

---

## Appeal Decision

Hearing held on 11 August 2015

Site visit made on 11 August 2015

**by M Seaton DipTP MRTPI**

**an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government**

**Decision date: 26 January 2016**

---

**Appeal Ref: APP/M0933/W/15/3003034**

**Fishwicks Ltd. Beetham Hall, Beetham, Milnthorpe, LA7 7BQ**

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
  - The appeal is made by Mr J Fishwick against the decision of South Lakeland District Council.
  - The application Ref SL/2014/0701, dated 15 July 2014, was refused by notice dated 4 November 2014.
  - The development proposed is a change of use, extension and alteration to create a crematorium, associated landscaping, car parking, and associated changes of land use.
- 

### Procedural Matters

1. During the course of the planning application, the appellant amended the proposed development to remove the elements related to the provision of a workshop on the site of the existing piggery, which was to have been demolished. I have amended the description of development to reflect these changes and remove the references to these elements.
2. Amendments were also made prior to the refusal of planning permission to the location and quantum of parking to be provided in connection with the proposed use, and a reduction in the size of the timber fins proposed for the main crematorium building. In addition, a number of documents and further submissions from the main parties were submitted with the appeal and at the Hearing. These submissions and documents were addressed and referenced at the Hearing and my decision has therefore taken these additional documents into account.

### Decision

3. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for a change of use, extension and alteration to create a crematorium, associated landscaping, car parking, and associated changes of land use at Fishwicks Ltd. Beetham Hall, Beetham, Milnthorpe, LA7 7BQ in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref SL/2014/0701, dated 15 July 2014, subject to the conditions attached in the Annex.

### Application for costs

4. At the Hearing an application for costs was made by Mr J Fishwick against South Lakeland District Council. This application will be the subject of a separate Decision.
-

## **Main Issue**

5. The main issue is whether the proposed development would conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the Arnside and Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.

## **Reasons**

6. The appeal site comprises a group of buildings located to the west of the A6, between the villages of Milnthorpe to the north, and Hale to the south. The buildings include Grade II & II\* listed farmhouse and outbuildings, as well as other listed and unlisted buildings and structures, and a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) in the form of the uninhabited part of Beetham Hall including the curtain wall, former hall, solar wing, and buttery. The land surrounding the appeal site is largely agricultural, with an extensive area of woodland located further to the west, the cluster of residential properties in Hale located broadly to the south, and dwellings and a school in Milnthorpe to the north. An established funeral service business is currently run from the appeal site, utilising some of the existing buildings on the site in connection with the business, including for the manufacture of coffins, offices, and the storage of vehicles and equipment. Access to the site is obtained via a short macadam lane. The appeal site is located within open countryside and the Arnside and Silverdale Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (the AONB).
7. It was established at the Hearing that the Development Plan comprises the policies of the South Lakeland Core Strategy 2010 (the Core Strategy), the South Lakeland Allocation of Land Development Plan Document 2013 (the DPD), and the saved Policies of the South Lakeland District Council Local Plan 2006 (the Local Plan). Neither the Council nor appellant has drawn my attention to a specific Development Plan policy regarding crematoria, although paragraphs 11.22 – 11.25 of the South Lakeland Land Allocations Infrastructure Delivery Plan 2013 (the Delivery Plan) have been referred to in relation to crematoria.
8. In establishing the locational criteria for crematoria, my attention has been drawn by the Statement of Common Ground (the SoCG) to the requirements governing crematoria as set out in the primary legislation of the *Cremation Act 1902*, which are still engaged. The Cremation Act advises that sites should be at least 200 yards (183 metres) from any dwelling unless the owner, lessee or occupier has given their consent in writing, and at least 50 yards (46m) from a public highway. Whilst this would not necessarily preclude urban sites, in order to meet these requirements, there would seem to be support for the contention that crematoria should be situated within rural locations and in all likelihood within the open countryside. I note on the basis of the submitted evidence that this conclusion is consistent with the views reached by Inspectors on previous appeal decisions.
9. My attention has been drawn to Policies CS5 and CS8.2 of the Core Strategy, insofar as they address matters related to development within the AONB. These policies seek to give high priority to the conservation and enhancement of the character of the landscape within the AONB, including its historic dimensions, and safeguarding the identified attributes from inappropriate change and development. Furthermore, development should safeguard and enhance buildings, sites and areas of heritage and cultural importance, whilst the location, scale, design and materials should protect, conserve and where

- possible enhance the special qualities of the environment associated with the AONB.
10. The Framework broadly reflects this requirement, but also sets out at paragraph 115 that great weight should be given to conserving landscape and scenic beauty in AONBs, which have the highest status of protection in relation to landscape and scenic beauty. At paragraph 116 it is indicated that permission should be refused for major developments in an AONB except in exceptional circumstances and where it can be demonstrated they are in the public interest. However, it is set out that consideration of such development should include an assessment of the cost of, and scope for, developing elsewhere outside the designated area, or meeting the need for it in some other way.
  11. The planning application as submitted was assessed as a major development by the Council for development management purposes, with the site location plan identifying a 'red edge' of in excess of 1 hectare. However, I note that as a consequence of amendments to the scope of the planning application, it is common ground that the areas subject to the change of use would not exceed 1 hectare. In seeking to define 'major development', I have been mindful of paragraph 005 Reference ID: 8-005-20140306 of the Planning Practice Guidance, which states that "*Whether a proposed development in these designated areas should be treated as a major development, to which the policy in paragraph 116 of the Framework applies, will be a matter for the relevant decision taker, taking into account the proposal in question and the local context.*" The main parties have agreed that the word 'major' should take on its natural meaning and address the development in its context, which in the absence of any defined meaning in the context of the Framework or AONBs, I consider to be an appropriate and reasonable conclusion.
  12. In this respect, I must therefore make my own assessment, on the basis of the particular facts and circumstances of this case. The proposed development would include works to facilitate the conversion and adaptation of the existing composite metal clad workshop and garage into a crematorium, the provision of a chimney flue in metal housing, a porte-cochere at the entrance way, a new fenced service yard, and a new driveway and parking area. Having regard to the context of the works to the existing complex of buildings, and associated areas of hardstanding and access, I am satisfied that the scope of the works incorporating as they would the conversion of the existing building and provision of areas of parking, and the proposed intensity of use of the site, would not in themselves constitute major development taking on its natural meaning. It is not therefore necessary for the appellant to demonstrate exceptional circumstances and public interest in accordance with paragraph 116 of the Framework, the provisions of which are not therefore engaged.
  13. Turning to the proposal itself, I note that the SoCG confirms that there is no dispute between the main parties over the design treatment of the modern building or that this would have a significant impact on the landscape. I observed the existing building from a number of viewpoints in the vicinity including from public footpaths and private gardens, and consider it to be a widely visible building within the complex, particularly from the A6, Hale, and the public footpath to the south-west. However, whilst I have had regard to the addition of the chimney flue and the visually unusual form of the Siberian Larch Timber fins compared to the existing composite cladding, I am satisfied that the alterations to the appearance of the building would not significantly or

unacceptably increase its prominence within the context of the wider complex. Whilst the fencing of a service yard and addition of a porte-cochere would result in an increased extent of built-form and enclosure, these elements of the proposals would be located immediately adjacent to the main crematorium building, and would be read in the context of the existing built form of the wider complex. These elements of the works would not therefore have an adverse impact on the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB.

14. The proposed car parking would be formed of a mix of Macadam, Gravel, and Grasscrete (or similar) finishes, and would be located adjacent to the new access road, and parallel to the field boundary running along the A6. Whilst parts of the parking areas would as a consequence of their position adjacent to existing hedgerows and screening within the appeal site be less visible from the A6, the use of hard finishes would undoubtedly alter the character of this part of the AONB from that of existing pastoral farmland. However, I accept that when the areas of car parking are not in use the existing broad sense of visual openness currently available would remain. Nevertheless, I note that the appellant's LVIA submitted with the appeal has concluded that there would be minor direct adverse effects on the existing landscape character on the edge of the AONB from the development as a whole. Whilst I would accept this conclusion in the context of the physical works, the use of the proposed car park for up to 4 services per day and the consequent visual impact of varying numbers of parked vehicles, would result in a more significant adverse effect when considered in the context of the prevailing lower-lying undulating farmland character of the AONB landscape at this point.
15. I have carefully considered the written and verbal submissions made regarding the possibility that the impact of the development on the AONB, and in particular from the car parking, could be mitigated through the provision of additional landscaping. Whilst I would accept that, given time, some screening of the car parking areas would be visually beneficial as a means of mitigating the impact of the car parking and its use, the introduction of screen planting within the locations where it would be necessary would in itself introduce a feature which would not be characteristic of the landscape form and openness of this part of the AONB. As a consequence, such planting, whilst potentially beneficial for the purpose of screening the development, would itself result in some limited visual harm to the character of the AONB.
16. I am satisfied that the proposed porte-cochere, service yard, and alterations to adapt the main crematorium building including the addition of a chimney, would not, given their form, scale and position, result in an adverse impact on the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB. However, it is evident on the basis of the submissions and my observations on site that the proposed car parking and access would appear as an uncharacteristic form of development in the context of the open pastoral farmland character of this part of the AONB. Whilst I have had regard to the possibility of the beneficial impact of planting on the appeal site, the proposal would nevertheless fail to conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB. This would conflict with Core Strategy policies CS5 and CS8.2. These policies give high priority to the conservation and enhancement of the character of the landscape and the special qualities of the environment associated with the AONB. In this respect the proposal would also be contrary to paragraph 115 of the Framework, which attaches great weight to the conservation of the landscape and scenic beauty in AONBs.

## **Other Matters**

### *Impact on Heritage Assets*

17. In determining this appeal, I have a statutory duty, under Section 66(1) of the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, to consider the impact of the proposal on the special architectural and historic interest of the listed buildings affected, and their settings. I am also mindful that paragraph 132 of the Framework states that when considering the impact of a proposed development on the significance of a designated heritage asset, great weight should be given to the asset's conservation. Paragraph 134 of the Framework confirms that where a development proposal would lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal, including securing its optimal viable use. Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) confirms that what matters in assessing if a proposal causes substantial harm is the impact on the significance of the heritage asset, and that, in general terms, substantial harm is a high test and may not arise in many cases.
18. The heritage assets include a Scheduled Ancient Monument (SAM) in the form of the uninhabited part of Beetham Hall including the curtain wall, former hall, solar wing, and buttery; Grade II\* listed 17<sup>th</sup> Century hall, 18<sup>th</sup>/19<sup>th</sup> Century barns and various agricultural outbuildings including a rubble stone bull shed, piggery and storage barns; and Grade II listed former threshing barn, which has been converted into the current funeral directors. The existing unlisted appeal building is of no particular merit in itself, but it and the associated land within the appeal site has a clear functional connection and relationship with the historic use of the wider complex of listed buildings and the SAM. From nearby public footpaths, Hale to the south and the passing A6 road, the group including the appeal building and adjoining land can be clearly read as part of the setting.
19. In drawing my conclusions on this matter, I have noted the submissions from English Heritage in welcoming the appellant's intention to repair some of the listed structures within the Beetham Hall complex in advance of the work on the main crematorium building, enabling their conversion to use as workshops and stores and thus removing them from the Heritage at Risk Register. I have also had regard to their broad satisfaction that the level of harm which would be caused to the Beetham Hall complex and its setting has been lessened due to the reduction in the number of parking spaces and their relocation, as well as alterations to the timber fins, and would be outweighed by the public benefit of ensuring a viable, long-term use for the complex. Whilst I have carefully considered the submissions made by interested parties in respect of the impact on the setting of the listed buildings, I would concur with the views of English Heritage regarding the desirability of securing the repair and re-use of the listed buildings as being a significant benefit of the proposal. I note that this is not a matter disputed by the Council as it forms part of the basis of the SoCG.
20. I accept that the proposed development would cause some limited harm to the setting of the listed buildings and SAM, and that there would be less than substantial harm to the significance of the affected designated heritage assets. However, I must attach considerable importance and weight to that harm.

### *Other Possible Harm*

21. Concerns have been raised by interested parties over the potential impact of pollution and emissions from the crematorium, to the detriment of local residents and wildlife. In this respect, I have noted the absence of any technical representations from the Council's Environmental Health/Protection team with respect to the proposed impact on air quality. I have also considered the conclusions of the appellant's air quality assessment that emissions to the atmosphere will not have a detrimental impact on air quality in the area, and I am mindful that these would be controlled by an Environmental Permit. However, in this respect I have also had regard to paragraph 122 of the Framework, which requires local planning authorities to assume that where the control of processes or emissions themselves are subject to approval under pollution control regimes, that those regimes will operate effectively.
22. With respect to the potential for other impacts on living conditions of nearby residents, whilst I observed that the proposed development would be visible across existing land and fields, particularly from properties to the south, the distances involved would mitigate against any adverse impacts in respect of noise and disturbance or impact on outlook.
23. The absence of a memorial garden has been cited as a shortcoming of the proposed crematorium, although no definitive evidence has been placed before me that the provision of such a facility would either be needed from a legislative or operational standpoint. I have had regard to the references made to the Government publication entitled *The Siting and Planning of Crematoria (1978)*, which advises that sufficient land should be provided for an appropriate setting for the crematorium including space for the disposal of ashes, but also for reflection, but note the publication to be Guidance only. I have also had regard to the concerns expressed by interested parties over the potential need for future expansion of the facilities, but this is conjecture at this stage and does not form part of the scope of the proposed development upon which the planning merits of the appeal must be assessed.
24. Local residents express concern about the effect on highway safety. In respect of highway safety, I note that Cumbria Highways have assessed that the traffic generation from the development in the context of the local highway network, and are satisfied that given the limited number of services in a day that any impact would be negligible. Furthermore, from my observations at the site visit, the access to the A6 possesses adequate visibility splays for the characteristics of the road, and I am satisfied that the increased use of the access would not result in an unacceptable impact on the existing pedestrian environment.
25. Interested parties have also raised a number of other issues including the loss of agricultural land, the impact on biodiversity, and the impact on children in the local area as a consequence of the constant exposure to the operation of the crematorium. However, I have no definitive evidence before me to suggest that the agricultural land to be lost could be considered best and most versatile agricultural land as defined in Annex 2 of the Framework. In respect of biodiversity, I have had regard to the bat, barn owl and nesting bird survey undertaken, and have no basis upon which to disagree with the conclusions reached. Whilst I note that the potential for Great Crested Newts on the site

was raised at the Hearing, I have not been provided with any definitive evidence of their presence or linkages to water bodies where they are present, and furthermore I note that Natural England has raised no objection to the proposed development in respect of protected species. I am satisfied therefore that the biodiversity impacts of the appeal site have been fully investigated and addressed.

26. Turning to the issue of the exposure of children in the area and at the local school to the operation of the crematorium, I accept that there may be some limited perception of the use as a consequence of the proposed development. However, given the distance involved from the local school, the most visible manifestation of the impact would undoubtedly be an increased number of vehicles arriving and departing the appeal site, including funeral corteges. However, given the frequency of occurrence and relationship with the proposed crematorium, on the basis of the evidence before me I do not consider that this in itself would be significant or unacceptable.
27. I have also had my attention drawn to an alternative site proposed for a crematorium elsewhere within South Lakeland District. However, I was advised at the Hearing that the planning permission for this site had been refused although it was anticipated that an appeal could be made against the decision in the future. However, whether or not this proves to be the case, in the absence of an alternative planning permission I have determined this appeal solely on the basis of the planning merits of the proposals.
28. I have also noted that concerns over procedural aspects of the application as dealt with by the Council have been raised. However, these have not had any bearing on my determination of the appeal.

*Benefits of the scheme*

29. I have accepted that paragraph 116 of the Framework and the requirement for an assessment of need for the development in the AONB is not engaged in this instance. However, the Council Plan 2013-2017 and the Delivery Plan, which sit alongside the main Development Plan documents, identify there to be a need for a crematorium in South Lakeland, with it acknowledged that there is a current reliance placed upon existing facilities at Lancaster and Barrow, some considerable distance away for many residents.
30. I have noted that the issue of there being a need for a crematorium is common ground between the main parties, albeit that neither main party was able to direct me towards any definitive background evidence which had established the need. I have also had regard to the submissions of interested parties on the same matter, although no substantive or compelling evidence has been provided to counter the Council's Delivery Plan and illustrate that there is not a need or that it should be provided elsewhere within the District. Nevertheless, I have been mindful of the conclusions reached by an Inspector regarding need in a previous appeal decision at Land at Sampool Bridge, Levens, Kendal, and in particular that the provision of a local crematorium would substantially reduce the need to travel for that purpose.
31. My attention has not been drawn to any recent provision of new crematoria or an increase in available capacity within the area. I have noted the contention of interested parties in respect of existing crematoria not operating at full capacity, but accept the appellant's point that the notion of 100% operation at

crematoria would be theoretical due to the technical limitations of equipment and the unpopularity of certain slots during the day. Whilst I have also considered the interested parties point as to whether convenience for users and accessibility should translate into need, I am satisfied that need must realistically comprise both quantitative and qualitative elements. In this respect, the desirability of reducing the need to travel, coupled with the current indicative capacity and delays experienced at existing crematoria as well as demographic trends showing the District to have an ageing population, demonstrates to my satisfaction that on the balance of the evidence before me that there is a need for additional crematorium facilities in the district. I note that the Council's Delivery Plan has indicated the historic difficulties of establishing an appropriate site for a crematorium, and I therefore would conclude that addressing this identified need would clearly be in the public benefit, and would add substantial weight in support of the proposals.

32. In respect of the impact on the local economy, the provision of even a limited number of jobs, as proposed in this instance, would support economic growth in a rural area and would also be a public benefit. There would be a clear functional linkage between the existing funeral services business and the crematorium, which whilst stated to not be exclusively for use by the appellant's existing business, would nevertheless support the expansion of the business through the conversion and re-use of existing buildings. My attention has been drawn to the support given towards the expansion of appropriate businesses outside service centres, and the conversion and use of redundant buildings for employment-generating uses within Policy CS7.4 of the Core Strategy. I am satisfied that this aim is also consistent with the objectives of paragraph 28 of the Framework. In this respect, the support for an existing rural business would be a matter which must convey limited weight in support of the proposed development, albeit that I acknowledge that I have not been provided with any conclusive evidence that the improved turnover would be a key factor in the performance of the existing funeral directors business.

#### *Planning Balance and Conclusion*

33. I have concluded that the car parking related to the proposed crematorium would appear as an uncharacteristic form of development, which despite the possibility of mitigation, would fail to conserve the landscape and scenic beauty of the AONB. In this respect I am mindful of paragraph 115 of the Framework, which sets out that great weight should be given to that conservation. However, whilst I have also concluded that the proposals would result in there being limited harm to the setting of the listed buildings and SAM, to which I have attached considerable importance and weight to, in this instance the public benefits related to the restoration and re-use of the listed buildings at risk would result in an overall enhancement to the historic environment in accordance with the Framework. In this respect, I am satisfied that this would be a factor weighing in support of the proposals. Furthermore, the proposal would address an identified and long-established need for additional crematorium facilities within South Lakeland, and would provide support for the rural economy. In respect of other possible harm identified by interested parties in relation to the proposed development, I conclude that none would be likely to result from the scheme.
34. Overall, I therefore conclude that the harm likely to be caused by the proposal to the AONB, would be outweighed by the benefits of the proposed



development, and that for the reasons given above, and subject to the conditions attached, the appeal should be allowed.

*Conditions*

35. Turning to the suggested conditions, I have considered these in the light of paragraph 206 of the Framework. This paragraph sets out that planning conditions should only be imposed where they are necessary, relevant to planning and to the development to be permitted, enforceable, precise, and reasonable in all other respects.
36. Conditions related to timeliness and the identification of plans are necessary in the interest of proper planning and the avoidance of doubt. In order to safeguard the appearance of the development and the countryside, conditions are necessary in respect of hard and soft landscaping; tree protection; and details and samples of external surface materials. A scheme of surface water and sewage disposal would be necessary in the interests of the environmental management of the site. A restriction tying the occupation of Beetham Hall Farmhouse to a person or person's related to the employment uses on the site would be necessary in the interests of the viability of the business, whilst the removal of permitted development rights for changes of use would be necessary to protect against inappropriate future use of the appeal site.
37. I have added conditions related to the undertaking of proposed works to the listed buildings and archaeological geophysical works as suggested by English Heritage, and accepted by the appellant, in the interests of the heritage assets on the appeal site.

*M Seaton*

INSPECTOR

## **Annex**

### **Conditions**

- 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than three years from the date of this decision.
- 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Drawing Numbers 5224-11 (Site Location Plan), 5224-01 Rev. B, 5224-02 Rev. C, 5224-04 Rev. D, and 5224-06 Rev. C.
- 3) No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscape works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and those works shall be carried out as approved.

The details shall include:-

- proposed finished levels or contours;
- means of enclosure;
- car parking layouts and any gating at the entrance;
- other vehicle and pedestrian access and circulation areas;
- hard surfacing materials;
- minor artefacts and structures (e.g. furniture, fencing, refuse or other, signs, lighting, etc.);
- retained landscape features.

Soft landscape works shall include planting plans; written specifications including the wildflower meadow (including cultivation and other operations associated with plant and grass establishment); schedules of plants, noting species, plant sizes and proposed numbers / densities; and an implementation programme. Any trees / shrubs which are removed, die, become severely damaged or diseased within five years of their planting shall be replaced in the next planting season with trees / shrubs of similar size and species to those originally required to be planted unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

- 4) All hard and soft landscape works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details. The works shall be carried out before any part of the development is first brought into use or in accordance with a programme to be agreed in writing with the local planning authority prior to any development commencing. Any trees / shrubs which are removed, die, become severely damaged or diseased within five years of their planting shall be replaced in the next planting season with trees / shrubs of similar size and species to those originally required to be planted unless the local planning authority gives written consent to any variation.
- 5) No site clearance, preparatory work or development shall take place until a scheme for the protection of retained trees (the Tree Protection Plan) and the appropriate working methods (the Arboricultural Method Statement) in accordance with the requirements of section 5.5 and sections 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3 of BS5837:2012 Trees in relation to Design,

- Demolition and Construction Recommendations has been agreed in writing with the local planning authority. These measures shall be carried out as described and approved.
- 6) The materials to be used for the external surfaces of the development hereby approved shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Once approved the materials shall be installed and retained thereafter.
  - 7) A sample panel of the stonework to be used for the external surfaces of the development hereby approved shall be erected at the application site and no superstructure shall be erected until the written approval for the stonework has been given by the Local Planning Authority. The sample panel shall be of sufficient size to indicate the method of jointing and coursing to be used. The stonework shall be constructed as per the sample panel and retained thereafter.
  - 8) No development shall take place until a scheme of surface water and sewage disposal works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority. The development shall not be occupied until the surface water and sewage disposal works have been completed in accordance with the approved scheme. The approved works shall be retained thereafter.
  - 9) The occupation of the adjacent dwelling house (Beetham Hall Farmhouse) shall be restricted to a person or persons wholly or mainly employed by the funeral director's business hereby permitted and the family and dependents of such person or persons.
  - 10) The use hereby permitted shall be restricted to that of a funeral director and crematorium as described in the submitted documents and as illustrated on the submitted drawings and for no other purposes (including any other purposes in Class B2 of the Schedule to the Town and Country Planning [Use Classes] Order 1987, as amended).
  - 11) Prior to the commencement of development, a detailed scheme of conservation and repair works to facilitate the conversion and re-use of the listed buildings to accommodate a coffin workshop and coffin spray shop, shall be submitted to, and agreed in writing by, the local planning authority. The works shall be implemented in accordance with the approved scheme of works, prior to the commencement of work on the main crematorium building.
  - 12) No development shall be carried out on the land until the applicant, or their agents or successor in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of geophysical archaeological survey works in accordance with a written scheme of investigation and timetable which has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall only be implemented in accordance with the approved details.

## **APPEARANCES\***

### FOR THE APPELLANT:

John Fishwick	Appellant
Jane Fishwick-Aynsley	Appellant
Miss Clare Bland	Appellant's Agent (Scalia Planning)
Mark Deverill	Chartered Architect – HM Architecture
Kelly Anderson	Stephenson Halliday

### FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mark Loughran	South Lakeland District Council – Team Leader
Simon Fawcett	South Lakeland District Council – Planning Officer

### INTERESTED PERSONS:

Zoe Mack	Local resident
Karen Langley	Local resident
Peter Winter	Preston Patrick Parish Council
Victoria Eden	Local resident
Sue Wagstaff	Local resident
Stephen Yates	Local resident
Mr Wagstaff	Local resident
Sue Hunter	Arnside and Silverdale AONB
Bob Pickup	Arnside and Silverdale AONB
Susan Fairless	Local resident
Brian Tate	Local resident
Stuart Mack	Local resident
Ann Robinson	Local resident
Jason Harley	Local resident
David Clarke	Local resident

\*This is not a comprehensive list of people who spoke - other people who were present also made brief comments at points during the Hearing and Site Visit.

## **DOCUMENTS**

- 1 Appeal Hearing Notification Letter
- 2 Full Copy of Statement of Common Ground (electronically signed)
- 3 Updated Bat Survey Report
- 4 Costs Application & Submissions (Appellant & Council)