

<b>Agenda Item</b>	A7
<b>Application Number</b>	20/00550/FUL
<b>Proposal</b>	Demolition of buildings including William Thompson Tower, William Thompson Offices, Primary Curriculum Building, Estates & Secondary Centre buildings and erection of an 8, 9 and 10 storey building comprising residential student accommodation in cluster flat arrangements with ancillary laundry room, cycle store, refuse store, management office and reception, plant room and associated landscaping, access and service infrastructure
<b>Application site</b>	University of Cumbria, Bowerham Road, Lancaster, Lancashire
<b>Applicant</b>	University of Cumbria & NWSDL
<b>Agent</b>	Clare Bland
<b>Case Officer</b>	Mr David Forshaw
<b>Departure</b>	No
<b>Summary of Recommendation</b>	Approval

(i) **Procedural Matters**

This application was deferred from the meeting of the Planning Regulatory Committee on 1 March for the applicant to submit additional drainage details and verified views of the proposed building and for further consultation to be carried out.

**1.0 Application Site and Setting**

1.1 This site is in the southern part of the campus adjacent to the Gateway building and close to the chapel and Barbon building. Immediately to the south west are existing residential roads of Havelock Street and Cumberland View. To the north are the open grounds of the campus containing sports facilities and car parking. To the east are existing campus buildings including the non-designated heritage assets Barbon and Hornby buildings and car parking. The campus boundary between the site and neighbouring houses is formed by the original barrack stone wall – another non-designated heritage asset.

1.2 The precise location for this development is within the developable area of the campus identified in policy EC6 of the adopted Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD (SPLA). It is outside the SPLA identified heritage led residential site (H3.3) and key urban landscape (EN5).

**2.0 Proposal**

2.1 The proposal is to demolish the existing 10 storey accommodation block (William Thompson Tower) and associated single storey buildings and replace them with a new student accommodation block split into 8, 9 and 10 storeys on the same site albeit not the same footprint. The proposals take advantage of the sloping site to include a lower ground floor and external landscaped gardens. This is an amended proposal responding to concerns with the original design and location within the site.

2.2 The accommodation will provide 214 en-suite bedrooms arranged in clusters of 5 or 6 with each cluster served by a kitchen/dining area and additional shared social space on each floor. The main entrance is at ground level facing the Gateway campus building. The lobby is served by a reception area and office. At lower ground floor level further communal student social space is provided along with conferencing facilities, bar/café, laundry, cycle store, plant room, servicing facilities and late-night access door. The replacement block will provide an additional 49 student beds than the current block.

### 3.0 Site History

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

Application Number	Proposal	Decision
20/00762/FUL	Erection of a 2-storey supported living facility (C3), erection of a bin and cycle store, creation of access road and parking, and alterations of existing ground levels including retaining walls and gabion terraces, associated landscaping and service infrastructure	Application Permitted
20/00554/FUL	Demolition of buildings including Sarah Witham Thompson, Gressingham and Melling Halls, Black Box Theatre, Old Dining Room and the Long Corridor and erection of a 4 storey Extra Care residential building (use class C3), partial demolition, conversion and change of use of the Art Studio from education facility (use class D1) to ancillary space associated with the Extra Care residential building and change of use and conversion of Barbon Hall and Hornby Hall from education facility (use class D1) to provide affordable residential apartments (use class C3) with associated landscaping, parking, access and service infrastructure	Application Permitted
20/00425/EIR	Screening request for a replacement student residential block in area A following the demolition of the existing 10 storey William Thompson Tower and surrounding buildings	ES not required
18/01220/PREMTG	Demolition of existing teaching and accommodation blocks, conversion of 2 barrack buildings to 17 2-bed apartments, erection of 23 4-bed 3 storey townhouses and 2 4-storey student accommodation buildings comprising a total of 30 5-bed cluster flats	Advice provided
18/00399/PRETWO	Demolition of existing teaching and accommodation blocks, conversion of 2 barrack buildings to 17 2-bed apartments, erection of 23 4-bed 3 storey townhouses and 2 4-storey student accommodation buildings comprising a total of 30 5-bed cluster flats	Advice provided

### 4.0 Consultation Responses

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

Consultee	Response
United Utilities	The application does not provide sufficient drainage information at this time so request a condition requiring pre-commencement approval of the detailed drainage system. This will enable all parties the opportunity to work together to reach a suitable outcome.
Local Lead Flood Authority	The revised drainage strategy proposes to discharge at the minimum greenfield rate with excess volume stored on site. No infiltration testing has been carried out which is the first level of drainage hierarchy and the potential for this needs to be

	confirmed at detail design stage. The LLFA has no objection subject to conditions including requiring pre-commencement approval of the detailed drainage system.
County Highways	No objection subject to provision of a zebra crossing, contribution to improvements to Pointer roundabout, implementation of a parking management strategy and travel plan
County Archaeology	No further archaeological investigation is needed
Environmental Health	Condition requested relating to dust and EV charging points
Contaminated Land	No objection subject to standard conditions
Arboriculture Officer	No objection
NHS CCG	A contribution towards extension and reconfiguration of one of the Lancaster Medical Practice's premises is requested, without which they object
Conservation Team	No objections subject to conditions.
Civic Society	No objection to loss of the existing tower. From a cursory review some of the earlier reservations have been addressed and a more imaginative design has emerged for the replacement tower with a building taller than that originally envisaged. Concerned about the need for more student accommodation and the current over-supply of such facilities is evident from the number of half-empty and half-built residences around the city. It is to be hoped that the internal design of the new block will be future-proofed to allow for alternative uses.
Arboricultural Officer	No objection
Police	A crime impact statement provides security advice
Fire Service	Standard advice
CSTEP	More detailed Employment Skills Plan needed which can be conditioned
Natural England	No objections subject to a condition securing mitigation through a resident's pack and notice board

4.2 A total of 35 neighbour responses have been received. All are objections apart from one support and two making comments. The objections can be summarised as:

- The area already suffers from traffic, parking, flooding and litter issues
- Effect on wildlife
- Pollution
- Increased traffic
- Worsening parking problems, especially from loss of on-site spaces (planning condition needed to address)
- Out of character with the residential area
- Overshadowing and overbearing impact
- Boundary treatment issues
- Construction noise
- Loss of existing tower
- Too much student development
- Proposal exceeds height in UoC's original publicity and should be 18m tall.
- Building should be clad in slate or wood
- Car free for students is unenforceable
- Loss of part of historic wall and overall effect on historic site
- Footprint larger than existing
- Campus has been neglected for many years
- Approval should not be granted without a site visit
- Tower should be demolished but not replaced with one of similar height
- Roof installations should be controlled
- Locating a new zebra crossing close to bus stops and a junction is dangerous
- Raising in height is a new application not an amendment
- No assessment from long distance view points
- Building is too high and imposing, towering over two storey houses
- Insufficient consultation has taken place
- Site notices have not been displayed and/or properly
- Location on a ridge is particularly sensitive and this design is insensitive
- "Village" nature of the area will be ruined
- Loss of light

- Increased noise from students
- Location closer to neighbouring houses
- Loss of property value
- Covenant may prevent taller replacement buildings
- Effect on TV and radio signals

The support is for loss of the existing tower and the comments state materials should be sandstone in colour and type and not grey or brick.

## 5.0 Analysis

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

- Principle
- Design
- Townscape and visual impact
- Effect on neighbours
- Heritage
- Traffic and parking
- Other material considerations

5.2 **Principle of Development** SPLA DPD Policies SP1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development, SP2: Lancaster District Settlement Hierarchy, EC6: University of Cumbria Campus. Development Management DPD Policies DM7: Purpose Built Accommodation for Students and National Planning Policy Framework Sections 2, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12 and 16.

5.2.1 SPLA policy EC6 states the Council will support sustainable growth of the campus where it accords with both the masterplan for the University of Cumbria (UoC) and all relevant planning policies. Any expansion (except small scale and for outdoor sports) should be confined to the identified developable area. The location for the new block is within the developable area. The University's Masterplan and Estates Strategy have been submitted with the application along with a planning statement which sets the context for the UoC's estate management.

5.2.2. The planning statement states that the UoC is the country's largest provider of initial teacher training operating from five main campus sites. Changes in government policy and the nature of learning has reduced the number of students by over 2,000 or 30% between 2013/14 to 2017/18. The UoC considers future student growth will be modest and further changes to teaching/learning methods has and will reduce the overall amount of physical space required per head (students, teachers, admin and support staff). The Lancaster campus currently operates at almost double the optimum sq. m floorspace per head (14.02sqm v 7.5 sqm). To remain competitive and attempt to deal with the loss of revenue from reduced student numbers UoC has reviewed all its business practices, including the extent and future requirements for the wider estate.

5.2.3 The Estates Strategy sets out initiatives focusing on reducing the amount of space and improving the efficiency and learning environment of the remaining space. It also includes a student residential strategy which aims to provide attractive and affordable accommodation that is owned or leased by the university. The masterplan identifies estate management issues and options and guides future development requirements. This has been informed by various baseline studies.

5.2.4 Preparation of the masterplan is supported, and officers have had some involvement in it. However, wider Councillor involvement and endorsement has not taken place. Concern has been raised by officers about the short, 10 year timescale of the masterplan and the ability to plan with comfort for the longer term needs of the University. In response, the applicant states that the higher education sector is extremely fluid with teaching practices continuously evolving (as demonstrated during the pandemic). The UoC considers teaching, student support and administration will never return to the pre-pandemic form. Pre-pandemic, all higher education institutions were seeking to adapt their physical estates in line with new technology and advances in remote learning, alongside the growing demand for better and more dynamic, value for money teaching for students paying higher fees. Having regard to these factors the UoC considers the 10 year masterplan lifespan is appropriate and robust and, unlike a longer plan, is able to offer sufficient flexibility to meet the ever changing

requirements placed on it by stakeholders. The need by the UoC for a flexible and responsive masterplan (even if covering a shorter period than officers would like) is reasonable.

- 5.2.5 Part of the baseline research informing the masterplan is a condition survey of the existing William Thompson tower. The survey identifies numerous defects in the masonry and structure throughout the building that need urgent and extensive repair, including total re-pointing and structural strengthening. The survey considers without this work the building's expected life span is less than 5 years.
- 5.2.6 DMDPD policy DM7 covers purpose built student accommodation and sets out a number of criteria which a development must comply with. Other criteria are dealt with in following sections of this report but in terms of the principle, DM7 supports such new development located on campus. The proposal is therefore in compliance with EC6 and the first criterion of policy DM7, and the principle of the development is acceptable.
- 5.3 **Design Consideration DMDPD DM7: Purpose Built Accommodation for Students DM29: Key design principles; DM30: sustainable design; NPPF section 12**
- 5.3.1 The current design has evolved through a series of meetings and discussion with officers both at the pre-submission and determination stages. The original submitted design was considered monolithic, bland and uninspiring, lacking design quality and variation. That building was between 5 and 7 storeys in height with grey brick and bronze cladding predominantly around the top 3 floors and appeared more like a civic building than modern student accommodation. Informal plans were submitted for comment for a 10 storey block incorporating a plinth building but this was still unacceptable. The architects were encouraged to take a bolder and more imaginative approach given the character and constraints of the site.
- 5.3.2 The current plans respond to this criticism by proposing a building of distinctive architectural form that is similar in height to the existing tower, albeit larger in plan. The massing of the proposed building has been designed with an interplay of elements to break up the apparent scale and generate visual interest. The proposal creates more positive and memorable architecture than before, with a striking profile. It now represents a bolder, modern and imaginative design through its appearance, massing, scale, layout and materials.
- 5.3.3 The footprint is L shaped with 4 different size elements making up the single building. There is a central feature tower of 10 storeys running SW-NE clad in bronze metal panels. Its narrow end elevation faces residential properties on Havelock Street. Parallel to this on its SE side is a lower 8 storey tower, also end on to the nearest houses with its long elevation facing the Barbon and Hornby buildings. This tower will be finished in a contrasting way to the taller central tower with grey brick over buff bricks to the ground and lower ground floors. Adding a great deal of interest to the external elevations of the subservient tower will be a network of profiled aluminium fins which appear like an external supporting skeleton. At a right angle to the central tower on its NW side, furthest from the nearest houses are two more adjoining towers of 7 and 8 storeys. Like the other lower tower they will be finished with the same grey brick and aluminium fins. This design and use of materials breaks up the mass and provides an interesting design that is fitting for a feature building in this location. Although the same height as the existing building, the proposal provides a much improved visual appearance of the multi storey accommodation at the site. Around the building will be landscaped gardens providing sitting out areas for students. The proposed tree planting is largely ornamental but this would not reflect the existing character of the local area which incorporates large tree species or help integrate the development into the wider landscape character. It is important the character of the existing planting is reflected in the scheme particularly close to the boundaries, subject to appropriateness of species close to buildings. Therefore, a condition is proposed requiring a more suitable soft landscaping scheme. All servicing and late night entry to the building will take place at lower ground floor level from within the existing campus.
- 5.3.4 The building has been aligned with key views to the Lake District and links within the campus. The central tower is a visual anchor and link through to the campus and Gateway building enabling creation of a plaza. The contrasting materials and detailing accentuate the subservient nature of the towers surrounding the central feature tower creating a visually pleasing building. The mass is broken up through use of different heights and vertical projections.

- 5.3.5 All pedestrian and vehicle access to the building will be through the campus with no new external openings proposed to surrounding roads. The immediate grounds of the building will be landscaped at ground and lower ground floor levels with lawns, planting beds, trees, seating and pathways.
- 5.3.6 It is considered the design is appropriate to the character of the local area and the height is compatible given it matches the existing building. The building could be converted to hotel or residential use demonstrating its flexibility. The proposal fully complies with the design requirements of policies DM7, DM29 and DM30.
- 5.4 **Townscape and Visual Impact DMDPD Policy DM46: Development and Landscape Impact; NPPF section 12**
- 5.4.1 Policy DM46 states that the district has a landscape and townscape which is valued, unique and provides a distinct sense of place which should be protected and enhanced. The Council will support development that is in scale and keeping with the landscape character and is appropriate to its surroundings in terms of scale, siting, massing, design, materials, external appearance and landscaping.
- 5.4.2 The applicant has completed a Townscape and Visual Appraisal (TVA). At a national level the site is within National Character Area 31: Morecambe Coast and Lune Estuary. At the regional level, A Landscape Strategy for Lancashire (Lancs County Council, 2000) identifies the site as an "Urban" Landscape Character Type and within this as a Landscape Character Area of "Industrial Age". The TVA considers that an Urban character type is a diverse and varied area which has seen much change over the years, has a capacity to accommodate change and therefore of low sensitivity. The Industrial Age character area is described as medium sensitivity given it is defined as relatively attractive and formal although with some detracting features throughout. At the local level the TVA states the site is within the UoC campus which contains a range of land uses and buildings, including non-designated heritage assets and is considered of medium sensitivity. Outside the campus the area is characterised by residential dwellings, urban green space and key urban landscape designations with further residential and the registered Williamson Park, associated Listed buildings and Conservation Area beyond. In order to establish a baseline townscape position the TVA considers the site to be "ordinary" when assessed in terms of its townscape condition and value.
- 5.4.3 Following establishment of the baseline position of the site and sensitivity of the local character areas, the TVA completes an in-depth assessment of the proposals' effect when viewed from a number of locations by various receptors in the immediate locality. For townscape character and features and heritage assets the assessment concludes the development will give rise to a range of Neutral, Negligible, Minor (beneficial) and Moderate (beneficial) impacts. Loss of the existing buildings and replacement with a high quality, rationalised scheme promoting connectivity to the wider campus will result in an overall improvement to the local townscape and a positive effect on the setting of the non-designated heritage assets. For visual effects the development will have a range of Neutral, Negligible, Negligible (beneficial), Minor (beneficial) and Moderate (beneficial) impacts on residential, non-designated heritage assets, road users and users of open space. The overall conclusion is that the development would represent an overall improvement in townscape and visual terms and would not give rise to unacceptable townscape or visual effects.
- 5.4.4 In particular, the TVA includes an appraisal of the visual impact from a number of representative viewpoints close to the site. 13 of the viewpoints are outside the university campus ranging in distance from the site of 30 metres on Adelphi Street to 685 metres at the Ashton Memorial in Williamson Park. The views from roads closest to the site are a combination of close-range, direct and oblique, channelled and partially screened by existing buildings. The building will be visible, particularly between properties on Havelock Street. The assessment concludes the improvement in architectural merit and materials over the existing provides a small (beneficial) overall magnitude of effect giving rise to a minor (beneficial) overall significance of effect for residents and negligible for road users. This represents the worst visual effect identified in the appraisal. At other close viewpoints the overall effect is of small (beneficial) magnitude with a minor (beneficial) significance. The medium to long views have a range between negligible (neutral and beneficial) or no overall magnitude giving rise to a range of overall significance of effect from negligible, neutral or minor (beneficial). This is due to intervening buildings and vegetation. More distant views are limited in number but when visible the existing block appears prominent. Evidence of longer views of the proposal from Skerton Bridge and Lancaster Castle have been submitted which do not lead to a

different conclusion about lack of impact on the townscape given the prominence and appearance of the existing building.

5.4.5 Following concerns regarding the accuracy of the images submitted by the applicant, verified views were requested and have been submitted. These relate to 7 views from the following locations: Bowerham Road looking up Havelock Street; Golgotha Road; Cork Road; Coulston Road near Anderson Close; Skerton Bridge; Lancaster Castle approach and Parkfield Drive. The impact on long distant views of the proposal are acceptable, and in many more localised areas the proposal will not be visible due to topography. However, there are some locations, notably Parkfield Drive and some of the parallel streets where the scale of the proposal is much more noticeable and the visual impacts are significant. The verified views indicate that the impact on the local skyline to the west of the site would be greater than the existing building, with the new building undoubtedly more prominent in views, bulkier in form and dominant in scale. Against this, the building is of improved design compared to the original submission and the massing is linked to the wider strategic aims for the site, which include the provision of the Extra Care facility. While it might be possible to reduce some of the visual impact of the scheme given the size of the application site, this may require a larger building footprint, with likely increased construction costs and greater problems of overlooking. Nevertheless, following assessment of the impact of the design, mass and bulk as presented by these images, there is no change to the recommendation.

5.4.6 The existing 10 storey tower is of a 1960s design with multiple telecommunications installations on the roof. It appears dated and suffering from the effects of weather and use and does not enhance the townscape. The proposed building, for the reasons set out above relating to its design and materials will make a more positive contribution the townscape. Given it is the same height as the existing its height and massing are appropriate for the context within which it will be viewed. Local and longer views of the building demonstrate acceptable massing given the existing tower and spacious site context. Therefore, it is considered it complies with the requirements of policy DM46, subject to removing permitted development rights for telecommunication installations.

5.5 **Effect on Neighbours DMDPD DM7: Purpose Built Accommodation for Students; Policy DM 29: Key Design Principles**

5.5.1 The visual impact of the development for occupiers of surrounding residential properties is dealt with in the section above. This section deals with impact on neighbours living immediately adjacent the development, particularly on Cumberland View and Havelock Street, from overshadowing and overlooking causing loss of light and privacy issues respectively. Both roads contain traditional two storey terraced housing running in a straight line away from the campus and development site with rear yards and windows facing NW and SE.

5.5.2 The existing 10 storey building is located approximately 25 metres from the nearest houses, with a single/two storey building, campus stone boundary wall and pedestrian alley between. The closest elevation facing the housing contains windows to all floors above ground level serving staircase landings.

5.5.3 The original application plans proposed a new building 5 metres from the nearest houses positioned opposite the rear yards and alley between the rear of Cumberland View and Havelock Street. The nearest part of the new build would have been 5 storeys. The nearest windows in the student accommodation were proposed approximately 26 metres away, opposite the end of Havelock Street in a 6 storey wing. This relationship was unacceptable.

5.5.4 The current proposal has moved the block to 16 metres from the side elevations of the end terrace properties with the facing elevations of the new build containing no windows. The nearest facing windows in the student accommodation are in the 9 storey wing approximately 37 metres away from the end houses on Cumberland View and Havelock Street. The proposed block is therefore approximately 9m closer to housing than the existing building but facing windows have been moved a further 12metres away.

5.5.5 Any multi storey building close to lower height houses has the potential to create actual or a perception of overshadowing and overlooking. The existing building gives rise to both issues. The replacement building will be of the same height but 9m closer, potentially worsening any overshadowing effects. However, the replacement building, as is the existing, will be located north

east of the closest housing and therefore not within the direct sun path for the vast majority of the day. The only time direct sunlight may be blocked is early in the morning to the rear of properties on Cumberland View. This will occur at present and although will be worsened by the proposed building being closer to Cumberland View, not to a degree that warrants refusal. Overshadowing is also not greatly worsened due to the relative position of the building to the houses and the fact the houses face away at a right angle to the building and not towards it.

- 5.5.6 In terms of overlooking, the loss of the facing windows in the existing building is a great benefit. Proposed new windows facing south west directly towards the houses' gable ends will only have distant and oblique views of rear facing windows in those houses. This angle, despite the height, is unlikely to cause actual loss of privacy. Any perceived overlooking is much less than that caused at present from the much closer existing student block windows. The proposed south east facing windows will have an oblique view towards houses on Adelphi Street. This occurs at present and the location of the new accommodation is unlikely to worsen actual or perceived overlooking of those properties.
- 5.5.7 In conclusion, the current overshadowing and overlooking effects of the existing building will be part improved and part worsened by the proposed development. In terms of balance, the slight worsening of the loss of early morning sun is outweighed by the improvement in overlooking from locating windows further from existing housing.
- 5.6 **Heritage DMDPD DM41: Development Affecting Non-Designated Heritage Assets or their Settings; NPPF section 16**
- 5.6.1 None of the buildings to be demolished are heritage assets. The stone perimeter wall forming the site boundary to the north and west is a non-designated heritage asset (NDHA) being the original barracks wall. A new pedestrian access is proposed through the wall on the north boundary to link the site to the existing car park off Bowerham Road. This will be used for late night access. The opening has been positioned at the location of an existing modern window to minimise loss of historic fabric and therefore will not diminish the wall's historic significance. Full details of the opening are required by condition.
- 5.6.2 Within the campus are buildings considered NDHA. The main impact of the development will be on the Barbon and Hornby buildings (former married quarters). The existing building's poor quality materials do not sit comfortably with these buildings. The height of the proposed matches that of the existing but the highest part is set back from Barbon and Hornby. For the majority of the NDHAs the views would be similar to existing or the impact of greater massing neutral given the site's relatively spacious character of trees. The main impact of the development would be on near views to the immediate west of the site, where there would be the greatest change compared to existing, but where there are few notable heritage assets. The proposed bronze metal cladding, grey brick and aluminium fins will contrast with the stone used in the historic buildings ensuring they are readily distinguished. The location of the student block would not affect their setting or views from or of them. Other NDHAs are separated from the site by intervening open space or other buildings. It is not considered the proposed building will diminish the setting, appreciation, or significance of any of the campus NDHAs.
- 5.6.3 The scheme will be a marked improvement on the tired appearance of the existing buildings and help refresh the character of the campus environment. It would add to the varied architectural interest of the wider site while not harming the settings of the more historic and architecturally significant campus buildings nearby. Therefore, the proposal meets the requirements of policy DM41.
- 5.6.4 An archaeological desk based assessment does not consider there to be any potential for surviving below ground archaeology to be present. County's Historic Environment Team agrees that there is no need for further investigation. Policy DM42 is therefore satisfied.
- 5.7 **Traffic and Parking SPLA EC6: University of Cumbria Campus; DMDPD DM60: Enhancing Accessibility and Transport Linkages; DM61: Walking and Cycling; DM62: Vehicle Parking Provision; NPPF section 9**



- 5.7.1 SPLA policy EC6 states proposals that may result in an increase in student numbers and/or traffic movements must include mitigation to ensure no net increase in traffic movements occurs. The proposal will result in an additional 49 student bed spaces on campus. The submitted transport statement says *“the provision of student residential facilities as part of the overall offer at the Lancaster campus is a key element of the University’s strategy to reduce the number of journeys being made to/from the campus by private car. As part of a comprehensive travel plan approach, there are no dedicated car parking facilities proposed for the student residential scheme. As the development is located within the campus and in the immediate vicinity of all key services that future residents....will ultimately require, the demand for private car travel during term time will be extremely low.”*
- 5.7.2 The framework travel plan is accepted by County Highways and will cover monitoring of travel modes, support for students to travel sustainably and later submission of a Parking Management Strategy associated with term start and end times to minimise disruption of the surrounding highway network and residents. The site is well served by public transport, pedestrian and cycle links. The detailed measures to be implemented include appointment of a co-ordinator, welcome packs for students, information on and new signage for pedestrian and cycle routes; on site showers and changing facilities for staff; cycle parking and raising awareness of public transport and discount tickets. The travel plan will be implemented and reviewed through a condition attached to the permission.
- 5.7.3 A study of parking carried out on behalf of the University shows that on a typical university day no more than 65% of the total 528 on site parking spaces are used, leaving spare capacity of at least 184 spaces. Even with the loss of 72 spaces due to the extra care development (20/00554/FUL) if this is approved and implemented, sufficient parking is available on site. A detailed assessment of the parking implications of that development is included in the report elsewhere on this agenda.
- 5.7.4 County Highways states that it is recognised the University contributes to some vehicles parking on surrounding residential streets but that complaints have not been received recently regarding this. The results of the parking survey suggest on-site capacity is not a major factor in this.
- 5.7.5 A dedicated strategy will be designed to deal with vehicles at arrival and departure times of the academic terms. County Highways request a new zebra crossing on Coulston Road on the north east side of the junction with Golgotha Road and provision of 110 cycle parking spaces. These will be secured by conditions.
- 5.7.6 With the measures to be implemented through the travel plan, parking management plan, additional cycle parking and new zebra crossing County Highways raises no objection and it is considered the requirements of policy EC6 will be met by the development.

## 5.8 **Other Material Considerations**

- 5.8.1 **Drainage and flood risk** - Current drainage is by way of a combined system through the campus discharging to an off-site combined public sewer. Infiltration tests are not currently available so it is proposed to limit discharge to greenfield rates for all rainfall events up to the 100-year plus 40% climate change. Water runoff from hard surfaces will flow into a below ground attenuation tank under the car park from where the outflow will be controlled to the greenfield rate into the existing campus system. Infiltration may be possible, subject to testing, which will be carried out at the detailed design stage. Infiltration is the first aim in the drainage hierarchy and this must be investigated. Conditions proposed by the LLFA and United Utilities require this to be done and the final detailed drainage design agreed prior to commencement of any operations on site. Foul water will be gravity fed to the combined public sewer separately from the surface water while on site. Flood risk at the site is low apart from isolated surface water flooding of high potential. To mitigate this ground levels around the building will fall away so as not to create low points. The proposed conditions can be imposed based on the revised drainage strategy and overcome the previous concerns of the LLFA and United Utilities meeting the requirements of policies DM33 and DM34.
- 5.8.2 **Ecology and trees** – There are no priority habitats on site and the nearest designated site is 600m away (Lancaster Moor Hospital Grassland BHS) with no connectivity to the development site. Two buildings were identified as having potential suitability for bat roosts so the site has been subject of detailed bat surveys. No bats were seen emerging from either building and very low number of

commuting bats was recorded. Further species protection/mitigation is proposed through use of suitable external lighting, no site clearance during bird nesting season, use of bat and bird boxes and hedgehog friendly features. These are covered by conditions. Six trees are proposed to be removed which are all assessed as of low quality. They are cherry, goat willow and cypress trees. The tree protection plan is appropriate to the site with a combination of fencing, ground protection and arb supervision. Replacement in the ratio 3:1 will be included in the landscaping scheme, which can also be designed to ensure biodiversity net gain. The site is within the Morecambe Bay buffer zone and a Habitat Regulation Appropriate Assessment has been completed which concludes the recreational pressures from the development on the designated areas can be mitigated by suitable packs distributed to all resident students. The scheme is compliant with policies DM44 and DM45.

- 5.8.3 Air Quality – A qualitative air quality assessment for the construction and operational phases has been submitted. This concludes during the construction phase there is a medium to low risk of dust soiling effects and proposes mitigation measures to reduce any potential impacts based on best practice. During the operational phase concentrations of pollutants will be below air quality objectives and therefore not significant. Policy DM31 is therefore complied with.
- 5.8.4 Sustainability – An energy statement has been submitted which confirms the development has the potential to achieve a 21% reduction from Part L Building Regulations emission requirements through measures including enhanced thermal building fabric, recovery of waste heat, combined heat and power system, thermal storage water heating, air source heat pumps and solar panels. This complies with the requirements of policy DM30.
- 5.8.5 Planning obligations – A contribution of £5,627 has been requested by the NHS to mitigate the effects of the development. However, the request fails to meet the required standard tests as precise details of the project to which the money will contribute has not been provided. Therefore, there is no justification to request the contribution. In line with the terms of the request the CCG raises an objection to the development in the absence of the contribution. However, this is not sufficient reason to justify refusal.

## **6.0 Conclusion and Planning Balance**

- 6.1 The existing building has a negative impact on the townscape and neighbouring properties. The replacement building is an improved design and uses materials which will improve the overall visual appearance in the locality and from further afield. A worsening of sunlight loss to a small number of properties on Cumberland View is outweighed by the removal of actual and perceived overlooking from existing closer windows than those proposed. There is no negative impact on heritage assets, though there are some localised viewpoints where the visual impact is significant. However, these are outweighed by the provision of on-site student accommodation that will reduce reliance on private cars and free up family housing for other parts of the community. Furthermore, the development will enable implementation of carbon reduction technologies. In the overall balance, benefits are considered to outweigh the negatives.

### **Recommendation**

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

Condition no.	Description	Type
1	Time limit	Standard
2	Approved plans	Standard
3	Detailed Sustainable Drainage Strategy	Pre-commencement
4	Construction Phase Surface Water Management Plan	Pre-commencement
5	Foul Water Drainage	Pre-Commencement
6	Employment Skills Plan	Pre-commencement
7	Contaminated land	Pre-commencement
8	Details of pedestrian access in boundary wall	Pre-commencement of that work
9	Off-site highway works	Pre-commencement other than demolition

10	All materials and details of fenestration, eaves, external wall construction and entrance canopies	Above ground
11	Homeowner packs	Above Ground
12	Landscaping details and implementation	Prior to occupation
13	Lighting details	Prior to occupation
14	Travel Plan and car parking management strategy	Prior to occupation
15	Security details	Prior to Occupation
16	Cycle Parking Provision	Prior to Occupation
17	Drainage Operation and Maintenance Plan and Verification Report	Prior to Occupation
18	Approved tree Works	Ongoing
19	Ecological mitigation measures	Ongoing
20	Hours of construction	Ongoing
21	Travel Plan	Ongoing
22	Nesting birds	Specific time
23	Separate Drainage	Control
24	Sustainable construction and energy efficiency	Control
25	Removal of Telecommunications Permitted Development	Control
26	Restriction to student accommodation	Control

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

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 taken having had regard to the impact of development, and in particular to the relevant policies contained in the Development Plan, as presented in full in the officer report, and to all relevant material planning considerations, including the National Planning Policy Framework, National Planning Practice Guidance and relevant Supplementary Planning Documents/ Guidance.

**Background Papers**

None.