1.0 The Site and its Surroundings

1.1 The site is located on the southern periphery of the village of Arkholme, located to the east of the B6254 (Kirkby Lonsdale Road) covering an area of 1.05 hectares. The existing use of the site is agricultural land enclosed by hedgerows to the western and northern boundaries (together with the existing Methodist Church Car Park), with open fields to the east and south. The land is relatively level until it starts to fall away towards the Public Right of Way which immediately abuts the application boundary to the south. There are currently two redundant buildings on the site on the northern boundary.

1.2 The application site is bound by the B6254 to the west, with Arkholme Methodist Church and a row of terraced cottages to the north west. To the north is a scheme for 14 houses which is currently under construction (The Shelling - 14/00895/FUL), with open fields to the east. A Public Right of Way (Footpath 4) immediately abuts the southern periphery of the site and runs from a west to east orientation, beyond this are further fields.

1.3 The site is within part of the Arkholme Conservation Area and falls within the Countryside Area (as allocated within the adopted local plan). The western aspect of the site falls within a mineral safeguarding zone.

2.0 The Proposal

2.1 The scheme proposes the erection of up to 17 units, a new car park for the Methodist Church, a new access off the B6254, together with a new footway to the north west of the B6254. The application is in outline form, only seeking permission for the new access into the site. Matters associated with layout, scale, appearance and landscaping would be assessed at the reserved matters stage (assuming outline consent is granted).

2.2 The access into the site will consist of a 5.5 metre road which in essence utilises the existing farm access, together with a 1.8 metre wide footway on the northern side of the new access with an uncontrolled pedestrian crossing to be provided to link to a new 1.8 metre footway proposed on the opposite side of the B6254 (circa 80 metres in length).
3.0 Site History

3.1 There is no relevant planning history associated with the site.

4.0 Consultation Responses

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consultee</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arkholme Parish Council</td>
<td><strong>No objection</strong> in principle however concerns raised in relation to:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The impact of the development on the Conservation Area;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Concerns regarding lack of employment locally;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Wish for no further development of this scale to occur;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Access from the site to the village needs consideration;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Foul water and surface water drainage concerns;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Affordable homes need to be made available for locals on low incomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire County Highways</td>
<td>Initially raised an objection to the scheme as there was a lack of information pertaining the site’s access arrangements. Following further consultation, <strong>No Objection</strong> raised subject to conditions pertaining to off-site highway works, access arrangements and associated visibility splays, closure of the existing car park access and construction method statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Health</td>
<td><strong>No Objections</strong> subject to conditions in relation to contaminated land, dust suppression, hours of work and bunding of fuel tanks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Section</td>
<td><strong>No Objection</strong> in principle subject to details on the materials to be used and details of the design of the units proposed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire County Council (Mineral Safeguarding)</td>
<td><strong>No comments</strong> received during the statutory consultation period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Housing Officer</td>
<td><strong>No comments</strong> received during the statutory consultation period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Utilities</td>
<td><strong>No Objection</strong>, subject to conditions concerning foul and surface water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Protection Officer</td>
<td><strong>No Objection</strong> in principle, subject to the reconsideration of the loss of hedgerow to create the new footway along the B6254. This should be reconsidered together with hedgerow that is to be lost which is currently around the Methodist Car Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Local Flood Authority</td>
<td><strong>No Objection</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural England</td>
<td><strong>No comments</strong> to make on the application.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire County (Education Planning)</td>
<td><strong>No objection</strong>. However, based on the development has calculated a need for up to 1 secondary school places equating to a contribution of <strong>£18,126</strong>. There is no requirement for primary school provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Realm Officer</td>
<td><strong>No Objection</strong>, subject to providing 309 m² of amenity space on site together with an off-site contribution of <strong>£32,902</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Rights of Way Officer (Lancashire County)</td>
<td><strong>No Objection</strong>. Requests that there is a 1-metre buffer between the public right of way and the development to create a margin verge. Requests a kissing / pedestrian gate adjacent to the B6254.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Policy</td>
<td><strong>No Objections</strong> and support the location of development in principle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancashire Constabulary</td>
<td><strong>No Objections</strong>. However, recommends security details to be considered at the reserved matters stage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Manchester Ecology Unit</td>
<td><strong>No Objection</strong>, though the ecological report covers a slightly smaller area than covered by the proposed development, however as this is improved grassland the proposal would not have a material impact on the findings. Planning conditions are recommended.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.0 Neighbour Representations

5.1 There has been 3 pieces of correspondence received, 1 objects; 1 neither objects nor supports; and 1 supports.
The reason for the objection is that the development extends too far southwards and should be restricted to the field adjacent to the Russell Armer Development.

The reason for support is that the development will help to sustain the village and provide addition of affordable housing.

The reason for neither objecting/supporting relates to uncertainty as to how the development will be designed to integrate into the village.

6.0 **Principal National and Development Plan Policies**

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

The National Planning Policy Framework indicates that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development. At the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development (Paragraph 14). The following paragraphs of the NPPF are relevant to the determination of this proposal.

Paragraphs 7, 12, 14 and 17 - Sustainable Development and Core Principles
Paragraph 32; 34 and 38 Access and Transport
Paragraphs 49, 50 and 55 - Delivering Housing
Paragraphs 56, 58, 60, 61 and 64 – Requiring Good Design
Paragraphs 69,70, 72 and 73 – Promoting Healthy Communities
Paragraph 103 – Flooding
Paragraphs 109, 115,117,118 – Conserving the Natural Environment
Paragraphs 128-134 – Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment

6.2 **Lancaster District Core Strategy (adopted July 2008)**

SC1 – Sustainable Development
SC4 – Meeting the District’s Housing Requirements

6.3 **Lancaster District Local Plan - saved policies (adopted 2004)**

E4 – Countryside Area

6.4 **Development Management DPD**

DM20 – Enhancing Accessibility and Transport Linkages
DM21 – Walking and Cycling
DM22 – Vehicle Parking Provision
DM26 – Open Space, Sports and Recreational Facilities
DM27 – Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity
DM28 – Development and Landscape Impact
DM29 – Protection of Trees, Hedgerows and Woodland
DM31 – Development Affecting Conservation Areas
DM32 – The Setting of Designated Heritage Assets
DM33 – Development affecting Non-designated heritage assets
DM35 – Key Design Principles
DM38 – Development and Flood Risk
DM39 – Surface Water Run-off and Sustainable Drainage
DM41 – New Residential dwellings
DM42 – Managing Rural Housing Growth
DM48 – Community Infrastructure

6.5 **Other Material Considerations**

National Planning Practice Guidance
Meeting Housing Needs Supplementary Planning Document
Lancaster City Council 2015 Housing Land Supply Statement
Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan – Policy M2
Arkholme Conservation Area Appraisal
7.0 **Comment and Analysis**

The key considerations in the assessment of this application are:

- Principle of Development;
- Layout and Amenity;
- Impact on Heritage;
- Drainage;
- Highways and Public Rights of Way;
- Landscape;
- Education;
- Nature Conservations;
- Mineral Safeguarding;
- Open Space.

7.1 **Principle of Development**

7.1.1. The District Core Strategy requires new development to be as sustainable as possible, in particular it should be convenient to walk, cycle and travel by public transport between the site and homes, workplaces, shops, schools, health centres, recreation, leisure and community facilities (Policy SC1). Policy DM42 of the adopted Development Management DPD identifies a number of rural settlements that the Council considers sustainable villages and can support new housing development in principle. Arkholme is listed in this policy.

7.1.2 Policy DM42 does indicates that in all cases, proposals for new residential development on non-allocated sites such as this one must:

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

7.1.3 The site has been assessed as part of the 2015 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, as being suitable for potentially 10 dwellings (SHLAA Reference 11) and being deliverable within the 1-5 year phase (although this application encompasses land to the south of the SHLAA allocation giving an additional 0.4 hectares). Notwithstanding other technical issues, it is considered that the development is well related to the built form of Arkholme, and the scheme is considered to be of a scale and character which is proportionate to the village. Given none of the infrastructure consultees have objected to the development, the opinion is that the environment and infrastructure can accommodate the proposed development and the site is of a size whereby a high quality scheme could be devised which is complimentary to the character and quality of the landscape and the Conservation Area. It is therefore concluded that the scheme conforms to the requirements of Policy DM42 of the DM DPD.

7.1.4 A key benefit of the scheme is the provision of affordable homes, of which the scheme proposes 40% of the total units to be affordable (6.8 units), therefore it is compliant with Policy DM41 of the DM DPD. The units as indicatively shown consist of one 2-bedroom, twelve 3-bedroom units and four 4-bedroom units. This would cater for a local need. Whilst the Council does not have specific data for Arkholme in terms of the Meeting Housing Needs SPD, there is a demand for predominately detached dwellings, with some semi-detached properties of predominantly 4+ bedrooms and some 3 bedroom properties in rural villages. Therefore, it is considered the type of properties could be viewed favourably at reserved matters stage.

7.2 **Layout and Amenity**

7.2.1 The application is outline and therefore matters of layout, scale, landscaping and appearance will be determined at reserved matters stage. Policy DM35 requires new development to make a
positive contribution to the surrounding landscape through good design having regard to local distinctiveness, siting, layout and scale. It requires development to promote diversity and a choice of a balanced mix of compatible buildings. In particular it requires development to be accessible and to promote permeability by creating connections to existing services and to retain appropriate amounts of garden space.

7.2.2 The layout of the development is inherently inward looking which is considered to be unacceptable in this location. The scheme is designed around the new access road coming in off the B6254 and running through the spine of the development, turning its back on the wider landscape and the adjacent Public Right of Way. However, the layout plan is indicative, and officers believe that there would need to be a number of improvements made at reserved matters stage for the layout to be acceptable in planning terms (for instance, ensuring the road hugs the southern boundary and necessary separation distances to the new dwellings on the Shieling are appropriate). The proposal for the improvement to the Methodist Church Car Park with dry stone walling along the frontage to the B6524 could be seen as an improvement over the existing, and subject to suitable materials this is considered acceptable in principle.

7.2.3 Overall it is considered that the development proposed is of a density appropriate to its surroundings and the applicant has provided sufficient information to state that 17 homes could be comfortably accommodated on the site. It is considered that at reserved matters stage a high quality scheme could be achieved in line with Policies DM41 and DM42 of the DM DPD, subject to the layout being revisited as set out above.

7.4 Impact on Heritage

7.4.1 The proposed Methodist Church car park and site access fall within the Arkholme Conservation Area; an area designated for its special historic and architectural character. Due to its rural location, open spaces and surrounding agricultural land this enhances the character of the area. The proposed layout results in a fairly low-intensity development of the site, and the use of grass verges adjacent to the roads, drystone boundary walls, differing surface treatments to the private drives and also appropriate landscaping and boundary treatments work well within the local context. The key chapel gable window when approaching Arkholme from the south would be also be preserved.

7.4.2 It is considered that the layout would not detract from the vernacular buildings along Main Street which positively contribute to the historic and architectural character of the Conservation Area. Assuming the use of random rubble sandstone and slate is used, it is not considered that the development would harm the appearance of the Conservation Area. Policy DM31 does state that outline applications will not be encouraged within Conservation Areas. However, given only a small aspect of the site is within the Conservation Area (Methodist Church Car Park and site access) there is sufficient confidence with the indicative layout that a high quality scheme can be achieved, subject to the scheme being re-orientated to look outwards so the approach to the village from the west is not dominated by rear boundary treatments, but rather a positive row of attractive facades. The Council’s Conservation Officer has no objections to the development assuming the design is carefully considered at reserved matters stage together with appropriate materials, and therefore the scheme can be considered to comply with Policy DM31 of the DM DPD.

7.5 Drainage

7.5.1 There has been concern raised from the Parish Council regarding drainage, in particular drainage into Bainsbeck. Given the size of the site (in excess of 1 hectare) a Flood Risk Assessment has been submitted in support of the application which demonstrates that the proposed development is in Flood Zone 1, and whilst no intrusive surveys have been undertaken it is understood that millstone grit is the predominant underlying geology to the area which could mean that infiltration into the ground is possible as a means of dealing with surface water. The Lead Local Flood Authority, together with United Utilities, do not object to the development on surface water drainage issues, and conditions can be attached to the grant of any outline consent.

7.5.2 Whilst not raised by United Utilities it is understood that there are no public foul or combined sewers in the vicinity of the site, and therefore for a scheme of this nature a pumping station would be required for the development. This would need to be considered as part of the reserved matters submission (assuming outline consent is granted).
7.6 Highways and Public Rights of Way

7.6.1 A new access is proposed off the B6254 utilising a standard 5.5 metre road together with the provision of a new footway on the northern side of 1.8 metres in width with an uncontrolled pedestrian crossing to be provided to link to a new 1.8 metre footway proposed on the adjacent side of the road (circa 80 metre in length). County Highways initially raised an objection on the basis of insufficient information to allow the application to be determined. Following a re-consultation the County expresses concerns with the site’s location in terms of sustainability terms but does not object to the development and has recommended a series of planning conditions (notably off-site highway works) which the Highways Authority deems necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

7.6.2 Much of the off-site highway works are seen as being appropriate to the level of development that is being applied for, and can be suitably controlled by planning condition. The County raises concerns with the existing footway which leads to the village crossroads from the site as this varies between 1.1 metres and 1.4 metres in width and requests this is improved. Whilst it is understood that the footways may not be to ‘inclusive mobility guidelines’, it would be unreasonable to request this for just 17 houses. As part of the approved Shieling application the off-site works essentially consisted of a 1.8 metre wide footway with a new dropped crossing on the adjacent footway (the same footway the County is seeking the improvements to). This was for a development of 14 houses and therefore akin to what is being applied for here (albeit the development subject to this application is more distant from the village centre). Whilst the comments of the County are noted, on balance it is not considered it would be possible to resist the application based on the footways to the village centre not being 1.8 metres in width, and given the proposal for an additional footway which would allow a safe passage of movement into the village, together with links to the public right of way, as part of the balancing exercise this is considered acceptable. The County has also requested an upgrade to the bus stops to quality bus stop standards. One of these bus stops contains a shelter with the other being an open bus stop. In view of the Local Planning Authority’s concerns relating to the extent of the works suggested by the Highway Authority further discussion will be had with County regarding off-site highway works and an update will be reported verbally to Committee.

7.6.3 There is a Public Right of Way (PROW) crossing the southern boundary of the site. Initially the application proposed to abut this boundary (with gardens backing onto this). However, the applicant has since amended this to include a 2 metre buffer between the footpath and the proposed gardens. This is still unacceptable in terms of security, landscape, heritage and design. The access road needs to abut the southern boundary so that the setting of the PROW is not adversely affected. It also removes the poor relationship between a footpath and the rear gardens, which is a security concern. Dry stone walls would not provide the gardens with sufficient privacy and hedges (which would be appropriate in landscape terms) would not provide the required security. From a landscape perspective close boarded timber fencing is out of the question. However, given the development is indicative at present this can be incorporated into the design at reserved matter stage. The County Council’s Public Rights of Way Officer has requested that the PROW be stoned up until it reaches Main Street (circa 300 metres) as the route is currently just defined from where users have walked across the grassland. Whilst this has a lot of benefits (as there would be provide an alternative option to walking along the B6254), the path diverts away from the village centre leaving its users some 225m south of the crossroads. The path also crosses undulating fields and would remain unlit, so it would not be overly user friendly. In conclusion, the stoning up of the path would have limited benefit, and as such is not required to make the development acceptable in planning terms.

7.6.4 Overall, subject to the imposition of conditions addressing off-site highway works, construction of the site access (including replacement planting) and protection of visibility splays, the scheme is acceptable from a planning perspective.

7.7 Landscape

7.7.1 Policy DM28 and the NPPF seeks to attach great weight to the protection of nationally important designated landscapes. For the avoidance of doubt, it should be noted that the application site is not located within any such designation (e.g. AONB or National Park). Given this is an outline application, matters associated with siting, design, materials, external appearance and landscaping will be determined at the reserved matters stage should this outline application be approved.
The development is on land allocated as open countryside in the adopted local plan and it is inevitable the proposed development will lead to a landscape impact simply on the basis that the site will lose its previously recognised greenfield character. This is particularly true for users of the Public Right of Way, where there would be a localised significant impact as users traverse passed the site. Special consideration will need to be paid between the relationship of the footway and the built development and this can be considered further at reserved matters stage. Notwithstanding, this a change from open land to a developed form is not necessarily harmful subject to the layout changes already outlined in this report. Subject to the scheme’s layout being revised and the properties being appropriately designed to preserve the character of the village, it is deemed that the benefits arising from the scheme in increasing the supply of new homes in the District is likely to outweigh the loss of the open field, but this will need to be fully considered at the reserved matters stage.

Education

The County Council as the education authority has sought an education contribution of £18,126 towards the provision of 1 secondary school place at Carnforth High School (the nearest high school to the site). There is no contribution sought towards the provision of primary school places. The applicant’s agent has questioned the need for the contribution to be made for the secondary school places. The officer’s view is that it is essential that development coming forward makes provision for essential community infrastructure; education would fall within this. With the growth in housing numbers that the District will experience over the plan period it is essential that there are sufficient school spaces to accommodate the additional pupils that the development is likely to yield. A request can only be sought where they are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, related to the development and fair and reasonable in scale and kind. It is considered that the request does not meet these requirements as the nearest secondary school is in Kirkby Lonsdale and therefore the contribution sought by Lancashire County Council would be unlikely to be spent on the school that is most likely to serve the development’s needs.

Nature Conservation

In order to accommodate the development there will be a need to lose hedgerow along the frontage to the site (for the access and replacement car park). This is in addition to the hedgerow to facilitate the new pedestrian footway to the north west of the B6254. The Council’s Tree Protection Officer has concerns with the loss of the hedgerow to accommodate the footway on the adjacent parcel of land, together with hedgerow loss to create the new car park. Any development, especially development which involves the provision of a new access/pavement is inevitably going to involve the loss of some trees and hedgerow to accommodate not only the access but to ensure that the visibility splays can be achieved and therefore ensuring that there is a safe means of access/egress.

The Tree Protection Officer’s concerns are shared by the case officer as the hedgerows play an important role in the amenity of the area and the character of the Conservation Area. In terms of the loss of hedgerow along the site’s frontage, this is principally for the new car park which is proposed to be enclosed by dry stone walling. To achieve the required sightlines the hedgerow would also need to be cut back to no greater than 1 metre in height (particularly to the south). With respect to the hedgerow loss to compensate for the new footway on the adjacent side of the road, it should be explored as opposed to removing this, whether the hedgerow could be pushed back and/or translocated (assuming undertaken in winter), albeit it is understood there is a low stone wall within the hedgerow at this location which may make this process difficult to achieve. In the event this cannot be undertaken there would be some short term landscape impact associated with the implementation of the new footway and the establishment of the new hedgerow. However, this has to be balanced against the provision of new homes and providing a safe means of access to village amenities. It is unfortunate that the application does not contain the replacement planting detail but there is confidence that through an appropriate landscaping scheme for the access and footway detail that a replacement landscaping scheme (together with long term maintenance) can be achieved which is appropriate to rural setting of the site.

Natural England raises no objection to the development. The site is not covered by any statutory designation and given the site is farmed and trees would remain as part of the scheme it is not considered there would be any detrimental impact on ecology. This is a view echoed by Greater Manchester Ecological Unit who raise no objection. Through a high quality landscaping scheme to
be secured at reserved matters stage there is the potential to offer an enhancement to biodiversity of the area and therefore considered that the scheme is compliant with Policy DM27 of the DM DPD.

7.10 Mineral Safeguarding

7.10.1 Approximately 25% of the site is covered by a mineral safeguarding zone. The County Council as the minerals and waste authority has not responded to the consultation request. However, given the location of the area of safeguarding (directly adjacent to Bainsbeck House and the existing beck), it is highly unlikely that the site would be able to be commercially worked for mineral. Notwithstanding this, there may be the opportunity for a prior extraction exercise to take place, though given the constraints of the site this is unlikely to be feasible and in the absence of a response from the County it is not considered there would be any sterilisation of mineral resource by non-minerals development and therefore the scheme complies with Policy M2 of the Lancashire Minerals and Waste Local Plan.

7.11 Open Space

7.11.1 The applicant’s layout does not include any provision for open space at present and there will be a requirement for open space should the scheme be approved by Committee. The applicant is amenable to providing on-site open space but has questioned the need for the off-site contribution given this was not requested on the recently approved ‘The Sheiling’ scheme. There has been a change in policy background since the approval of ‘The Sheiling’, given the recently published Planning Advice Note on Open Space which was approved by the Council in June 2015. Coupled with the requirements outlined in Policy DM26 of the DM DPD, it is considered reasonable to ask for such a contribution to be made. The village lacks equipped play area for children and its football pitch is poorly drained. A contribution could therefore be supported to provide for a new facility or to enhance an existing one. The applicant is amenable to this, subject of it being reviewed further at reserved matters stage when number of units and bedrooms are known. This is considered reasonable.

8.0 Planning Obligations

8.1 A Section 106 Legal Agreement is sought to secure the following:

- Up to 40% provision of affordable housing (percentage, tenure, size, type, phasing to be agreed at Reserved Matters stage based on local housing needs and viability);
- Provision for long term drainage, open space and landscaping maintenance management company; and,
- Off-site contribution for open space (to be calculated at Reserved Matters Stage).

With Committee’s support, Officers seek delegation to ensure that the Section 106 Agreement is signed within the 13 week deadline (i.e. before 21 January 2016), otherwise the application be refused under delegated powers.

9.0 Conclusions

9.1 The site is located in a sustainable location, adjacent to existing development, and will provide an important contribution towards housing supply within the District. It is considered that the development could be accommodated on the site without a significant impact on the character and appearance of the landscape and will be served by an appropriate means of access.

9.2 The Council does not have a five year land supply of housing and as such the application should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. This means granting planning permission unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, or specific policies in the NPPF indicate development should be restricted. Taking all matters into consideration, it is not considered that any adverse impacts of granting consent significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits and there are no specific policies in the NPPF that indicate development should be restricted. As such, it is considered that the proposal represents a sustainable form of development and accords with the NPPF.
**Recommendation**

That Outline Planning Permission **BE GRANTED** subject to the signing and completing of a legal agreement securing:

- Up to 40% provision of affordable housing (percentage, tenure, size, type, phasing to be agreed at Reserved Matters stage based on local housing needs and viability);
- Provision for long term drainage, open space and landscaping maintenance management company;
- Off-site contribution for open space (to be calculated at Reserved Matters Stage)

and the following conditions:

1. Reserved Matters to be submitted (scale, layout, landscaping and appearance)
2. Development in accordance with plan (red line and access plan)
3. Layout plan – indicative only
4. Construction details for the access/footways
5. Offsite highway works
6. Protection of visibility Splays (2.4 m x 45 metres).
7. Scheme for Foul Water to be submitted
8. Surface Water Drainage Scheme
9. SuDs management and maintenance plan
10. Construction Method Statement
11. AMS to be submitted
12. Finished Floor Levels and site levels to be submitted
13. Scheme for electric vehicle charging points
14. Landscaping Management Plan
15. Replacement Planting scheme – Access and New Footway
16. Contaminated Land


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

Lancaster City Council has made the recommendation in a positive and proactive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development, working proactively with the agent 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.

**Human Rights Act**

This recommendation has been reached after consideration of the provisions of The Human Rights Act. Unless otherwise stated in this 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.

**Background Papers**

None.