Agenda Item	**<u>Appendix to A10 Pump House</u>** (*item A5 at 06:11:2023*)
Application Number	23/00571/FUL
Proposal	Change of use and conversion of existing pump house and erection of front and upwards extensions to create 35 studio apartments for students (C3 use) with associated communal areas
Application site	Part Of Former St Georges Works (Pump House) Abram Close Lancaster Lancashire
Applicant	Mr Nick Langford
Agent	Mrs Rachael Oldroyd
Case Officer	Mr Andrew Clement
Departure	No
Summary of Recommendation	Approval, subject to conditions and a legal agreement

1.0 Application Site and Setting

1.1 The application site relates to the Pump House, which is understood to be the last remaining historic building of the former St Georges Works complex located to the south of St George's Quay, Lancaster. The 19th century building comprises a tall single-storey building, externally utilitarian in design and plainly treated, being a simple brick shell with little ornamentation, and openings being simply round headed. Internally the walls are of more interest, being faced in white, black and brown glazed brickwork, incorporating various specially moulded bricks to form the arched heads to the openings and string courses to form the skirting, dado, inpost string course and a dentilated picture rail. Retained engine beds and internal features provide an understanding of internal arrangements and the use of the building. Links to Lord Ashton and the source of wealth means the Pump House is considered to be a locally important heritage asset, identified as a non-designated heritage asset, but that in 2016 failed an assessment for Listed Building status as the building was considered to be of local, rather than national, importance. The site is just beyond the Lancaster Centre Conservation Area, Character Area 1. The Quay, of national heritage importance, but within the setting of this area that extends to, but does not include, the railway line circa 75 metres to the east of the site.

1.2 The setting of the Pump House as part of the wider St Georges Works has significantly altered in the last 15 years, with 149 dwellinghouses constructed to the south and west, whilst to the north there is a 419-unit student accommodation and ground floor ancillary commercial uses within four buildings that are of three to six storeys in height (inclusive). Whilst the Pump House formed part of the latter consent, the approved conversion was never implemented, and the site remains unaltered and in a dilapidated condition. The application site and the surround developments described above are all within the Luneside East Development, a housing delivery allocation and wider regeneration priority area within the Local Plan. The site and wider area for the majority of Lancaster have an Article 4 restrictions on permitted development rights for conversions from dwellinghouses to HMO, requiring planning permission for such a change of use within this area.

1.3 To the north of the site lies the River Lune, an environmentally important Biological Heritage Site (BHS) and Marine Conservation Zone. As it opens up into the Lune Estuary approximately 2km downstream to the southwest, national and international protections and designations of the Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), Morecambe Bay Special Protection Area (SPA), RAMSAR Site, Special Protection Area (SPA) and Special Area of Conservation (SAC) apply, with the site within the buffer impact zone of the SPA. The site lies within Flood Zone 3a, at high risk (1in100 year) of river flooding, but not within the function flood plain as there are flood defences along the River Lune. The site is within lower risk areas of groundwater flooding at the site (25 to 50% risk), with low risk (1in1000 year) risk surface water flooding to immediately adjacent streets. There is a designated hard surfaced off-road cycle route along the north of St George's Quay, with a regular bus service between the railway station and Lancaster University stopping within approximately 75 metres of the application site.

1.4 To the east is the elevated railway line, with a parallel Tree Preservation Order - Number 531(2014) - to the immediate west of the railway line. To the east lies the Lancaster Centre Conservation Area and Quay Meadow designated open space. The site is within 1km walking/cycling distance of Lancaster Bus station, supermarkets and other services in Lancaster City Centre to the southeast. A smoke control area extends to the site. Lancaster Railway station is located circa 500 metres to the south, with the neighbouring residential developments bound to the south by a former railway line designated as public open space; a Tree Preservation Order - Number 531(2014) and Giant Axes sports pitch and designated open space are set just beyond. Lancaster Cricket Club is situated circa 400 metres west of the site, beyond this recently developed residential schemes and the remaining area of Lune Industrial Estate, with off-road cycle and walking routes southwest continuing to Glasson Dock.

2.0 Proposal

2.1 This application seeks planning permission to erect a single storey glazed front extension and standing seam black metal clad vertical extension above the existing Pump House walls to create a 4-storey student accommodation site containing 35 studio apartments with associated ground floor communal area, internal plant room, bin and bike store, and external fenced condenser compound. The proposal will use the existing ground floor arched head openings, installing two additional arched head openings to the east facing side elevation, with three flat head doors added for functional accesses to the rear south facing elevation. The semi-circular aspects of arched head external opening is to contain a black metal detail, with all window frames finished in bespoke black aluminium units, with black steel faced doors.

2.2 The proposed single storey front extension measures 3.75 metres high under a flat roof, with the duo-pitched gable end vertical extension to the Pump House rising the maximum height of the building by 1.5 metres to 13.5 metres tall, with a 10.5 metres tall eaves height measuring 3.5 metres above the existing eaves. The vertical extension roof pitch matches that of the retained gables, with the existing eaves visually retained through slight setback of the vertical extension behind the outer wall and the change of material to the proposed standing seam black cladding above the existing red brick.

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
22/00737/PRE3	Pre application advice for a rooftop extension and conversion of existing pump house to 31 studio apartments	Advice provided
16/00574/FUL, 18/01543/VCN and 19/01057/NMA	Demolition of existing mill building, erection of 3 buildings comprising ground floor ancillary uses (Classes A1-A4, B1a, D1 and D2) and student accommodation above and 1 building of student accommodation, conversion of	Approved

	existing pump house to a mixed use communal facility (Classes A2, B1a and D1), and associated access, parking, servicing and landscaping / public realm works	
13/01200/FUL and 14/01186/VCN	Erection of 149 dwellings with associated landscaping and car parking	Approved
12/00169/FUL	Erection of 8 three storey dwellings with associated landscaping, access and parking including the change of use of open space to form domestic gardens	Approved
11/00885/FUL	Phase 1 of Luneside East Masterplan including external works, car parking and all related demolition and remedial works	Approved
07/00775/FUL, 07/00776/CON, and 11/00881/CON	Demolition of 2 No. Industrial units and continuation of proposed landscaping of reserved matters application (07/00442) to tie in with link from Quay Meadow	Approved
07/00442/REM	Reserved Matters Application For Phase 1a Of Luneside East Masterplan: Buildings 5, 7, 8, 9, 12 and 14 only. 11,000 sq.m Office Space, Ground Floor Retail Space and Residential Flats, and Discharging of Condition Nos 2, 10, 12, 14, 17, 22, 24, and 30 on Application 01/01287/OUT in respect of Phase 1a	Approved
01/01287/OUT	Outline application for comprehensive mixed use development as an urban village comprising of up to 350 residential units and up to 8,000 square metres of business floor space and ancillary leisure uses and other support uses	Approved

4.0 Consultation Responses

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

Consultee	Response
Conservation Team	**Objection**, current scheme results in the almost total loss of significance, which would normally be difficult to justify in terms of the public benefit unless it can be demonstrated that there is no viable alternative
Lancashire Archaeology	**No objection**, advise that the proposed mitigation of an information board including a QR code to further information regarding the history of the site should be secured by means of suitably worded planning condition.
Lancaster and District Heritage Group (LDHG)	**Objection**, loss of much needed potential communal/community space, and loss of industrial heritage. LDHG would strongly urge that this remaining part of the city's industrial heritage is kept as much as possible intact. Question the need for 35 additional apartments
Lancaster Civic Society	**Concern** at loss of significant features of the city's industrial heritage, particularly the interior worthy of preservation. Concern regarding need/desirability for student accommodation, concern regarding height of proposal. Request full pre-intervention survey and external plaque detailing historic importance.
County Highways	No observation received
Environmental Health	Given the pumphouse building was in-situ throughout, it is understood that no remediation work was done on this site, so further investigation and remediation required.
Lead Local Flood Authority	**No objection**
Environment Agency	**No objection**
United Utilities	No adverse comment, subject to a detailed drainage design controlled through pre-commencement condition.
Engineering Team	No observation received

Lancashire Constabulary	**No objection**, advice regarding secure by design principles
Fire Safety Officer	**No objection**, advice regarding fire vehicle access and water provision
Waste And Recycling	No observation received
Planning Policy	No observation received
Strategic Housing	No observation received
Public Realm	**No objection**, subject to proportionate contributions to open space
LUSU Housing	No observation received
Lancaster University	No observation received
University of Cumbria	No observation received

4.2 **19 objections** have been received from members of the public, raising the following concerns reasons for objection:-

- Car parking, access and traffic, undersupply within the proposal, exacerbate existing issues
- Adverse impact upon access and residential amenity and vehicle movements during construction
- Overlooking the garden and dwellinghouse to the west, loss of privacy
- Overbearing height of development in relation to adjacent dwellinghouses
- Overshadowing adjacent dwellinghouses through increased height
- Incongruent design
- Heritage impact
- Adverse noise impacts in residential area, and deficiencies in submitted noise report
- Arrangements for bins and waste storage and collection, resultant litter, odour and vermin
- Impact on water supply and pressure
- Existing drainage already at capacity, exacerbated by the proposal
- Ground floor commercial units from adjacent student accommodation scheme remain vacant, and building itself was originally approved for commercial/community use
- Decrease house values
- No need for additional student accommodation

2 supportive due to complimenting existing adjacent well occupied student accommodation, and renovating a vandalised eyesore, ensuring the buildings retention and conversion. Concern about parking and vehicle movements also raised.

5.0 Analysis

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

- Principle of development
- Design, scale and streetscene impact upon heritage assets, viability and open space
- Residential amenity, waste and security
- Transport, parking, and air quality
- Flood risk and drainage
- Ecology, biodiversity, and contamination
- Energy efficiency, employment and skills

5.2 **Principle of development** Development Management DPD DM7: (Purpose Built Accommodation for Students), Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD SP1: (Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development), SP2: (Lancaster District Settlement Hierarchy), SG4: (Lancaster City Centre), SG5: (Canal Quarter, Central Lancaster), EC5: (Regeneration Priority Areas), H1: (Residential Development in Urban Areas), National Planning Policy Framework Section 2. (Achieving sustainable development), Section 4. (Decision-making), Section 5. (Delivering a sufficient supply of homes), Section 6. (Building a strong, competitive economy), Section 7. (Ensuring the vitality of town centres)

5.2.1 The wider area of Luneside East is a long-standing regeneration priority area and housing opportunity site sought for mixed-used regeneration, and the culmination of over 10 years of preparatory work to secure a new mixed-use area on the edge of the city centre. Whilst the heavily contaminated and brownfield site has largely been transformed by recent residential and mixed-use student accommodation scheme, the Pump House remains untouched, in a dilapidated condition surrounded by new developments. The Pump House had previously been intended and permitted for renovation and conversion to a use class containing financial and professional services, office or health clinic. Unfortunately, this has not come to fruition, but it is noted that developers are able to partially implement a planning permission 18/01543/VCN. It is recognised that whilst student occupancy through the wider scheme is apparently in high demand, the demand for commercial ground floor units is unfortunately much lower, with the majority remaining vacant, and the Pump House remaining undeveloped. In this case, it is understood there is no planning or legal trigger to insist upon the implementation of the part of the consent relating to the Pump House, the result of this being the Pump House remaining an undeveloped brownfield site. As such, the application should be judged on its own merits having regard to the current adopted Development Plan and other material considerations.

5.2.2 The site sits within wider developments and policy land allocations for housing, and the location of the site and proximity to existing larger student accommodation and sustainable transport provision make this site suitable for student accommodation in principle. Students represent an important component of Lancaster's housing market as part of the overall housing strategy, and student studio accommodation forms housing that contributes to meeting the district housing need. This would modestly contribute to addressing the lack of 5-year housing land supply, which currently identifies just 2.4 years supply of deliverable housing within the district. The consequences of not having a 5-year housing supply means paragraph 11d of the NPPF is engaged ('the presumption in favour of sustainable development') unless policies in the Framework that protect areas or assets of particular importance provides a clear reason for refusing the development; or any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessment against the policies in the Framework taken as a whole. This carries significant weight in the consideration of this application.

5.2.3 Given the proposal relates to the conversion and extension of a local heritage asset within a regeneration priority area, provision of high standard of building for student accommodation is considered to be appropriate at the site, if this is delivered to an appropriate high standard of finish at this locally important heritage site. Matters of design will be assessed in the following section of this report, however the principle of the development on this site is considered to be acceptable and policy compliant. The provision of student studio residential accommodation, and the contribution this would make to addressing the current local undersupply of housing, together with the associated social and economic benefits of this, weigh in favour of the proposal.

5.3 **Design, scale and streetscene impact upon heritage assets, viability and open space** (Development Management DPD DM27 (Open Space, Sports and Recreation Facilities), DM29 (Key Design Principles), DM39 (The Setting of Designated Heritage Assets) and DM41 (Development Affecting Non-Heritage Assets or their settings), DM42 (Archaeology), DM57 (Health and Wellbeing), DM58 (Infrastructure Delivery and Funding) and Appendix D (Open Space Standards and Requirements), Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD SP7 (Maintaining Lancaster District's Unique Heritage), National Planning Policy Framework Section 12. (Achieving well-designed places), Section 16. (Conserving and enhancing the historic environment), and Listed Building and Conservation Areas Act 1990 Section 7, 17 Paragraph 72, 73

5.3.1 The application site is not located within a Conservation Area and has no listed buildings within its site boundaries. Whilst the site is adjacent Lancaster Centre Conservation Area, the boundary of this is the railway line, which combined with the wider existing developments and intervening buildings this would ensure no adverse impact upon the Conservation Area. Similarly, whilst the wider site forms the foreground to the Grade I listed Castle and Priory to the south-east of the site, particularly when viewed from the north side of the River Lune, the intervening and surrounding developments ensure there is extremely limited intervisibility between this proposal and these heritage assets. As such, it is considered that the proposal causes no undue harm to nationally designated heritage assets or their settings.

5.3.2 Whilst the Pump House and what remained of the industrial Mill buildings on-site in 2016 were assessed and ultimately determined by Historic England to not be of suitable national heritage importance to form a designation as a Listed Building, the site is certainly of local heritage significance, and is considered to be a non-designated heritage asset. The effect of a proposal on the significance of a non-designated heritage asset will be taken into account, and in weighing proposals a balanced judgement should be made having regard to the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset. However, such local assets have less protection than those that are nationally designated, and policy does not attach great weight to such impacts, but weighs this within the overall planning balance, in accordance with NPPF paragraph 203.

5.3.3 The Pump House is a relatively large industrial building constructed in red brick with a gabled roof and remaining timber louvres for ventilation, with a Welsh slate covering and of a utilitarian design that is plainly treated. The building currently comprises a very tall single storey form that is six bays long by three bays wide, but is dwarfed by the recently constructed adjacent student accommodation units; as it was previously by the historic buildings at the St George's Works, since demolished for the adjacent student accommodation. The key heritage significance relates to the fact the Pump House is the last remaining historic buildings at the former St George's Works, and the association with the Williamsons family and particularly Lord Ashton. This is of great significance to Lancaster as the last surviving indication of the source of Lord Ashton's wealth, which has a significant contribution to Lancaster and its built heritage. The most significant and ornate detailing of the asset is inside, with the retained lifting equipment, hoists, containers and open plan allowing appreciation and strong evidential and illustrative value of its built form and functional past. High aesthetic value is derived from the repeated arch motif, created in fine gauged brickwork, creating a rhythm along the elevations, and internally the high quality white glazed brickwork which survives extremely well internally, which contrasts visually to the glazed moulded brick arches and moulded string course above.

5.3.4 The proposal seeks to remove the existing Welsh slate roof and timber louvred clerestory above for ventilation, and replace this with a contemporary standing seam black metal cladding vertical extension. This would retain the shape and pitch angle of the existing building, albeit in a modern design and finish, retaining the distinctive roofline at a taller height, in a setting where this is now unfortunately less distinctive following the removal of surrounding multi-pitched roof buildings. The design and material were discussed at length during pre-application discussions, resulting in a form that recognises the character of the building, using a distinctive material against the surrounding corten cladding of neighbouring student accommodation buildings, but also used less extensively within the surrounding student accommodation providing a degree of congruency. The pattern of window openings, and the subserviency of these to the existing arched headed openings, avoiding the existing eaves line and appearing to become smaller to upper floors, is considered an approach sympathetic to the Pump House. However, the loss of clerestory and the existing the distinctive roof structure, a key component of the assets significant, cause a modest degree of heritage harm to the Pump House. Details and samples of the roof material, window/rooflight openings and rainwater goods to ensure an appropriately uncluttered and sharp appearance of the vertical extension is required to minimise harm to a modest degree.

5.3.5 The front single storey extension is lightweight and contemporary additional. Subject to details and samples, only a very small degree of harm would be caused, primarily through concealing existing arched headed openings within the building, but also encouraging their retention. The retention of other arched headed openings at ground floor level is encouraged, and two near arched heading openings to a currently blank side elevation is considered appropriate. Whilst ideally these would remain glazed, the setback metal cladding flush within the arches above new black aluminium framed window (and of similar design to existing) is considered an appropriate intervention to accommodate a lower first floor crossing of these openings, again subject to precise details through condition. Utilitarian openings to the rear of the property are similarly appropriate for the simple design of the rear (south) elevation, with plant equipment visually contained by timber boarded fence similar to a neighbouring bin store. Whilst the rhythm of openings at first floor level gives an industrial appearance, these and the installation of windows upper floors within the currently blank gable are considered to cause further modest heritage harm, albeit to almost the minimum degree to facilitate the proposal of this nature given most studio apartments would only benefit from a single window opening each.

5.3.6 The proposal sits within a streetscene of other, larger student accommodation, and a relatively new housing estate, of smaller scale at predominantly two and three storey town houses. From a design and streetscene perspective, the external appearance is considered to be congruent to the existing streetscape, and congruent to the industrial inspired design of the adjacent student accommodation. The proposed development achieves this industrial inspired design greater integrity, given the reuse and incorporation of existing elements of the Pump House. The height would be larger than the immediately adjacent student block, primarily due to the pitched roof form inspired by the existing Pump House, this would still be subservient and proportionate to the student accommodation units fronting St George's Quay.

5.3.7 Whilst the Pump House was originally designed to be subservient to the surrounding mill buildings, as the last remaining structure of this heritage industrial site it is considered appropriate that this would attract some attention through bold design of the proposal at a key corner location in the immediate area. Whilst this would stand taller than neighbouring dwellinghouses, it is considered that this would not be disproportionate nor overbearing in the context of existing larger student accommodation buildings and given the history of the property. Whilst the external design has some impacts upon the Pump House heritage significance, in terms of design, scale and how this would be viewed in the existing context, the proposal is considered to sit comfortably in the surrounding and congruent to the contemporary industrial inspired student accommodation, and would certainly address the unfortunate condition of the existing building and streetscene impact this makes.

5.3.8 Unfortunately, a number of key components of significance are within the building and beyond public view. Most unfortunately, a large number of these would need to be removed and concealed in perpetuity through this proposal. Through any renovation and conversion, the gantry crane and other machinery would likely need to be removed. The subdivision for the student studio accommodation proposed removes the single open space internally, and particularly the creation of multiple lower ceiling heights loses the sense of space and appreciation of the former use. This is particularly exacerbated by the low ground floor, crossing the arched headed openings internally, removing any internal appreciation of these key features. With the exception of just over half the height of the stairwell, where glazed bricks and tiles will remain exposed, appreciation of these ornate internal features, height and former use will be largely concealed. As the primarily source of mitigation for internal elements, it is considered that the scheme for the internal stairwell and immediately adjacent door opening fitting within an existing internal arched headed feature should be controlled through planning condition. The glazed bricks and tiles are to remain exposed within the communal ground floor space within the existing building, albeit the ceiling height here would conceal the detailed arches and cornicing. Even with these mitigations, there would be a moderate degree of heritage harm to the interior of the Pump House.

5.3.9 Officers had sought retention of some lofted internal space, namely through double height communal area internally through the removal of two first floor studio units, and removal of associated windows to those units. Whilst the majority of the interior features would remain concealed or removed, this would have given an appreciation of the scale and ornate features within an open area at a key entrance point to the property. Unfortunately, this has not been accommodated within the proposal, and the scale of harm remains as assessed above. An external information board has been suggested as mitigation by the applicants and Lancashire Archaeology, and whilst this will provide some electronic information and context as to the building, its history, wider context and condition prior to works and developments, this digitisation of history is far less impactful than the physical presence and experience of retained features, albeit more publicly accessible externally. This mitigation and precise details of this should be controlled through condition, but even with this, the cumulative harm to the non-designated heritage asset of the Pump House is considered to be fairly high.

5.3.10 There is a fallback position of a commercial use within a more open plan space, which has the potential to cause a reduced degree of harm to the Pump House and would be an optimal use of the space, from both a heritage and likely community perspective from the public consultation responses. Whilst such a renovation and conversion may have been viable as part of the wider scheme within which it was originally approved, outside of this the figures are much more marginal. Due to the condition of the Pump House, and abnormal costs to enable development of this likely contaminated building estimated at circa £430,000 by the Council's appointed viability assessor, such a use in this location is highly unlikely to ever come to fruition, particularly given the vacancy similar space within immediately adjacent new build units.

5.3.11 Viability was assessed for the proposed scheme. The conclusion reached is that 35 student studio apartments would be viable with a £20,000 public open space contribution, and a 33 student studio scheme would also be viable, but only on the basis of all financial contributions being removed.

5.3.12 Whilst Officer preference would be to retain internal elements within a slightly reduced number of studios, the applicant's considered this unviable, and unpractical to have a vaulted height communal room finished in tiles with very little insulation. Furthermore, such an approach would remove all contributions to public open space. During the course of the application, a deliverable scheme for the public land to the north of St George's Quay has emerged. Whilst this remains at an early stage, this is sufficiently progressed to seek a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) compliant contribution of £20,000 for the design, implementation and early maintenance of this public space. This is a planning benefit to the proposal, weighing modestly in favour, but more importantly a tangible benefit that would be experienced by immediate local community most impacted by the proposal. Furthermore, discussions separately with the local community and the developer has brought forwards the suggestion of using some internal elements of the Pump House within the public open space, providing a form of retention and link between the heritage of the Pump House and public realm, in a similar fashion to that considered to be very successful within the preceding adjacent larger student accommodation led scheme (18/01543/VCN). Whilst this latter potential arrangement is too early to be controlled directly through this application, this can be advanced outside of this application given the potential mutual benefits. However, the agreed financial contribution of £20,000 to designing and delivering public open space benefits can be controlled through legal agreement, and this is considered to be a modest benefit of the proposal.

5.3.13 The NHS contribution is also sought, however the contribution to the Dalton Square Practice for student accommodation on St George's Quay is unfortunately not CIL compliant, due to lack of specifics regarding projects this would contribute towards, nor justification for contribution to this particular practice given the healthcare services available to students on campus. The omission of the NHS contribution is not at the request of the applicant, but unfortunately because this is considered to fail to meet the requirements of the CIL regulation tests and could not therefore be supported at this time.

5.3.14 It is considered that with the design and mitigation measures proposed to minimise heritage harm, would avoid undue adverse impacts upon the designated heritage asset, although they do unfortunately result in a cumulative 'fairly high' degree of harm to the local heritage significance of the Pump House. However on balance the scheme does at least ensure the retention of some external and limited internal elements, making others recorded and available digitally. It is considered that the viability assessment demonstrated that the level of intervention sought is at least close to minimum viability, providing justification for the level of impact upon this local heritage asset, whilst providing previously assessed benefits in terms of 35 units of accommodation and contribution to a local public open space scheme. As such, whilst there is harm and some degree of conflict with DM DPD policy DM41 to be considered in planning balance, the proposal is considered compliant with other policies considered within the section of the report, whilst providing a modest but locally tangible benefit in terms of open space and DM DPD policy DM27.

5.4 **Residential amenity, waste and security** Development Management DPD DM29 (Key Design Principles), Appendix G (Purpose Built Student Accommodation), PAN01 (Waste Storage and Collection Guidance for Domestic and Commercial Developments), National Planning Policy Framework Section 8. Promoting healthy and safe communities

5.4.1 Whilst proposed Studio 2 appears a little cramped, this shows all facilities expected within a student studio and technically meeting the minimum floorspace requirements. The arrangement of other studios is more comfortable. All studios and living space benefit from windows providing suitable levels of outlook and natural light, and whilst corridors do not benefit from openings, they accommodate accessibility provisions and lift services. Combined with a generous communal area, this is considered to offer suitable residential amenity standards to future student occupants, and is compliant with DM DPD Policy DM7 and Appendix G. This compliance relates to student occupation only, which should be controlled through a planning condition to ensure any future occupation is by full-time students only. The studios do not meet nationally described space standards (NDSS) and policy requirements that apply to unfettered residential occupation, but are considered to be acceptable for the more transient occupancy of students whilst studying.

5.4.2 Turning to existing neighbouring residents, the application site is already within a densely populated residential area adjacent to a railway line and existing student housing, and this increase is considered to cause no adverse impact regarding noise or disturbance. To protect future residents from adverse noise levels, standard double glazing and ventilation mitigation is required, in addition to fencing around external plant equipment, which can be controlled through planning condition. The greater impacts in terms of noise and disturbance would likely occur during construction, particularly given the proximity to existing neighbours, and as such a construction management plan (CMP) should be controlled through planning condition.

5.4.3 Existing residents to the south are just over 12 metres from the Pump House, facing a blank elevation as existing. There would be no glazed openings to this south facing rear elevation of the Pump House, and as such no adverse impact upon privacy. Whilst the ridge and eaves height of the building would increase, given the fact this is north and across a cul-de-sac road, it is considered that this would have no undue harm in terms of overbearing, and no impacts upon overshadowing. Similarly, this is considered to have no adverse impact upon residential amenity of existing students to the east. To the north, whilst the proposed development would cast shadows predominantly in this direction, the separation distance of 33 metres is more than sufficient to ensure no undue adverse impacts upon student accommodation to the north.

5.4.4 To the west, the proposed development faces the side elevation, and rear garden, of a 2.5 storey tall semi-detached dwellinghouse. The side elevation contains a small obscure glazed upper floor window only, however the rear garden area is bound by a circa 1.9 metre tall wall, and the Pump House is just 10.5 metres east of this. Some degree of overlooking is expected within any densely populated edge of town residential area, and for new developments the minimum depth of rear gardens is ordinarily 10 metres to ensure opposing neighbouring windows are at least this distance from neighbouring garden areas. However, this minimum distance increases depending on difference in land levels, or in this case, storeys of development, being large than those ordinarily between dwellinghouses. This case is also exacerbated by the impact being from multiple upper floor windows, along the length of the garden, rather than the more common end-to-end garden overlooking impacts the 10 metre minimum is sought to address.

5.4.5 Mitigation has been proposed, namely in the form of openings serving second and third (top) floor studios being 1.2 metres above the finished floor levels of the associated studios. Whilst this appears a modest compromise, design alterations have been required to accommodate this, and this has a large impact upon overlooking of private open space beneath these openings, encouraging upwards views. From perspectives further into the rooms and from seated viewpoints this window height would physically restrict overlooking downwards. Whilst this effect would not cover all viewpoints, in smaller rooms with all the furniture and fittings for daily life the restrictions are a significant mitigation against direct overlooking. However, there will still be a degree of impact upon residential amenity, particularly on the perception and feel of being overlooked by windows visible from this garden, which is unfortunate. Given the mitigation measures of window heights, and the fact this is within a densely populated housing development as existing, harm to neighbouring privacy through overlooking is considered to be less than significant harm, and would not warrant a refusal of consent on this ground alone.

5.4.6 Neighbouring concerns have been raised regarding waste arrangements, and particularly those currently experienced. Waste and recycling bins are to be stored internally within the building, and accessed by doors to the rear. Subject to a planning condition for these bins and associated waste to be stored internally, other than on bin collection days or other arrangement to be agreed prior to occupation, it is considered that this will control acceptable waste arrangements and the bins will only be beyond the built form when practically required for collections and emptying. Lancashire Constabulary consultation response recommends a number of security measures, although some are inapplicable to this particularly site, particularly relating to site boundaries. Security details of surveillance, lighting, window opening restrictions and other security measures could be adequately controlled through planning condition to ensure suitable security for the proposed development and use.

5.4.7 The proposed development offers suitable amenity standards to future student occupants, with no adverse impact through noise or from waste given the arrangements of the proposal. Whilst the design and scale would be noticeable, in the context of the area this would not cause undue harm

in terms of overbearing and overshadowing. A modest degree of harm to privacy would likely be experienced by a nearby residential neighbour to the west, weighing against the proposal, but through mitigation measures and mitigating circumstance this would avoid significant detrimental impact to amenity, and as such is broadly compliant with DM DPD Policy DM29 and other policies assessed in this section.

5.5 **Transport, parking, and air quality** Development Management DPD DM29 (Key Design Principles), DM57 (Health and Well-being), DM61 (Walking and Cycling), DM62: (Vehicle Parking Provision), Appendix E (Car Parking Standards), Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD T2: Cycling and Walking Network, EN9: (Air Quality Management Areas), PAN08 (Cycling and Walking), National Planning Policy Framework Section 9. (Promoting sustainable transport)

5.5.1 The site benefits from good sustainable transport links, within walking distance of the bus and train stations, with off-road paved walkway and cycle routes closely accessible and running along the southern side of the River Lune, north of St George's Quay, and continuing to Morecambe, Heysham, Halton and Glasson Dock almost entirely off-road. The nearest bus stop is very close by on St Georges Quay, providing public transport to key destinations of University of Cumbria, Lancaster University, and Lancaster Train Station. This bus service runs from 7:23am until 7:28pm from the site, and similar times in the reverse. Whilst in an ideal world this would continue longer into the evening to cover social trips, the application site is considered to be a highly sustainable location, and such provision should encourage uptake and modal shift to using these transport methods.

5.5.2 To encourage these further, the proposed development contains space for securely parking 18 bikes, which is within the building itself to improve security. Whilst this provision covers just over half of the proposed studios, below the policy indication of one per studio, this is considered to be sufficient quantity, particularly with additional Sheffield stands providing overflow and non-resident provision in the immediately surrounding open space delivered through the neighbouring student development. Precise details of the bicycle parking can be controlled through planning condition, to ensure this is suitable to encourage this method of transport. Furthermore, the submission includes an interim travel plan, including a number of measures to encourage sustainable transport options through welcome packs and on-site provisions to increase awareness and the practicality of using these options. The levels of private car parking within this proposal, 8 in total including 2 disabled parking spaces, will also encourage sustainable transport through discourage private car trips by having a less attractive offer to potential future occupants that choose to travel by car.

5.5.3 It is appreciated that the positive measures to encourage sustainable travel are unlikely to overcome the concerns of local residents, with parking and highway safety the most frequent concern raised through the public consultation process. It is clear these issues are felt locally, and the source of concern relates to the existing arrangements, and whether the proposal would exacerbate these. The 8 parking spaces part of this proposal are existing, but for the use by the proposed development, as opposed to the existing student accommodation units as within the current arrangements. It is understood the existing student accommodation units currently benefit from access to 88 parking spaces, although public concern relates to the underuse of these, rather than under provision of space, resulting in parking roadside.

5.5.4 Demand for parking in the vicinity has certainly increased in the immediate vicinity over the last 15 years through the residential and student accommodation developments as part of the wider site and allocation. Arguably, public highway parking restrictions along St George's Quay have not kept pace with these changes, which appear largely unchanged. It is unclear what proportion of existing experienced issues are caused by the 419 student accommodation beds, 149 new dwellinghouses or other potential factors in parking demand and highway movements. However, in the context of these wider recent changes, the proposal for 35 additional student studios is considered to be a modest uplift.

5.5.5 Many student accommodation developments come forwards with little or no private car parking, particularly in city centre and edge of centre locations. Whilst students cannot be restricted from owning and using private cars, providing greater levels of private off-street car parking would likely encourage this transport method, and the provision of 84 car parking spaces for existing student accommodation may encourage frequent student drivers to occupy these units. Through the proposal, 8 of these spaces would serve the Pump House proposal, and subject to a planning

condition for these to be used by those occupying and/or employed at the Pump House, this is considered to be suitable provision, without over providing and actively encouraging private car ownership by occupants. The proposed provision and mitigation measures of secure cycle parking and others within the interim travel plan are considered policy compliant and would promote uptake in such transportation methods, encouraging a modal shift from frequent private car use to public and sustainable transport methods. This approach is policy compliant and in-line with the declaration of a Climate Emergency by the Council.

5.5.6 In terms of air quality, and impacts upon the Air Quality Management Area around Lancaster city centre in particular, the aforementioned encouragement of sustainable transport will also offer mitigation in this regard. The submitted Air Quality report also details mitigation of Positive Input Ventilation (PIV), and measures to control dust and emissions during construction, which can be controlled through suitably worded planning conditions, and would suitably mitigate the additional trip associated with the development that includes no net increase in parking provision in the area, compliant with policy.

5.6 **Flood risk and drainage** Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM33 (Development and Flood Risk), DM34 (Surface Water Run-off and Sustainable Drainage), DM35 (Water Supply and Waste Water), DM36 (Protecting Water Resources and Infrastructure), DM57 (Health and Wellbeing), and the Flood Risk Sequential Test and Exception Test Planning Advisory Note 6, 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)

5.6.1 The site falls within Flood Zone 3, which is defined as having a high probability of flooding, albeit it in this case the Quay is protected by flood defences with crest levels of the defences at the site set at 8.29m above Ordnance Datum. New development in areas vulnerable to flood risk are required to meet the Sequential and Exception Tests as appropriate, and provide site-specific Flood Risk Assessments (FRA) to demonstrate the site is not at risk of flooding and would not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere. The site is covered by a wider a housing allocation, and flood risk and alternative sites were assessed during the plan making and land allocations process. As such, in accordance with national planning policy, there is no need to undertake a Sequential Test and Exceptions Test again, given this was already undertaken within the local plan for this allocated site.

5.6.2 The application has been supported by a basic Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) and Drainage Strategy. The details within this rely heavily on the surrounding development and existing infrastructure, with limited information regarding the specific arrangements for the proposal itself. However, both Statutory consultees, the Environment Agency (EA) and the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA), have considered the information submitted and have raised no objections to the development proposals. The finished floor level at ground floor level is above the minimum considered appropriate in terms of flood risk in this location, by almost 0.5 metres. The proposal would not exacerbate flood risk to surrounding properties, being largely impermeable as existing and proposed. As such, the proposal is considered acceptable in terms of flood risk without further mitigation.

5.6.3 In terms of drainage, the proposal details that the development will connect to outfalls and facilities already delivered and linking to the application site as part of the wider student accommodation scheme 18/01543/VCN, which also incorporate this property, albeit for a commercial rather than residential use. Subject to planning condition to ensure the proposal is linked and connected to the facilities detailed within the submission prior to first use, it is considered that drainage and flood risk details are acceptable and already accommodated through immediately adjacent and recently implement development and the land allocation respectively. This approach proposed is considered to be policy compliant.

5.7 **Ecology, biodiversity, and contamination** Development Management (DM) DPD policies DM36 (Protecting Water Resources and Infrastructure), DM44 (Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity) and DM57 (Health and Wellbeing), Strategic Policies and Land Allocations (SPLA) DPD policy SP8 (Protecting the Natural Environment) and EN7 (Environmentally Important Areas), and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Section 15 (Conserving and enhancing the natural environment)

5.7.1 Whilst flood risk and drainage matters are largely resolved through existing consents, development and land allocations, unfortunately this is not the case with regard to contaminated land. Externally contamination risk has been addressed, primarily through surfacing to cap such risk. However, the interior of the Pump House is largely untouched, and unmitigated, in terms of contamination. Further basic information regarding risk and mitigation, with no further assessment. Further assessment is necessary in terms of the risks involved from contamination, and how these will be fully mitigated to make the site safe for future occupants, and during development for construction workers. Given the risk is largely contained within the building, in this instance it is considered that the full scheme for investigating, recording, removal, containment, remediation and validation of contamination measures can be controlled through planning condition, which should be pre-commencement to ensure construction workers are protected, in addition to future occupants and existing neighbours.

5.7.2 With regards to ecology and biodiversity, the vast majority of the site is developed land and sealed surfaces, and other than potential impacts to bats, the ecological value of the site is negligible. There is an existing bat box attached to the southern elevation, which would need to be removed under precautionary working methods. One common pipistrelle was observed community in the vicinity during the survey works as bat of the submitted Nocturnal Bat Survey Report, but no emergences from the building or bat box, and no roost locations observed. As such, impacts of development and removal of the existing bat box can be mitigated through a provision of crevice dwelling bat boxes, with planning condition to control the installation at an appropriate location of the building. This bat survey report also recommends no external lighting to the building, which again can be controlled through planning condition. Subject to these conditions, and the planting of an additional tree within the parking area, the proposal is considered to be acceptable in terms of habitat creation and protected species.

5.7.3 The River Lune Biological Heritage Site (BHS) and Marine Conservation Zone is located circa 100 metres north of the site, and the River has direct connectivity with the Morecambe Bay European protected site (SPA). Morecambe Bay is very important for many species of birds. 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. This is contained within a separate document and concludes that, with the implementation and retention, where appropriate, 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. Subject to the implementation of the mitigation measures within the AA, namely for appropriate construction and environmental management practices and procedures, to be controlled through a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), and homeowner packs including details of adjacent designated sites and alternative for recreation to mitigate such recreation pressure, the proposal is considered to have an acceptable impact upon the environment, habitats and protected species and sites. Subject to these planning conditions, the proposal is considered to adequately mitigate the impacts upon ecology and risk of contamination, compliant with relevant policies.

5.8 **Energy efficiency, employment and skills** (Development Management DPD DM28: Employment and Skills Plans, DM30: Sustainable Design, Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD SG5: Canal Quarter, Central Lancaster, PAN09: Energy Efficiency in New Development

5.8.1 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/ additional development in the District and the possible associated mitigation measures will be a significant consideration in the assessment of the proposals. 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, they must also be adaptable to the impacts of the climate crisis and support resilient communities. One of the primary areas for emissions reductions for development in supporting the transition to net zero is in building to high fabric standards and supplying the new buildings with renewable and low carbon energy. This is highlighted in the Local Plan in policies DM29: Key Design Principles and DM30: Sustainable Design and supported by PAN9 – Energy Efficiency in new Development Planning Advisory Note.

5.8.2 Whilst this proposal includes elements of new construction through extensions, importantly this retains the majority of the existing building, and use of a new timber frame, with savings in embodied carbon when compared to a new build development. The submitted Sustainability and Utilities Statement details measures to reduce energy demand, through specific measures such as building management system and automated control of LED lights, panel heater controls, metered water with low flow fittings and air source heat pumps. Other aspects, such as how the commitment to exceeding the minimum U value and air infiltration standards stipulated in Part L of the Building Regulations would need to be detailed through planning condition, which can also control the implementation of this and the specific mitigation already proposed in the aforementioned statement. Subject to such planning condition, the proposal is considered to provide suitable energy efficiency and sustainability credentials, compliant with policy.

5.8.3 During the construction phases, the applicant has committed to the implementation of an employment skills plan, to support local people sure experience and upskilling in the construction and design sector. Details submitted at present are limited, however sufficient details and implementation of agreed measures to provide opportunities for, access to and up-skilling local people through the construction phase of the development proposal, proportionate to the scale of the development, can be controlled through planning condition to this effect.

6.0 Planning Obligations

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

- £20,000 to the design, implementation and early maintenance of public open space to the north of St George's Quay.

7.0 Conclusion and Planning Balance

7.1 This full application seeks permission for the last remaining parcel of the Luneside East regeneration area, incorporating the refurbishment and extension of a locally significant heritage asset. This would be delivered through student accommodation, in a sustainable location benefitting from a related land and regeneration allocations, in a location immediately adjacent to existing student accommodation. The development of student accommodation will also positively contribute to the District's acute housing supply needs, and should be considered in the context of the presumption in favour of sustainable development. Permission should be granted, unless any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits of the proposal, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF taken as a whole.

7.2 Adverse impacts have been identified within the proposal, namely the level of intervention to the locally significant heritage asset and harm to neighbouring privacy standards. Mitigation has been proposed with both regards, however even weighing such measures, the identified harm to the significance of this locally important heritage asset of the Pump House itself remain fairly high, albeit with viability justification that this such intervention could not be greatly reduced whilst delivering a viable scheme. Due to these viability challenges, without the proposed development incorporating retained elements of building form within the conversion, there is a real possibility of the site continuing to deteriorate in condition. Whilst residential amenity and overlooking impacts are considered to be modestly harmful, it is particularly unfortunately that this adverse impact is upon an existing neighbouring dwelling. It therefore needs to be considered whether the adverse impacts outlined would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits.

7.3 The provision of student accommodation and associated development delivers social and economic benefits, particularly given the fact that student studio accommodation forms housing that contributes to meeting the district housing need. Whilst 35 units of accommodation is a modest windfall to addressing the lack of 5-year housing land supply, the need is acute with currently just 2.4 years identified supply of deliverable housing within the district. With the economic benefits of development, cumulatively these benefits of development and student accommodation are considered to offer moderate benefits, due to the current 5-year housing land supply position this is amplified to carry significant weight. There are further modest benefits of the contribution to public open space locally weighing in favour, with matters relating to drainage, ecology, contamination,

transport, sustainable credentials and other material considerations mitigated through details and conditions, and neutral within the planning balance.

7.4 Whilst there remains harm to the heritage asset, positive engagement at pre-application stage and during determination has resulted in some reductions in harm, and improvements in benefits delivered by the proposal. Importantly, the harm does not individually nor cumulatively significantly and demonstrably outweigh the identified benefits, which is the key balance when considering such proposal that deliver contributions to addressed the acute housing need whilst avoiding a clear reason for refusal relating to protected areas or assets of particular importance (such as designated heritage assets, but not locally important non-designated assets). As such, it is recommended that consent is granted, subject to the assessed and below obligations and planning conditions.

Recommendation

That Planning Permission BE GRANTED subject to the following conditions and Planning Obligations (as set out at paragraph 6.1 of this report):

- £20,000 to the design, implementation and early maintenance of public open space to the north of St George's Quay.

Condition no.	Description	Type
1	Time Limit (3 years)	Control
2	Approved Plans	Control
3	Scheme for building recording and disseminating history	Pre-commencement
4	Contamination report and remediation	Pre-commencement
5	CEMP (including pollution control, noise and vibration mitigation, construction hours, vehicle movement, and protection of ecology)	Pre-commencement
6	Energy efficiency measures	Pre-commencement
7	Employment Skills Plan	Pre-commencement
8	Scheme for precise details of stairwell, door and tiles in this area	Pre-commencement to building envelope
9	Details and samples of external materials (including cladding, glazing, external doors, rainwater goods)	Pre-commencement of external works
10	Ecological mitigation (including bat boxes and planting details)	Pre-occupation
11	Drainage connections	Pre-occupation
12	Implement noise mitigation (including glazing, ventilation, fencing)	Pre-occupation
13	Precise details of the cycle store and trigger for full implementation	Pre-occupation
14	Security measures	Pre-occupation
15	Homeowner packs – HRA mitigation	Pre-occupation
16	Travel plan mitigation (including use of parking for occupants and employees at Pump House and sustainable travel measures)	Pre-occupation
17	Waste storage and collection	Control
18	External lighting	Control
19	Single Occupation Student Occupation Only	Control

Article 35, Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015
Officers have made this 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