

DECISION DATE 24 June 2005	APPLICATION NO. 05/00591/FUL A 5	PLANNING COMMITTEE: 27 June 2005
DEVELOPMENT PROPOSED ERECTION OF 37 APARTMENTS		SITE ADDRESS GROSVENOR HOTEL, SANDYLANDS PROMENADE, HEYSHAM, MORECAMBE. LA3 1DR.
APPLICANT: Rowland Homes Ltd., Farington House, Stanifield Lane, Leyland. PR25 4UA.		AGENT:

REASONS FOR DELAY

Not applicable.

PARISH NOTIFICATION

Heysham Neighbourhood Council - Observations awaited.

LAND USE ALLOCATION

Within the urban area defined in the Lancaster District Local Plan. The site adjoins a section of the sea front which is identified as an informal recreation area (policy R9).

STATUTORY CONSULTATIONS

County Council Highways - Observations awaited.

Engineering Services - Parking spaces to be provided and retained as such. A new vehicular crossing on to Grosvenor Road will be needed. Naming/numbering of dwellings to be agreed.

Strategic Housing - Observations awaited.

Environment Agency – A condition should be attached to any consent requiring that surface water from parking areas passes through trapped gullies.

United Utilities - Observations as for the last application, 04/00055. There is a public sewer crossing part of the site and no building should be sited should take place within 3 metres of it. There is also a water main which needs to be protected. A separate metered water supply will be required for each dwelling. Care should be taken not to interfere with electricity apparatus in the vicinity.

Police - Observations awaited.

OTHER OBSERVATIONS RECEIVED

A resident of Heysham Road objects to the proposal, on the following grounds:

- The materials proposed are out of keeping with the sandstone used on surrounding buildings.
- The roof would resemble an airport terminal building.
- Parking provision would be inadequate.
- He would prefer to see the site developed with low rise affordable housing.
- The occupier of one of the houses in Rydal Grove also objects, on the grounds that the foundations of her house could be damaged by construction work on the site. She states that structural damage to her house took place when the Grosvenor Hotel was demolished (this however is a matter between the parties concerned).

REPORT

This site occupies an important position at the corner of Sandylands Promenade and Grosvenor Road. Planning permission for the redevelopment of the land, which was formerly occupied by the Grosvenor Hotel, was originally granted in March 2003 (application 02/01226). Although the proposal was submitted in outline form, it was accompanied by a detailed design with only the landscaping intended to be considered as a reserved matter. The original developers, Newfield Jones Homes, then decided that they did not wish to proceed with the scheme and sold the site to Rowland Homes who submitted a reserved matters application covering the remaining details (04/00055). A further application making changes in the details of the design, including the omission of a basement car park, was approved in May last year (04/00420). A copy of the relevant Committee report on this proposal is attached.

It has however been apparent for some time that the original design of the building, prepared in response to a specification drawn up by Newfield Jones Homes, would be complicated and expensive to construct. Rowland Homes consider that it would not be economic and therefore wish to substitute the present scheme which provides the same amount of accommodation in a simpler configuration. Essentially it is now rectangular in plan rather than "butterfly shaped". They recognise however that the site calls for a landmark building and they have tried to produce something which retains the character and to some extent the appearance of the original scheme. The proposal is accompanied by a design statement and also a letter from a firm of Planning Consultants which sets out arguments in support of it.

As before the development would contain 37 flats on six floors. Two of these, either side of the main entrance on the ground floor, would be single bedroom units but the remainder would have two bedrooms each. Those units fronting the sea are shown with small balconies. The flats would meet the standards usually applied by the City Council for small dwellings. As before, the three penthouse flats on the top floor would be significantly more spacious than the remainder.

The ground floor would also accommodate a bin store and a cycle store. Its base level is shown as 1600mm above the road level, in line with the requirements of the Environment Agency. A total of 43 off street parking spaces would be provided for the use of residents and visitors in the car park off Grosvenor Road. The materials specified for the external walls are a mixture of buff and red brick for the walls, with light grey profiled metal cladding for the roof. The windows would be of white powder coated aluminium. The applicants emphasise the importance of using durable finishes suitable for an exposed seafront location.

The proposal has to be considered in relation to the following policies in the Lancaster District Local Plan:

- H19, which deals with proposals for new residential development within established urban areas. This requires that the development should not result in the loss of important areas of open space; not have an adverse effect on the amenities of nearby residents; provide a high standard of amenity; make adequate provision for the disposal of sewage and waste water; and make satisfactory provision for access, servicing and car and cycle parking.
- R9, which identifies the area of the Promenade opposite the site as one for informal recreation. The policy states that the City Council will work with landowners to improve the appearance and safety of such areas.

SPG 16 - concerning the phasing of new residential development sites.

So far as SPG 16, concerning the phasing of new residential development sites, is concerned, the proposal is an amended version of an existing scheme, rather than a new proposal. In addition to this the site is on the edge of the West End Renewal Area and has the potential to contribute positively to perceptions of this part of Heysham as a desirable area in which to live. It would therefore qualify as category "A" under the terms of the current restrictions on the release of land for residential development. With this in mind, it was concluded with the previous versions of the development that it was appropriate not to require an element of social housing as part of the scheme and the same considerations apply to the present application. A similar view has also been taken with the recently approved redevelopment of the garage site in Queen Street with flats.

The development meets the requirements of Local Plan policy H19. It is also consistent with policy R9; it does not prejudice the use of the land along the Promenade for recreation, and will fill an important gap site.

Although the detailed design is different the present proposal fulfils the brief given to the architects responsible for the earlier scheme. It will provide an important landmark building in place of the former hotel and will assist in the regeneration of part of Heysham. Members are recommended to support the application.

HUMAN RIGHTS ACT IMPLICATIONS

This application has to be considered in relation to two sections of the Human Rights Act: Article 8 (privacy/family life), and Article 1 of the First Protocol (protection of property). There are no issues arising from the proposal which appear 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.

RECOMMENDATIONS

THAT PERMISSION BE GRANTED subject to conditions as follows:

1. Standard five year condition.
2. Development to be carried out in accordance with the approved plans.
3. Materials to be agreed.
4. Landscaping scheme to be agreed and implemented.
5. Construction work to take place only 08:00-18:00 hours Monday to Saturdays - no working on Sundays or officially recognised public holidays.
6. Parking spaces to be provided and retained as such.
7. As required by consultees (if appropriate).

ADVICE

1. Naming/numbering to be agreed.
2. Vehicle crossing.
3. Environment Agency requirements.