SP5 (The Delivery of New Jobs), EC5 (Regeneration Priority Areas), DOS2 (Lune Industrial Estate, Luneside, Lancaster), Employment and Skills SPD and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Section 2 (Achieving sustainable development), Section 4 (Decision-making), Section 6 (Building a strong, competitive economy) and Section 11 (Making effective use of land)

5.2.1 The site has an established history of storage use, previously a builders merchants, but now seeking development of much smaller self-storage units within the same planning use class. The proposed buildings cover a much larger building footprint (4,795sq.m) than the previous use, which was primarily open-air storage. The proposal seeks storage within the single storey height buildings seeking permission through this application.

5.2.2 Much of the eastern and central sections of the Lunesdale Regeneration Priority Area have already

been redeveloped, from previous heavy industry to primarily residential uses to both sides of the retained cricket club. This application site is at the far western end of this regeneration area, forming part of the development opportunity site that more closely relates to the existing Lunesdale Industrial Estate, and associated employment buildings and uses to the south. Part of the site on the opposite southern side of New Quay Road was granted permission through 20/01145/FUL and 23/00389/VCN to redevelop circa 14,500sq.m of B2 and B8 use class buildings.

- 5.2.3 The application site is within the northwest portion of this development opportunity designation, immediately adjacent to an existing concrete mixer/manufacturer/supplier, with a Use Class E building recently constructed to the south, beyond which are retained and new employment buildings. Combined with the riverside location at high risk of flooding (flood zone 3) compared to other lower risk areas of the development opportunity designation, it is considered that the site is more suitable to deliver the economic/employment elements of this designation, as opposed to the residential regeneration aspirations as part of the mixed-use regeneration sought for this area. The proposal ensures that incompatible land uses are not located within close proximity of each other, in-keeping with the focus of commercial/employment elements of development to the north and west areas of this designation.
- 5.2.4 Combined with the established use of the site, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in principle. Whilst it is anticipated that few people would be employed ongoing for such a use once established, there are economic benefits of the sought development both during construction and once established as a business. The development would help achieve the regeneration and development objectives detailed within the designations for the site as part of the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations Development Plan Document. The site makes effective use of previously developed brownfield land, which is attributed substantial weight in accordance local and national policies. To ensure the storage use and facilities remain within the brownfield area of the site, a condition is recommended to specifically limit such activity to this area, with the greenfield area of the site for drainage and biodiversity only, as intended by the application.
- 5.2.5 The proposed development would deliver 4,795sq.m of self-storage floorspace, significantly over the 1,000sq.m of commercial floorspace trigger threshold for production of an Employment and Skills Plan (ESP). The ESP details how opportunities for, access to and up-skilling local people through the construction phase of the development proposal will be provided. As such, and given mitigation would likely be met during construction phase of the development itself, this should be controlled through pre-commencement planning condition to ensure any consent granted delivers the ESP requirements.
- 5.3 **Design, scale, landscape/streetscene and heritage impact** Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM29 (Key Design Principles), DM30a (Sustainable Design and Construction), DM30b (Sustainable Design and Construction – Water Efficiency), DM30c (Sustainable Design and Construction – Materials, Waste and Construction), DM42 (Archaeology), DM46 (Development and Landscape Impact), DM53 (Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation), Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD SP7 (Maintaining Lancaster District's Unique Heritage), DOS2 (Lune Industrial Estate, Luneside, Lancaster), CC1 Responding To Climate Change and Creating Environmental Sustainability and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Section 11 (Making effective use of land), Section 12 (Achieving well-designed places) and Section 16 (Conserving and enhancing the historic environment) and National Model Design Code (NMDC)
- 5.3.1 The site previously contained buildings of traditional materials and local historic interest, unfortunately these were demolished and removed from the site several years ago, with no protection of such buildings beyond national heritage assets. The site is now an unused area of rubble and broken hardstanding, bound by palisade fencing and some stone walls, in unkempt condition. Whilst the existing boundary fencing will largely be retained and maintained, the proposed development of the site brings the opportunity to provide a use, activity and improved condition of the site.
- 5.3.2 The proposed development is utilitarian in design and layout, proposing long narrow rows of buildings finished in metal grey colour metal cladding under mono pitched roofs. The front elevations will contain a number of brightly coloured roller shutter doors to each self-storage unit. Whilst the development is not high-quality design, it is a considered design that will provide a rhythm and cleaner appearance than numerous shipping containers that provide alternatives for such self-

storage elsewhere. The location of blocks along the boundaries provides a visual containment to the site, at single storey height with eaves just 3.25 metres tall to the rear of buildings, and all less than 4 metres tall.

5.3.3 The development sought will be low key and low-profile, reducing its prominence and wider visual impact. The self-storage development and units proposed will provide a tidy appearance, particularly compared to previous open-air storage of building materials that previously occurred at this site. As such, the design, materials, scale and height are considered to be appropriate for the use of the site, despite the riverside location of development and falling short of high-quality design. The low-profile development is considered to avoid landscape and streetscene harm through this well considered, if utilitarian, design and development. Despite the likely low energy demands of the development, positive energy and water conservation measures will be incorporated into the proposal, including solar panels to Block C. The implementation of these should be controlled through planning condition.

5.3.4 There remains heritage interest in the site that may be unearthed by development. Foundations and other aspects of historical interest from the original Isolation Hospital use of the site may remain within the ground. As such, Lancashire Archaeology recommend a planning condition for a written scheme of archaeological investigations, for investigations to take place during construction and subsequent reported for the historical record. Subject to such a planning condition, the development would record and advance understanding of the significance of any heritage assets unearthed as part of the development, should any archaeological interest be discovered during such investigations.

5.4 **Biodiversity, ecology and trees** Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM44 (The Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity), DM45 (Protection of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland), DM46 (Development and Landscape Impact), Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD SP8 (Protecting the Natural Environment), EN7 (Environmentally Important Areas) and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Section 15 (Conserving and enhancing the natural environment)

5.4.1 The previously developed brownfield area of the site is bound by trees, both within the site boundaries and just beyond. The greenfield areas to the banks of the River Lune have much higher ecological value and tree/vegetation coverage, however sustainable drainage and boundary treatments are the only developments sought in this area, which will be largely retained and enhanced through the proposal.

5.4.2 The sought development to the brownfield area seeks the removal of circa 12 trees and a few groups of smaller shrubs/trees. Some other trees are to be removed due to poor condition, irrespective of development pressure, due to their immediate decline. Two of the trees to be removed are category B trees. However, the Council's Tree Protection Officer has concluded that these are not a barrier to development, as these and other trees to be removed are growing from the existing concrete base and boundary fencing, and as such all have a limited retention span. The proposed losses can be adequately compensated for within the proposed landscape plan, subject to conditions to ensure appropriate full details, and its implementation and maintenance.

5.4.3 The proposal includes a pre-development biodiversity metric, which is considered to accurately reflect the biodiversity value of the site, meeting the pre-determination requirements of the proposal. Post-development information has been submitted, and whilst this falls short of a fully evidenced and maintainable scheme, leading to objection and concern from consultees, such post-development plans can be controlled through planning condition. The submitted information shows positive intention to deliver net gain on-site, the full details of which can be sought post-determination, but prior to commencement, through planning condition. Given the likely extent of monitoring for such on-site biodiversity area, the costs of the authority's obligation to monitor this should be controlled through legal agreement. Subject to such conditions and obligations, the proposal is considered to meet the pre-determination requirements for BNG, with the delivery, maintenance and monitoring of required net gain to be fully explored through such conditions/obligations.

5.4.4 Morecambe Bay is very important for many species of birds. The application site is within the impact risk buffer zone of the Morecambe Bay and its environmental designations. As such, there is the potential for development and recreational use close to the designated sites to have impacts on birds

associated with the SPA and Ramsar designations. It is considered that these impacts could be avoided, but only through mitigation. In light of the People Over Wind ruling by the Court of Justice of the European Union, likely significant affects cannot be ruled out without mitigation and therefore an Appropriate Assessment (AA) is required.

- 5.4.5 This assessment is contained within a separate document. It concludes that, with the implementation and retention of mitigation, the development will have no adverse effects on the integrity of the designated sites, their designation features or their conservation objectives, through either direct or indirect impacts either alone or in-combination with other plans and projects. The mitigation for the proposal is a construction management plans to prevent undue disruption and pollution of delignated areas during construction, employee packs informing of the sensitivities of the ecological sites, and appropriate controls over external lighting. Subject to such details being controlled through planning condition, the proposal can avoid adverse impact.
- 5.4.6 The site would be externally illuminated, in a location in close proximity to neighbouring ecological sites and public walking/wheeling routes. Light pollution can harm habitats and enjoyment/use of open space, and should be controlled to avoid adverse impact, particularly in this sensitive riverside location. The proposed lighting is solely to the previously developed land area, and a light spill plan demonstrates how artificial lighting would be directed within the site, and limits light spill with cowls proposed to restrict light spilling beyond the site. Such mitigation, combined with limiting illumination to movements and/or time when customers are accessing the site between dusk/dawn is considered to avoid harm through external lighting, with no adverse comment received from Environmental Health regarding lighting.
- 5.4.7 Whilst there will be tree and ecology losses through the proposal, it is considered these can be fully mitigated and ensure required net gain, with positive intention to deliver this within the wider site. As such, the proposal is considered to be policy compliant with regard to trees and ecological/biodiversity impacts and betterments.
- 5.5 **Drainage, flood risk and contamination** Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM32 (Contaminated Land), DM33 (Development and Flood Risk), DM34 (Surface Water Runoff and Sustainable Drainage), DM35 (Water Supply and Wastewater), DM36 (Protecting Water Resources, Water Quality and Infrastructure), DM43 (Green and Blue Infrastructure), Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD SP8 (Protecting the Natural Environment), EN7 (Environmentally Important Areas) and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Section 14 (Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change)
- 5.5.1 Following original concerns with the sought drainage scheme, an altered scheme has positively incorporated sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) including a surface attenuation pond within the land to the west of the brownfield land. This pond will ensure controlled outfall rate to an existing sewer. Whilst a full scheme would need to be controlled through planning condition, this has addressed the previous objection from the Lead Local Flood Authority, in addition to ecological benefits of providing such a SuDS pond in a location near Freemans Pools and the River Lune, considered an ecological benefit and positive link to existing local habitats.
- 5.5.2 The riverside location is defended by a flood defence bund, which the aforementioned drainage facilities and landscaping must provide a suitable easement for maintenance. Whilst defended, the site and proposed developments are within Flood Zone 3, at high risk of flooding from the River Lune. There are also small pockets of surface water flood risk within the site. Furthermore, the site is known to have flooded in 2002.
- 5.5.3 The proposed would develop self-storage facilities on the site, and customers property stored at the site would be at such risk of flooding. However, the use class and vulnerability of the site remains unchanged through this proposal, still within the 'less vulnerable' category. Whilst a sequential test has not been submitted as part of this application, within the development opportunity site itself, the proposal places this least vulnerable use within this area of highest risk of flooding. This approach avoids more vulnerable development, such as residential dwellings, in such higher risk areas of the development opportunity designation, where the impacts of flood would be more severe. This is considered to be a sequentially appropriate approach to delivering regeneration of brownfield land sought within the development opportunity designation.

- 5.5.4 The proposal demonstrates that the site can be drained and avoid flood risk elsewhere, whilst placing the proposed 'less vulnerable' development in terms of flood risk impact in the area of highest flood risk within the development opportunity site. To regeneration the brownfield land and progress delivering the aspirations of the development opportunity site, the proposed development is considered the optimal way of achieving. The proposal would not exacerbate flood risk elsewhere, nor placing more vulnerable uses sought within the broader allocation at such risk. As such, the proposal is considered to be acceptable and policy compliant with regards to drainage and flood risk, subject to implementation of mitigation measures within the submitted flood risk assessment.
- 5.5.5 A ground investigation and phase 1 preliminary risk assessment reports have been submitted, identifying risks to be investigated and potentially remediated further where required. These reports recommend the production of a Materials Management Plan to allow re-use of contaminated and/or uncontaminated areas of the site, and a Phase II human health and controlled waters risk assessment. Subject to such details being submitted and agreed through planning conditions prior to commencement of development, this is considered sufficient to protect construction workers and future customers and employees of the development. No adverse comment from the Environmental Health consultee.
- 5.6 **Accessibility, transport, residential amenity, parking and highways** Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM31 (Air Quality Management and Pollution), DM57 (Health and Wellbeing), DM60 (Enhancing Accessibility and Transport Linkages), DM61 (Prioritising Walking and Cycling), DM62 (Vehicle Parking Provision and Electric Vehicle Charging Points), DM63 (Transport Efficiency and Travel Plans), DM64 (Lancaster District Transport and Highways Masterplan), Appendix E (Vehicle Parking Standards), Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD SP10 (Improving Transport Connectivity), T2 (Developing the Cycling and Walking Network) and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Section 9 (Promoting sustainable transport)
- 5.6.1 The application site is on the edge of Lancaster City, at the far end of New Quay Road before open countryside separates the built-up areas of Lancaster from villages/hamlets further south. The site is unfortunately poorly connected to sustainable transport, with no bus service to the site. However, it is approximately a mile from the train station, and just over a mile from Lancaster bus station. Whilst it is anticipated that the majority of customers would drive to the site, at such distances from public transport, employees could walk/wheel to the site. Secure cycle storage should be provided to encourage such sustainable modes of travel, through the provision of Sheffield stands or similar controlled through planning condition.
- 5.6.2 Given the scale and nature of self-storage units proposed, it is anticipated that customers would be local residents and/or small business requiring additional storage space beyond their respective properties. Given the limited height and floorspace, large vehicle movements would likely be limited to primarily the construction phases, and suitable arrangement could be controlled through planning condition for a construction management plan. Once established, it is anticipated that the majority of vehicle movements would be domestic scale cars/vans.
- 5.6.3 The transport assessment anticipates low levels of vehicle movements for the use proposed, with peak hours attracting just 10x trips during those peak hours, as projected by the submitted assessment. Such an increase in movements by domestic scale vehicles is considered to have no adverse impact upon neighbouring residential amenity along New Quay Road, and the proposal would likely attract fewer large vehicles than the previous builders merchants use of the site.
- 5.6.4 The proposed vehicular parking provision is proportionately small to match such movements, and given the availability of on-street parking in the vicinity, it is considered parking would have no adverse impact on the highway network. There would be impact upon the wider highway network through vehicle movements, and given such movements would exacerbate existing highway issues, contributions to highway improvement projects would be necessary to mitigate such additional movements.
- 5.6.5 County Highways have requested a sum of £15,000, identifying 13 projection such funding could contribute towards. Such a contribution is considered proportionate to mitigate the additional vehicle movements from the proposal upon Lancaster gyratory road and other areas of the highway network. This position is understood to be agreeable to the applicants, and should be controlled through legal agreement. Subject to such mitigation, the proposal would sufficiently encourage

sustainable transport options whilst mitigating vehicle movements during construction and use of the proposal.

6.0 Conclusion and Planning Balance

- 6.1 The proposal seeks to develop and provide an active use of an existing derelict plot of brownfield land adjacent to the River Lune. This would help deliver some of the aims for the regeneration of the area and the more specific development opportunity site. Development of the site would achieve economic benefits being delivered, and most substantially, making effective use of previously developed brownfield land. Such benefits attribute positive weight in planning balance. For such regeneration and effective use of a brownfield site, development should be approved unless substantial harm would be caused.
- 6.2 The design of the scheme is utilitarian, and whilst this falls short of the high-quality design sought through the development opportunity allocation, the low height and locations of development avoid harm undue harm to the landscape and streetscene. The proposal will result in tree removals, biodiversity impacts, increasing in vehicle movements and drainage implications. However, it has been demonstrated through the application that such matters can be addressed and mitigated through conditions and obligations to avoid harm, and achieve a neutral impact with regard to these matters. As such, the benefits of the effective use of brownfield land and positive contribution to the regeneration aspirations for the area are considered to weigh in favour of approval, in the absence of any substantial harm individually nor cumulatively from the proposed development.

Recommendation

That Planning Permission **BE GRANTED** following the satisfactory completion of a Legal Agreement within 3 months of the date of this Committee meeting, and the conditions listed below. In the event that a satisfactory Section 106 Agreement is not concluded within the timescale above, or other agreed extension of time, delegate authority to the Chief Officer – Planning and Climate Change to refuse planning permission on the grounds that the obligations which make the development acceptable have not been legally secured and the following planning conditions:

The legal agreement shall secure:

- **£15,000** contribution to off-site highway projects and improvements
- Agreement to pay costs of monitoring BNG

List of conditions:

Condition no.	Description	Type
1	Timescales	Control condition
2	Accord with amended approved plans	Control condition
3	Contaminated land surveys and materials management plan	Pre-commencement
4	Employment skills plan	Pre-commencement
5	Archaeological written scheme of investigation	Pre-commencement
6	Construction management plan	Pre-commencement
7	Construction environmental management plan	Pre-commencement
8	Construction drainage scheme	Pre-commencement
9	Full sustainable drainage scheme	Pre-commencement
10	Landscaping plan and maintenance	Details prior to implementation/first use/completion
11	Cycle storage	Details prior to implementation/first use/completion
12	Electric vehicle charging	Details prior to implementation/first

		use/completion
13	Drainage operation and maintenance	Details prior to implementation/first use/completion
14	Drainage verification	Details prior to implementation/first use/completion
15	External lighting mitigation	Details prior to implementation/first use/completion
16	Employee ecological information pack	Details prior to first use/completion
17	Ecology mitigation	Control condition
18	Flood risk mitigation measures	Control condition
19	Implement energy measures	Control condition
20	Foul drainage separate system	Control condition
21	No storage development or use within greenfield area	Control condition

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	25/00866/PAD
Proposal	Prior approval application for the demolition of former mower storage shed
Application site	Lancaster City Council White Lund Depot White Lund Road Morecambe
Applicant	Mr Stuart McMinn (Lancaster City Council)
Agent	N/A
Case Officer	Mr Sam Robinson
Departure	No
Summary of Recommendation	Prior Approval is required and granted

(i) **Procedural Matters**

This form of development would normally be determined under the Council's Scheme of Delegation. However, the site is under the ownership of Lancaster City Council, and therefore, the application is referred to the Planning Regulatory Committee for determination.

1.0 Application Site and Setting

- 1.1 White Lund Depot is situated to the east of White Lund Road, near to the junction of White Lund Road and Westgate. The site comprises of numerous buildings that include office buildings, storerooms and the White Lund Plant Centre for Lancaster City Council members of staff. The remainder of the site consists of parking for council vehicles and staff parking.
- 1.2 To the northwest of the site are six residential properties, with further residential properties to the west of White Lund Road. To the north, east and south of the application site are various commercial properties that include Home Bargains and Whitehouse Motors.
- 1.3 The building subject of this prior approval is situated within the White Lund Industrial Estate which is an identified employment area in the Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD. The northern and western edges of the wider site are partially within Flood Zone 2 whilst other pockets within the site are also at risk from surface water flooding.

2.0 Proposal

- 2.1 This application seeks a determination as to whether prior approval is required for the demolition of a former mower storage shed.
- 2.2 Subject to the prior approval process, the proposal is considered to be permitted development by virtue of The Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 (as

amended) hereafter referred to as the 'Order'. It is only the method of demolition and any proposed restoration of the site that is considered under the Order.

3.0 Site History

3.1 A number of relevant applications relating to this site have previously been received by the Local Planning Authority. These include:

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
24/00437/VCN	Retrospective application for the temporary siting of 2 portable buildings to provide office space (pursuant to the variation of condition 1 on 23/01134/VCN to extend the time frame for removal)	Permitted
23/01435/FUL	Demolition of existing office building, canteen building, welfare building and greenhouse and erection of a new office building, canteen and welfare building	Permitted
23/01134/VCN	Retrospective application for the temporary siting of 2 portable buildings to provide office space (pursuant to the variation of condition 1 on 23/0649/FUL to extend the time frame for removal)	Permitted
23/00649/FUL	Retrospective application for the temporary siting of 2 portable buildings to provide office space	Permitted

4.0 Consultation Responses

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

Consultee	Response
Town Council	No response
Environmental Health	No response

4.2 No responses have been received by members of the public at the time of compiling this report.

5.0 Analysis

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

- Whether the proposal meets the requirements of Schedule 2 Part 11 Class B of the Order
- Method of demolition and restoration of the site
- Protected species

5.2 **Whether the proposal meets the requirements of Schedule 2 Part 11 Class B of the Order**

5.2.1 Schedule 2 Part 11 Class B of the Order permits “*any building operation consisting of the demolition of a building.*” This is subject to some exclusions (sub-section B.1) and conditions (sub section B.2). The proposal is not affected by the exclusions set out in sub-section B.1 and in accordance with B.1(i), the developer (in this case Lancaster City Council) has applied to the local planning authority for a determination as to whether prior approval is required. If it is required, details of the method of demolition and any means of restoring the site need to be approved. These are the only considerations applicable to such applications. It is not a planning application whereby the proposal is assessed against national and local planning policy and wider material planning considerations.

5.3 **Method of demolition and restoration of the site**

5.3.1 The application has been submitted with a Structural Inspection Report and a Method of Demolition Statement. Although not a consideration for this application, the Structural Inspection report provided

by R G Parkins indicates that the building has reached the end of its design life and any remedial repairs could be costly and may not rectify the issues. The Method of Demolition Statement sets out the way in which the proposed demolition will take place in a safe manner having regard to potential effects on nearby residents and the visual amenity.

- 5.3.2 The Method of Demolition Statement indicates that the contractor will be using heavy tracked excavating plant equipment which will cut and grab the frame in a controlled manner. The building will be demolished in small sections bringing the steel frames and cladding sheets down to the internal area down to the concrete ground floor slab. Materials will then be separated into recyclable and waste and disposed of via licensed scrap metal business for re-use where applicable. The concrete base will remain in situ.
- 5.3.3 Whilst the level of detail is limited, the building is a relatively lightweight structure and is not of a significant size, the demolition of such a structure should be completed relatively quickly and should not result in significant disturbance on the wider area. Hours of operation for the demolition will be between the hours of 08:30 and 17:00 and it is expected that the demolition will take a single day and a further two days to cut up the steel. This highlights that the proposal will have a very short-term impact. The building is also located within an existing employment site which is part of a wider allocated industrial site and is located c.100m away from the nearest residential properties. Any noise arising from the demolition is also likely to be absorbed into the wider working environment and is unlikely to have an adverse impact upon the amenity of the nearest neighbouring properties.
- 5.3.4 As such, the Method of Demolition Statement has established the means of demolition with regards to the site and area and it is considered that if the proposal were carried out in accordance with these details, it would not result in any adverse impacts and would be considered acceptable.
- 5.3.5 Where prior approval is required, the local planning authority can seek details of the restoration of the site following demolition. Following the demolition of this building, the Method of Demolition Statement outlines that the concrete base will be retained and will be used for the storage/parking of vehicles and the storage of materials and goods. Given that the building is located within a working site, surrounded by existing buildings, hardstanding, materials, goods and vehicles, the use and appearance of the site is considered acceptable and would not have any undue impacts on the amenity of the wider area.

5.4 **Protected species**

- 5.4.1 Although protected species are not specifically referred in Schedule 2 Part 11 Class B of the Order, Regulation 9 of 'The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017' still applies. This states that the "competent authority must exercise their functions which are relevant to nature conservation... so as to secure compliance with the requirements of the [Habitats] Directives". Accordingly, competent authorities must consider the Directives in making decisions relating to any of their planning functions. Article 3 of the Order provides a reminder of this duty insofar as it relates to development permitted by virtue of the Order.
- 5.4.2 The application has not been submitted with a bat survey but upon visiting the site it is considered unlikely that the building would provide a suitable habitat for bats. As outlined above, the building is a lightweight structure comprised of metal sheeting and has no enclosed roof space that usually offers habitat space. These factors combined within the site being located within an industrial and urban area further reduces the likelihood of the building being utilised by bats. As such, it is considered highly unlikely that the proposal would not have an adverse impact on any protected species.

6.0 **Conclusion and Planning Balance**

- 6.1 Any planning permission granted under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 11, Class B is subject to the standard conditions set out in paragraph B.2. These conditions include a requirement that the development is carried out in accordance with the details approved and within five years. For the reasons set out above, and having taken all relevant matters into account, it is recommended that prior approval is required for the method of demolition and the sites remediation, and that such can be granted.

Recommendation

That Prior Approval is required and **GRANTED**.

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

LANCASTER CITY COUNCIL

APPLICATION NO	DETAILS	DECISION
23/00045/DIS	Higher Bond Gate, Abbeystead Road, Dolphinhholme Discharge of conditions 3, 4, 6 and 8 on approved application 21/00798/REM for Mr Dan Bolton (Ellel Ward)	Application Permitted
23/00046/DIS	Higher Bond Gate, Abbeystead Road, Dolphinhholme Discharge of conditions 3, 4 and 7 on approved application 21/00799/REM for Mr Dan Bolton (Ellel Ward)	Application Permitted
23/00154/DIS	Site Of Former Filter House, Scotforth Road, Lancaster Discharge of condition 11 on approved application 21/00249/VCN for Mr Vivian Watts (University Ward)	Application Permitted
23/00211/DIS	Wennington Hall School, Lodge Lane, Wennington Discharge of condition 5 on approved application 23/00144/LB for Mr Warburton (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
23/00919/FUL	Land Off, Green Lane, Heaton With Oxcliffe Part retrospective application for the change of use of vacant land to extend existing caravan site, including provision of access, hardstanding, car parking area, gates and fencing, siting of mobile home and re-siting of utility block for Mr S Lee (Westgate Ward)	Application Permitted
23/01417/EIR	Land North Of, Royal Oak Meadow, Hornby Screening request for the erection of 23 dwellings with associated development for Hornby Developments Limited (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	ES Not Required
24/00052/DIS	Wennington Hall School, Lodge Lane, Wennington Discharge of condition 4 on approved application 23/00144/LB for Mr Warburton (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
24/00079/DIS	Mellishaw North Development Site, Mellishaw Lane, Heaton With Oxcliffe Discharge of conditions 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 on approved application 19/00507/VCN for Aston Cox Limited (Westgate Ward)	Application Refused
24/00081/DIS	Land At Higher Bond Gate, Abbeystead Road, Dolphinhholme Discharge of condition 7 on approved application 21/00798/REM for Mr Dan Bolton (Ellel Ward)	Application Permitted
24/00082/DIS	Land At Higher Bond Gate, Abbeystead Road, Dolphinhholme Discharge of condition 6 on approved application 21/00799/REM for Mr Dan Bolton (Ellel Ward)	Application Permitted
24/00103/DIS	Wennington Hall, Lodge Lane, Wennington Discharge of condition 4 on approved application 23/00576/FUL for Mr Warburton (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

24/00120/DIS	Proposed Solar Farm, Grimeshaw Lane, Quernmore Discharge of condition 4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12,13,14,15,16,19,20 on approved application 22/00017/FUL for Alexander Miejimolle (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Split Decision
24/00172/EIR	Proposed Solar Farm, Grimeshaw Lane, Quernmore Installation of a solar farm with associated access and infrastructure to include substations, inverter stations, control room, CCTV, lighting, perimeter fence and all associated works to include the laying of an underground cable to connect to Lancaster Sub Station for Opdenenergy UK 6 Limited (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Closed
24/00177/DIS	Wennington Hall, Lodge Lane, Wennington Discharge of condition 9 on approved application 23/00144/LB for Mr Warburton (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
24/00181/DIS	Wennington Hall, Lodge Lane, Wennington Discharge of condition 12 of approved application 23/00576/FUL for Mr Warburton (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
24/00218/DIS	5 - 11 Brock Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Discharge of conditions 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 on approved application 23/00793/FUL for Mr Inayat Munshi (Castle Ward)	Split Decision
24/00378/FUL	Ward Field Farm, Main Road, Galgate Demolition of existing barn and erection of two 2-storey dwellings for Hollins Strategic Land (Ellel Ward)	Application Permitted
24/00387/FUL	Land To The Rear Of, 38 And 40 Elms Drive, Morecambe Erection of 2 detached dwellings (C3) with associated parking area and landscaping for Michael Bell And Moore (Bare Ward)	Application Refused
24/00430/LB	The Castle Inn, 49 Main Street, Hornby Listed building application to facilitate the conversion of existing public house to 6 apartments including new windows and doors, new external steps, alterations to roofs, roof mounted solar panels and alterations to internal layout for Catalyst Corporate Developments Ltd. (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
24/00449/FUL	The Castle Inn, 49 Main Street, Hornby Relevant demolition of existing toilet block and change of use and conversion existing public house (Sui Generis) to 6 apartments (C3) with external alterations to include new windows and doors, new external steps, alterations to roofs, roof mounted solar panels and associated landscaping for Catalyst Corporate Developments Ltd. (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
24/00487/FUL	Land At Grid Reference E354765 N473249, Keer Holme Lane, Borwick Erection of agricultural workers dwelling in association with Hill Top Farm for Thomas and Sandra Blades (Warton Ward)	Application Withdrawn
24/00501/EIR	Land At Grid Reference E349246 N471955, Sand Lane, Warton Screening opinion for the reserved matters application for the erection of 12 dwellings for Oakmere Homes (Warton Ward)	Closed

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

24/00630/FUL	Curwen Hill Farm, Hornby Road, Wray Erection of an agricultural workers dwelling and installation of a package treatment plant for Mr Frank Towers (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Application Refused
24/00801/ELDC	2 River Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Existing Lawful Development Certificate for use of property as House in Multiple Occupation (C4) for Mr P Tabberner (Castle Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Refused
24/01004/FUL	The Old Vicarage, Burrow Road, Tunstall Erection of a single storey rear garden room for Mr And Mrs Walkden (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
24/01005/LB	The Old Vicarage, Burrow Road, Tunstall Listed building application for the erection of a single storey rear garden room for Mr And Mrs Walkden (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
24/01160/ELDC	Land Adjacent Keer Bridge A6, Scotland Road, Warton Existing lawful development certificate for the lawful commencement of planning permission 17/01127/FUL for G&J Shuttleworth Ltd (Warton Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
24/01193/FUL	38 - 40 Queen Street, Morecambe, Lancashire Change of use of Public House with residential units above (Sui Generis) to mixed use unit comprising of Public House (Sui Generis) and Ice Cream Kiosk (E) at ground floor and 11 holiday lets (Sui Generis) above, alterations to existing doors/windows, installation of replacement windows and new door and installation of rooflights and solar panels. for Mr Paul Purcell (Poulton Ward)	Application Permitted
24/01301/FUL	Ty Nant, Wyresdale Road, Quernmore Installation of ground mounted solar panels for Dr T Dawson (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Application Refused
24/01303/FUL	Land To The North Side Of Bay Gateway (A683), Heysham, Lancashire Erection of Energy Storage Facility comprising battery enclosures and ancillary development, erection of storage container, security fencing/gates, CCTV masts and associated access tracks, parking and creation of pond for Ben Coulston (Heysham South Ward)	Application Permitted
24/01359/VCN	Land Adjacent Galgate Mill, Chapel Lane, Galgate Erection of two industrial/employment buildings comprised of 11 units (Class B2/E(g)) with associated parking/turning area, landscaping and associated infrastructure (pursuant to variation of condition 2 of planning permission 23/01353/FUL to amend previously approved plans including changes to elevations, floor plans, site plan and levels) for Mr Rob Lowery (Ellel Ward)	Application Refused
24/01423/FUL	Redfields, Wyresdale Road, Quernmore Demolition of existing dwelling and erection of replacement dwelling with associated parking and landscaping for Mr Anthony Gardner (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Application Withdrawn

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

25/00012/DIS	Addington Lodge, Addington Road, Nether Kellet Discharge of conditions 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 ,9 ,10 and 11 on approved application 21/01547/FUL for Adrian Gott (Halton-with-Aughton And Kellet Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00042/DIS	Agricultural Grazing Land, Kirkby Lonsdale Road, Arkholme Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 18/00700/FUL for Mrs Julie Harwood (Halton-with-Aughton And Kellet Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00072/DIS	Land To The South Of Lawsons Bridge Site, Scotforth Road, Lancaster Discharge of condition 4 and 8 on approved application 23/00802/REM for Hannah Jackson (Scotforth West Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00076/DIS	Land To The South Of Lawsons Bridge Site, Scotforth Road, Lancaster Discharge of condition 5 on approved application 23/00802/REM for Hannah Jackson (Scotforth West Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00082/DIS	University Of Cumbria , Bowerham Road, Lancaster Discharge of condition 18 on approved application 24/00473/VCN for Mr Paul Higham (Bowerham Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00083/DIS	Dene Cottage, Main Street, Whittington Discharge of condition 6 on approved application 24/00263/VCN for John Stephenson (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00087/DIS	22 Whalley Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Discharge of conditions 3 and 4 on approved application 24/01293/FUL for Mr O Korede (Skerton Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00094/DIS	342 Oxcliffe Road, Heaton With Oxcliffe, Lancashire Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 17/01384/FUL for Mr William Hill (Westgate Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00095/DIS	Glasson Basin Marina, School Lane, Glasson Dock Discharge of condition 11 on approved application 21/01207/VCN for Mr Steve de Polo (Ellel Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00096/DIS	Glenarra, Park Road, Silverdale Discharge of condition 4 on approved application 24/00739/FUL for Mr & Mrs Livesey (Silverdale Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00099/DIS	West Hall, West Hall Lane, Whittington Submission of Biodiversity Gain Plan on approved application 24/00599/FUL for Mr David Airey (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00100/DIS	West Hall, West Hall Lane, Whittington Submission of Biodiversity Gain Plan on approved application 24/00600/FUL for Mr David Airey (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00101/DIS	Former Frankie And Benny's, Hilmore Way, Morecambe Submission of Biodiversity Gain Plan on approved application 25/00316/FUL for McDonald's Restaurants Ltd (West End Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00102/DIS	Bowerham Hotel , Bowerham Road, Lancaster Discharge of conditions 3,4 and 12 on approved application 23/01216/FUL for Mr Adam Thompson (Bowerham Ward)	Split Decision

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

25/00103/DIS	Lancaster Castle , Castle Park, Lancaster Discharge of conditions 4 and 5 on approved application 25/00011/LB for Vicki Mathews (Castle Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00104/DIS	Bowerham Hotel , Bowerham Road, Lancaster Discharge of conditions 5,6,7 and 8 on approved application 23/01216/FUL for Mr Adam Thompson (Bowerham Ward)	Split Decision
25/00105/DIS	Former Frankie And Benny's, Hilmore Way, Morecambe Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 25/00316/FUL for McDonald's Restaurants Ltd (West End Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00106/DIS	Bowerham Hotel , Bowerham Road, Lancaster Discharge of condition 9 on approved application 23/01216/FUL for Mr Adam Thompson (Bowerham Ward)	Split Decision
25/00110/DIS	Bank Close, Upp Hall Lane, Priest Hutton Discharge of condition 3 on approved application 25/00319/FUL for Mr & Mrs Clarke (Warton Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00111/DIS	Dragons Head Hotel, Main Street, Whittington Discharge of condition 11 on approved application 23/00093/VCN for Mr Bernard Sampson (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00115/DIS	Todds House, Melling Road, Melling Discharge of conditions 3, 4 and 5 on approved application 09/00324/FUL for Mrs Stephanie Williams (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00116/DIS	Todds House, Melling Road, Melling Discharge of conditions 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 on approved application 09/00325/LB for Mrs Stephanie Williams (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00120/FUL	La Panne, Craggs Hill, Over Kellet Demolition of existing garage and lean-to and erection of two storey side extension and porch, construction of dormer extensions to front and rear and installation of a rooflight to the front for Mr and Mrs Dave Faulkner (Halton-with-Aughton And Kellet Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00121/DIS	Land To The South Of Lawsons Bridge Site, Scotforth Road, Lancaster Discharge of condition 9 on approved application 22/00423/VCN for Mrs Hannah Jackson (Scotforth West Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00121/FUL	Ash Lawn, Lodge Lane, Melling Decommissioning of septic tank, installation of sewage treatment plant and associated drainage field for Mr Alan Spurret (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00204/PLDC	16 Belle Vue Drive, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed lawful development application for erection of single story rear extension, construction of hip to gable roof extension and dormer to the rear roof elevation for Mr Mathew Watt (Bowerham Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
25/00236/FUL	23 Chequers Avenue, Lancaster, Lancashire Construction of a rear dormer extension to the roof for Mr. I. Jasat (Bowerham Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

25/00265/FUL	Brunstow, Scriffen Lane, Ellel Erection of an extension to existing agricultural building for Mr James Hayhurst (Ellel Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00272/FUL	1 The Green, Silverdale, Carnforth Installation of new fire escape door to rear/side elevation, replacement of acrylic paint and cement render to front with lime mortar and lime/silicate masonry paint, installation of new rainwater goods, new soil vent pipe, construction of seating area to rear and installation of rooflights to the rear for Mr Mark Davies (Silverdale Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00273/LB	1 The Green, Silverdale, Carnforth Listed building application for the installation of new fire escape door to rear/side elevation, replacement of acrylic paint and cement render to front with lime mortar and lime/silicate masonry paint, installation of new rainwater goods, new soil vent pipe, construction of seating area to rear, installation of rooflights to the rear and installation of w.c. to rear shower room for Mr Mark Davies (Silverdale Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00277/FUL	22 Rushley Mount, Hest Bank, Lancaster Demolition of existing conservatory and erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr Joe Timperley (Bolton And Slyne Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00279/ELDC	11 Prospect Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Existing lawful development certificate for use as house in multiple occupation for Ms Danielle Frazer (John O'Gaunt Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Refused
25/00302/FUL	5 Coronation Way, Lancaster, Lancashire Installation of an air source heat pump to the north elevation for Arthur Sanchez (Skerton Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00303/VCN	Land Off, Willey Lane, Cockerham Reserved matters application for the erection of a dwelling (C3) (pursuant to the variation of conditions 2, 3, and 4 on reserved matters application 23/01117/REM to amend the approved plans, materials, and landscaping details) for Mr M Almond (Ellel Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00304/VCN	Land At Grid Reference E346743 N452450, Willey Lane, Cockerham Reserved matters application for the erection of a dwelling (C3) (pursuant to the variation of conditions 2, 3, and 4 on reserved matters application 24/00492/REM to amend the approved plans, materials, and landscaping details) for Mr M Almond (Ellel Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00318/VCN	3 Bradshawgate Drive, Silverdale, Carnforth Demolition of existing single storey rear extension, erection of a two storey side extension, alterations to existing rear conservatory to form an orangery, front porch and construction of two dormer extensions to the front elevation and two to the rear elevation (pursuant to the variation of condition 2 on planning permission 23/01336/FUL to amend previously approved plans) for Mr Terry Young (Silverdale Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

25/00328/ELDC	8 Seaborn Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Existing lawful development certificate for use of property as 3 self-contained flats for Mr & Mrs Wilcock (Bare Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
25/00333/FUL	Lancaster Bank Barn, Keer Holme Lane, Priest Hutton Demolition of ancillary buildings and conversion of existing agricultural building to dwelling for Mr R Bryning (Warton Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00337/FUL	20 Alston Drive, Morecambe, Lancashire Construction of dormer extension to front elevation for Mr and Mrs Welsby (Torrisholme Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00356/FUL	19 Dalton Square, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a single storey rear extension and installation of extractor equipment for Mr Nok Hei Lee (Castle Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00357/LB	19 Dalton Square, Lancaster, Lancashire Listed building consent for the erection of a single storey rear extension, installation of extractor equipment and associated internal alterations of the ground floor for Mr Nok Hei Lee (Castle Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00359/FUL	1 Salisbury Close, Heaton With Oxcliffe, Morecambe Erection of a two-storey rear extension, replacement outbuilding and conversion of existing garage to ancillary living accommodation for Mr Darren Hargreaves (Westgate Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00360/FUL	188B Main Street, Warton, Carnforth Installation of a rooflight to the north east elevation, installation of solar array to the south west elevation of existing garage roof and erection of a detached outbuilding for Mr & Mrs Lauretani (Warton Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00396/FUL	Abbotsons Farm, Cantsfield Road, Cantsfield Erection of slurry tank for Mr Gary Atkinson (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00423/FUL	54 Sycamore Road, Brookhouse, Lancaster Construction of a dormer extension and juliet balcony to the rear elevation and installation of two rooflights to the front for Mr Max McCulloch (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00439/FUL	Crook Farm, Slack Lane, Thurnham Replacement roof, replacement windows and doors to all elevations, insertion of new windows and doors for Mr John Gerrard (Ellel Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00440/LB	Crook Farm, Slack Lane, Thurnham Listed building application for reconfiguration of internal layout including removal and insertion of internal walls, replacement and repairs to roof, replacement windows and doors, insertion of new windows and doors and replacement render for Mr John Gerrard (Ellel Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00454/FUL	Yew Trees, Bentham Road, Wennington Erection of an oak framed outbuilding for Mr Jack Nethercott (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

25/00460/FUL	Tidal Reach, Corricks Lane, Conder Green Erection of a single storey side extension, construction of dormer extensions to the front and rear elevations and construction of a balcony to the front elevation for Mr Mark Crowther (Ellel Ward)	Application Refused
25/00465/FUL	Travis Perkins, Oxford Street, Carnforth Demolition of existing storage building and siting of 3 storage containers for Wilkinson (Carnforth And Millhead Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00486/FUL	11A Yealand Road, Yealand Conyers, Carnforth Erection of an outbuilding for Mr C Hobbs (Warton Ward)	Application Refused
25/00489/FUL	Winter Gardens Arcade, Marine Road Central, Morecambe Demolition of the arcade and associated structures, and siting of 3 storage containers for use as food and beverage stalls for Mr Scott Robson (Poulton Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00493/FUL	Broadgate Garage, Middleton Road, Middleton Erection of an industrial building for Mr Elliot Casson (Overton Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00504/ADV	24 - 26 Great John Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Advertisement display for an externally illuminated fascia sign and two externally illuminated projecting sign for AMH Matrix Ltd (Castle Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00521/FUL	Seal Rock, Hillam Lane, Cockerham Alterations to existing access off A588 for Mr P Hewitt (Ellel Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00524/FUL	Isle Of Skye Farm, Scorton Marshaw Road, Over Wyresdale Demolition of existing porches and car port and erection of a two storey to the south east elevation and a two storey extension to the north east elevation for Dr G Williams (Ellel Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00543/FUL	Bay View Holiday Park, Bolton Holmes Farm, Dertern Lane Change of use of agricultural land, creation of access tracks and regrading of land to allow siting of touring caravans for Holgates (Caravan Parks) Limited (Bolton And Slyne Ward)	Application Refused
25/00544/PLDC	4 Ash Tree Grove, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Proposed lawful development certificate for the construction of a hip to gable roof extension with rear dormer for Mr T Tranah (Bolton And Slyne Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Refused
25/00546/ELDC	6 Dallas Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Existing Lawful Development Certificate for a house in multiple occupation for Mr Gulam Hassan (Castle Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
25/00547/FUL	2 Ellis Drive, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of a single storey side extensions, two storey rear extension and alterations to roof with attic conversion to create additional storey for Mr And Mrs Hunt (Bare Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00555/FUL	Royal Lancaster Infirmary, Ashton Road, Lancaster Erection of a new air handling unit and supporting gantry for Satterthwaite (Scotforth West Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

25/00561/PAH	86 Bare Lane, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of a 4 metre deep, single storey rear extension with a maximum roof height of 4 metres and a maximum eaves height of 2.56 metres for Mr & Mrs Shaw (Torrisholme Ward)	Prior Approval Not Required
25/00570/EIR	8 Shore Cottages, Shore Road, Silverdale Screening opinion for excavation works, maintenance, and the erection of a structure to the front for Mr & Mrs Nick & Amanda Webster (Silverdale Ward)	ES Not Required
25/00579/PLDC	2 Yealand Drive, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for loft conversion and construction of dormer extension to the rear elevation for Mrs Hannah Youren (Scotforth East Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
25/00580/FUL	20 Hawk Street, Carnforth, Lancashire Change of use of former retail premises to restaurant and hot food takeaway including replacement windows, signage and extraction flue for Mrs N S Mamrasool (Carnforth And Millhead Ward)	Application Withdrawn
25/00581/ADV	20 Hawk Street, Carnforth, Lancashire Advertisement application for the display for a non-illuminated external fascia sign for Mrs N S Mamrasool (Carnforth And Millhead Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00590/ADV	Wickes, Unit G, Sunnyclyff Retail Park Advertisement application for the display of one internally illuminated fascia sign and two non-illuminated fascia signs for Mr Steve Hancock (Overton Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00591/ADV	W H Smith, 21 Market Street, Lancaster Advertisement application for the display of 4 non illuminated fascia signs and 1 projecting sign for Mr Neil Corrick (Castle Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00592/LB	W H Smith, 21 Market Street, Lancaster Listed building application for the replacement of signage with like for like signage to all elevations for Mr Neil Corrick (Castle Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00599/FUL	Caton Baptist Church, Artlebeck Road, Caton Erection of a single storey side extension for Mr S Talbot (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Application Withdrawn
25/00602/FUL	28 Derwent Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of single storey rear extension for Mrs Janet Muir (Bulk Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00603/PLDC	14 Shortlands Drive, Heysham, Morecambe Proposed lawful development certificate for erection of single storey side extension for Mr Gary Thistlethwaite (Heysham Central Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
25/00606/FUL	7 Grange View Road, Nether Kellet, Carnforth Construction of dormer extensions to the front and rear elevations and installation of doors to the rear elevation for Mrs Steph Winnard (Halton-with-Aughton And Kellet Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

25/00610/ADV	10 Hornbeam Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Advertisement application for the display of 2 internally illuminated fascia signs, 5 dibond graphic panels, an internally illuminated gantry sign and 2 pole mounted signs for Tesco Stores Ltd (Marsh Ward)	Application Refused
25/00612/PLDC	16 Beaumont Place, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a single storey side extension to existing garage for Joseph Deegan (Skerton Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Refused
25/00622/FUL	Flats 1-5, 25 West End Road, Morecambe Installation of replacement doors and windows to the rear elevation for Mr Lewis Bolton (West End Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00625/LB	Timpson, 26 Market Street, Lancaster Listed building application for replacement roof rafters for Mrs Gemma Johnson (Castle Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00627/LB	Lancaster Castle , Castle Park, Lancaster Listed building application for internal investigations of ceilings, walls and floors in Well Tower for Vicki Mathews (Castle Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00628/LB	Palatine Hall , Dalton Square, Lancaster Listed building application for the installation of replacement windows for David Hammond (Castle Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00629/FUL	25 Bay View Avenue, Slyne, Lancaster Part retrospective application for the erection of a single storey side and rear extension for Mr & Mrs Drake (Bolton And Slyne Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00632/CU	D6, Ashworth Way, Lune Business Park Change of use to a dance studio for Miss Georgia Reaney (Marsh Ward)	Application Refused
25/00633/VCN	93 Regent Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Change of use of trampolining and stunt school centre (D2) and film studio (sui generis) to 9 flats (C3), alterations to windows and doors, installation of rooflights and Juliet balconies and two dormers and erection of a bin store (pursuant to the variation of condition 3,4,6 and 7 on planning permission 20/00601/FUL to amend previously approved plans) for Mr M Shenton (West End Ward)	Application Refused
25/00635/FUL	16A Stankelt Road, Silverdale, Carnforth Conversion of a loft to form additional living space for Alex McVey (Silverdale Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00636/PLDC	2 Hayfell Crescent, Hest Bank, Lancaster Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of single storey side extension for Mr & Mrs B Platts (Bolton And Slyne Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
25/00638/FUL	18 Cathedral Drive, Heaton With Oxcliffe, Morecambe Conversion of garage into habitable room for Mr And Mrs Mahon (Westgate Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00639/FUL	10 Buckingham Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of single storey side and rear extension for Mr And Mrs Mercer (West End Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

25/00640/FUL	6 Meadow Drive, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Erection of single storey side extension incorporating garage for Mr H Taylor (Bolton And Slyne Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00643/FUL	Barn Adjoining Number 28, Main Street, Overton Relevant Demolition of a barn for Mr David Birkett (Overton Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00646/PAC	33 Euston Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Prior approval application for the change of use of commercial unit to mixed use unit comprising commercial at the ground floor and residential above for Mr Duom Nhu Nguyen (Poulton Ward)	Prior Approval Granted
25/00647/FUL	15 Belle Vue Terrace, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of a single storey rear extension incorporating roof terrace with bridge and glass balustrade above and erection of detached outbuilding incorporating external staircase, terrace and glass balustrade above for Mr Duncan Richardson (Scotforth West Ward)	Application Refused
25/00649/VCN	5 Fir Tree Close, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Demolition of existing garage and outbuilding, erection of 2-storey rear/side extension and two single storey rear extensions with raised platform to the rear elevation, erection of two single storey extensions to the front to create garage and porch and associated landscaping (pursuant to the variation of condition 2 on planning permission 24/00242/FUL to amend previously approved plans) for Craig And Julie Hollingdrake (Bolton And Slyne Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00650/PLDC	Pre School Centre And Baby Unit, University Of Cumbria, Bowerham Road Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a single storey side extension to the existing nursery building for Philippa Perks (Bowerham Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
25/00654/PLDC	Wasco House, Willow Lane, Lancaster Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of single storey rear extensions to industrial building for Gary Hewitt (Marsh Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
25/00658/ADV	Boots Opticians, 18 - 20 Market Street, Lancaster Advertisement application for the display of an externally illuminated fascia sign and externally illuminated projecting sign for Mr Robert Steel (Castle Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00665/LB	23 St Georges Quay, Lancaster, Lancashire Listed building application for replacement of two rooflight windows to the rear for Mrs Claire Bleazey (Castle Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00666/FUL	17 Grosvenor Place, Carnforth, Lancashire Demolition of existing rear single storey extension and mono pitch/lean-to outshot and erection of a single storey extension to the rear for Mrs Holliday (Carnforth And Millhead Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00669/FUL	1 And 2 Anderson Close, Lancaster, Lancashire Erection of single storey rear extensions and installation of solar panels to the front of both properties and construction of balcony over existing rear extension at 1 Anderson Close for McMann/Anderson (Bowerham Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

25/00671/FUL	1 Marine Drive, Hest Bank, Lancaster Demolition of existing outbuilding and erection of a detached outbuilding to be let as a commercial office for Miss Melina Modley (Bolton And Slyne Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00672/FUL	1 Shefferlands Cottages, Foundry Lane, Halton Erection of single storey side and front extension and reconfiguration of front porch for Mr Matt Lloyd (Halton-with-Aughton And Kellet Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00675/PAS	The Old School, Fall Kirk, Gressingham Prior approval for the installation of solar PV panels to the roof for Mr John Hamlett (Halton-with-Aughton And Kellet Ward)	Prior Approval Granted
25/00678/FUL	1 Exeter Avenue, Lancaster, Lancashire Conversion of existing conservatory and erection of a single storey rear and side extension for Mr and Mrs Daniel Ramsay (Bowerham Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00679/FUL	Belmount Farm, Hasty Brow Road, Slyne Erection of an agricultural storage building for Mr Johnny Hoggarth (Bolton And Slyne Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00684/FUL	1 Alderman Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Conversion of garage into a habitable room for Dr. Aravinth (Scotforth West Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00685/FUL	43 Pinewood Avenue, Bolton Le Sands, Carnforth Erection of a single storey side extension for Mr Austin Butterworth (Bolton And Slyne Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00686/VCN	3 Monteagle Drive, Hornby, Lancaster Demolition of rear single storey flat roof building and erection of a single storey rear and side extension (pursuant to the variation of condition 2 on planning permission 24/01375/FUL to amend previously approved plans) for Mrs Siobhan Miles-Moore (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00687/FUL	Land Adjacent 82 Wingate Saul Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Installation of a bike hanger, cycle stands and tool stand for Mr Andrew Brennand (Marsh Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00688/FUL	Footpath Outside Sainsburys Supermarket, Cable Street, Lancaster Installation of a BT street hub unit with double sided digital screen for Verity Cheyne -BT Group Plc (Castle Ward)	Application Refused
25/00689/ADV	Footpath Outside Sainsburys Supermarket, Cable Street, Lancaster Advertisement application for the display of an internally illuminated double sided digital screen for Verity Cheyne -BT Group Plc (Castle Ward)	Application Refused
25/00690/PLDC	7 Lawnswood Avenue, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed Lawful Development Certificate for the erection of a single storey side extension and installation of replacement windows and doors for Ms Helen Jones (Scotforth East Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
25/00692/LB	Banks Lyon Shoes, 42 - 44 Church Street, Lancaster Listed building application for the installation of windows to replace existing windows and doorway to shopfront for Mr Rodney Banks Lyon (Castle Ward)	Application Refused

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

25/00697/NMA	University Of Cumbria, Bowerham Road, Lancaster Non material amendment to planning permission 24/00473/VCN to amend the layout of the roof mounted photovoltaic panels for Mr Paul Higham (Bowerham Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00701/FUL	10 Royalty Mall, Arndale Centre, Morecambe Removal of existing roller shutters and installation of new shop front, replacement windows and doors to rear elevation, installation of HVAC condensers / louvres to rear elevation for Cash Access UK (Poulton Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00707/NMA	8 Roman Crescent, Caton, Lancaster Non-material amendment on approved application 23/01397/FUL to increase footprint of extension for Glenda Garry (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00708/VCN	1E Queen Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Installation of solar panels to east facing roof slope (pursuant to the variation of condition 2 on approved application 24/01024/VCN to amend the panel layout) for Mr Adrian Eglington (Castle Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00710/LB	1E Queen Street, Lancaster, Lancashire Listed building application for the installation of solar panels to east facing roof slope for Mr Adrian Eglington (Castle Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00713/PAS	Sellerley Farm, Conder Green Road, Galgate Prior approval for the installation of solar panels to agricultural building for Mr Eddie Newsham (Ellel Ward)	Prior Approval Granted
25/00714/AD	Scale House Farm, Scale House Lane, Wray Agricultural determination for the erection of a building to provide sheep isolation unit for Mr Daniel Towers (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Prior Approval Refused
25/00720/LB	Thurnham House, Thurnham Street, Lancaster Listed building application for internal alterations to form new shower room for Mr D Pilling (Castle Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00723/AD	Crook Farm, Slack Lane, Thurnham Agricultural Determination for slurry storage tank with canopy for Mr John Gerrard (Ellel Ward)	Prior Approval Is Required
25/00727/PLDC	104 Low Lane, Morecambe, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the construction of a dormer extension to the rear elevation for Mr & Mrs P Croft (Torrisholme Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
25/00728/FUL	Brooklands, Halton Road, Halton Erection of a single storey rear extension for Mr K Mason (Skerton Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00739/ADV	3 Bulk Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Advertisement application for the display of non-illuminated signs for Duncan Melville (Bulk Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00740/LB	Lancaster Castle , Castle Park, Lancaster Listed building application for repairs to Gatehouse roof including introduction of vents within leadwork for Vicki Mathews (Castle Ward)	Application Permitted

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

25/00741/EIR	Bay View Holiday Park, Bolton Holmes Farm, Dertern Lane Screening opinion for change of use of agricultural land, creation of access tracks and regrading of land to allow siting of touring caravans for Holgates (Caravan Parks) Limited (Bolton And Slyne Ward)	ES Not Required
25/00743/FUL	Banks Lyon Shoes, 42 - 44 Church Street, Lancaster Installation of windows to replace existing windows and doorway to shopfront for Mr Rodney Banks Lyon (Castle Ward)	Application Refused
25/00745/FUL	20 Warren Drive, Slyne, Lancaster Erection of single storey rear extension and construction of a pitched roof to existing front bay window for Mr David Nevinson (Bolton And Slyne Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00746/PLDC	20 Warren Drive, Slyne, Lancaster Proposed lawful development certificate for loft conversion and construction of dormer extension to side elevation for Mr David Nevinson (Bolton And Slyne Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
25/00749/FUL	2 Allandale Gardens, Lancaster, Lancashire Retrospective application for the conversion of a garage into habitable room with removal of garage door/insertion of a window and installation of a covered cycle storage area in rear garden for Mr Glyn Redgrave (Marsh Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00753/EIR	Ellers Farm, Hornby Road, Caton Screening request for the erection of extension to existing agricultural livestock building for Mr David Preston (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	ES Not Required
25/00755/PLDC	49 Moorside Road, Brookhouse, Lancaster Proposed lawful development certificate for the installation of rooflights to the rear elevation for Kevin Olive & Olivia Russo Alesi (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
25/00757/LB	Lancaster Castle , Castle Park, Lancaster Listed building application for the installation of handrails and lighting in Well Tower from ground floor to basement witches cell with internal repointing works and alterations to drainage for Vicki Mathews (Castle Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00760/PLDC	48 Gressingham Drive, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the construction of a rear dormer extension and installation of rooflights and roof mounted solar PV panels to the front for Mr & Mrs Carter (Scotforth East Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
25/00764/EIR	Garage/ Storage Building, The Hermitage Estate, Low Road Screening opinion for the conversion and alteration of garage/ storage outbuilding into a 2 bed holiday let and creation of two car parking spaces for Stour Estates Limited (Halton-with-Aughton And Kellet Ward)	ES Not Required
25/00775/PLDC	1 Cherry Tree Close, Heysham, Morecambe Proposed lawful development certificate for the construction of dormer extensions to the front elevation for Mr P Brown (Heysham South Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Refused

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

25/00776/PAH	14 Colwyn Avenue, Morecambe, Lancashire Erection of a 6 metre deep, single storey rear extension with a maximum roof height of 4 metres and a maximum eaves height of 2.76 metres for Mr And Mrs Parker (Bare Ward)	Prior Approval Not Required
25/00778/PLDC	Deroy, Hawk Street, Carnforth Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a single storey extension to side for Mr E Wilson (Carnforth And Millhead Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
25/00781/EIR	Scale House Farm, Scale House Lane, Wray Screening opinion for the erection of a building to provide sheep isolation unit for Mr Daniel Towers (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	ES Not Required
25/00793/CU	91 Alexandra Road, Morecambe, Lancashire Change of use of the property from a dwelling to 5 self-contained bedsits for Doris Dupeola Hassan (West End Ward)	Application Withdrawn
25/00797/EIR	Tatham Hall, Wennington Road, Tatham Screening request for the erection of an agricultural storage building for Mr Frank Towers (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	ES Not Required
25/00800/PLDC	Operational Land East Of, Sofidel UK, 15 Lansil Way Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of 3 cable ladders for Mr Andy Fletcher (Bulk Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
25/00806/NMA	10 Hornbeam Road, Lancaster, Lancashire Non-material amendment to planning permission 24/00934/FUL for revisions to service yard layout for Edgeplan Ltd (Marsh Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00812/NMA	2 Bottoms Lane, Silverdale, Carnforth Non-material amendment to planning permission 24/00785/FUL to change material of solar PVs from panels to solar slates on south west elevation of ground floor outrigger roof for Sue Chapman and Trudy Hubbard (Silverdale Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00826/NMA	Woodlands, Garstang Road, Cockerham Non-material amendment to planning permission 21/00435/FUL to replace original brick/blockwork and k-rendered finishes with natural stone finishes to match/blend with feature corner stones/quoins for Mr Liam Curwen And Ms Charlotte White (Ellel Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00827/EIR	Appletree Basin, Quernmore Brow, Quernmore Screening request for a change of use of land into residential curtilage, conversion of pump house into one dwellinghouse, creation of a lower ground floor and extension, access, drainage and landscaping for Mr C Beddis (Lower Lune Valley Ward)	ES Not Required
25/00830/PLDC	16 Beaumont Place, Lancaster, Lancashire Proposed lawful development certificate for the erection of a single storey extension to existing garage for Mr Joseph Deegan (Skerton Ward)	Lawful Development Certificate Granted
25/00842/PAD	DCL Transport Services, Northgate, White Lund Industrial Estate Prior approval for the demolition of part of building (bays 3, 4 and 5) for Darbyshire And Horabin Ltd (Westgate Ward)	Application Withdrawn

LIST OF DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS

25/00852/AD	North Farm, Moss Road, Heaton With Oxcliffe Agricultural determination for replacement concrete yard for Mr Sam Bargh (Overton Ward)	Prior Approval Not Required
25/00853/EIR	Land At Grid Reference 353470 468733, Birkland Barrow Road, Nether Kellet Screening opinion for part retrospective application for the change of use of agricultural land to touring caravan site, creation of areas of hardstanding for the storage of caravans/to site mobile toilet/shower facility block, construction of tracks, siting of 3 wagon bodies for storage and the installation of a package treatment plant for Mr John Lawrence (Halton-with-Aughton And Kellet Ward)	ES Not Required
25/00857/NMA	Yew Trees, Bentham Road, Wennington Non-material amendment to planning permission 25/00454/FUL for the addition of a flue to the roof for Mr Jack Nethercott (Upper Lune Valley Ward)	Application Permitted
25/00882/EIR	Strathmore Hotel, Marine Road East, Morecambe Screening opinion for the demolition of existing hotel and erection of a 7-storey building for use as an aparthotel (access, appearance, scale, and layout) for HY Hotels (Poulton Ward)	ES Not Required
25/00884/EIR	Land At Grid Reference E347900 N455890, Highland Brow, Galgate Screening opinion for residential development for up to 93 dwellings with access for Wainhomes (North West) Limited (Ellel Ward)	ES Not Required
25/00889/EIR	Land At Grid Reference E349246 N471955, Sand Lane, Warton Screening opinion for the erection of thirteen dwellings and associated access for Oakmere Homes (Northwest) Ltd (Warton Ward)	ES Not Required