#### Present:

Councillor L Williams (in the Chair)

Councillors

Blackburn Hutton Robertson BEM

Humphreys O'Hara Stansfield

# In Attendance:

Mrs Bernadette Jarvis, Senior Democratic Governance Adviser Mr Gary Johnston, Head of Development Management Mrs Clare Lord, Legal Officer Mr Latif Patel, Network Planning and Projects Manager Mr Mark Shaw, Principal Planning Officer

1 APOLOGIES

Apologies had been received from Councillor D Coleman who was engaged elsewhere on Council business.

## **2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest on this occasion.

#### **3 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 14 AUGUST 2018**

The Committee considered the minutes of the last meeting held on 14 August 2018.

**Resolved:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 14 August 2018 be approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

#### 4 PLANNING/ENFORCEMENT APPEALS LODGED AND DETERMINED

The Committee noted that an appeal that had been lodged against the Council's decision to refuse planning permission for the erection of 3 three-bedroom dwellings at the rear of 12-14 Olive Grove, Blackpool had been dismissed by the Planning Inspectorate.

**Resolved:** To note the planning appeal determined.

# **5 PLANNING ENFORCEMENT UPDATE REPORT**

The Committee considered a report detailing the planning enforcement activity undertaken within Blackpool during August 2018.

The report stated that 49 new cases had been registered for investigation, 11 cases had been resolved by negotiation without recourse to formal action and 20 cases were closed

as there was either no breach of planning control found, no action was appropriate or it was not considered expedient to take action.

The report also provided comparative information for the same period last year.

**Resolved:** To note the outcome of the cases set out in the report and to support the actions of the Service Manager, Public Protection Department, in authorising the notices.

#### **6 PLANNING APPLICATIONS AND APPEALS PERFORMANCE**

Mr Johnston, Head of Development Management, presented the planning application and appeals performance report. He informed the Committee that it was the last month of the two year assessment period for performance against Government targets and reported on the expectation that the performance figures for the assessment period would be significantly above the Government target for both minor and major development decisions.

**Resolved:** To note the report.

# 7 PLANNING APPLICATION 18/0331 ST KENTIGERN'S CATHOLIC PRIMARY SCHOOL

The Committee considered planning application 18/0331 seeking permission for the erection of decking and an external play area to first floor level enclosed by 3 metres high fencing with staircase enclosure at St Kentigern's Catholic Primary School, Newton Drive.

Mr Mark Shaw, Principal Planning Officer, provided the Committee with an overview of the application and presented an aerial view of the site, site location, layout and elevational plans. He highlighted the separation distances between the rear of the play deck and the outbuildings of the residential properties on Bryan Road. He reported that whilst the residential properties on Bryan Road were in the Raikes Hall Conservation Area, St. Kentigern's Catholic Primary School was outside of the Conservation Area. Mr Mark Shaw went on to report the increased outside play area per child of 0.7sqm, should the development be approved. He reported on the steps proposed to be taken to safeguard the amenity of residents of neighbouring properties which included an obscure film affixed to the velux windows facing Bryan Road to prevent overlooking and, following discussions with colleagues in Environmental Protection, the provision of a 3 metres high fencing and solid wall intended as an acoustic barrier between the school and the properties. The Committee was referred to the proposed condition that would be attached to the permission if approved to restrict the use of the play area to one hour per school day made up of 3 twenty minute sessions throughout the day. Mr Mark Shaw referred Members to the Update Note that provided sketches depicting comparative data of play areas for other schools.

Mr Holmes, a member of the public, spoke in objection to the application. His main objections related to the impact on the amenity of the residents of neighbouring properties in terms of increased noise and the scale and design of the development which in his view was not in keeping with the area. He also questioned the officer's assessment of the social benefit of the development in view of the relatively low increase in play space and number of children that would benefit.

Mr Oram, the Applicant's Agent, spoke in support of the application. He reported on the increased number of pupils at the school and limited outdoor play space available. He referred to the sketches in the Update Note that showed a school with fewer pupils and more play area. He reported on the current outdoor play area and the proposed access and design for the new play area. He referred to the objections raised and highlighted the 3 metres high fence that was proposed as part of the development which in his view would prevent views to neighbouring properties.

Mr Mark Shaw referred to the concerns regarding the impact of noise on residents of neighbouring properties and referred Members to the proposed conditions that were designed to protect the amenity of residents of neighbouring properties by restricting the hours of use of the play area and the provision of acoustic fencing. In respect of the objections relating to light and overlooking, Mr Mark Shaw highlighted that the development was to the North of the properties and the separation distances between the proposed fence and the rear outbuildings of the properties on Bryan Road.

The Committee considered the application and acknowledged the benefits in providing an increased play area but were mindful of the residents' concerns regarding the potential impact of the proposed development on their amenity. It also considered that it would be beneficial for residents to be provided with more information on the scale and design of the development.

**Resolved:** To defer the application to a future meeting to allow the opportunity for discussions to take place between the applicant and the objectors.

Background papers: Applications, plans and replies to consultations on the application.

## 8 PLANNING APPLICATION 18/0333 SOUTH PIER BLACKPOOL

The Committee considered planning application 18/0333 for the retention of a log flume ride on land to the north of the pier at South Pier, Promenade.

Mr Johnston, Head of Development Management provided the Committee with an overview of the application and presented site location and elevational plans and an aerial view of the site. He reminded the Committee of the temporary permission that had been granted for the log flume and advised that this had expired in April 2018. He also reminded the Committee that a key consideration in the decision to grant the temporary permission had been that it would enable the applicant to undertake improvements to the western end of the pier and that this had justified supporting the temporary relocation of the ride. However, it was noted that the proposed improvement work to the western end of the pier had not been undertaken, nor were there any known plans in place for this to happen. Furthermore a new ride had been installed on the site of the relocated log flume.

Mr Laister, on behalf of the Pleasure Beach, spoke in objection to the application. He presented his view of the reasons that the proposal conflicted with Policy CS21 and CS7 of the Core Strategy and Policy RR4 of the Local Plan and expressed concerns at the unsuitability of the location of the ride and the potential impact it would have on the Pleasure Beach.

Mr Shepherd, the Applicant's Agent, spoke in support of the application. He reported on the constraints on development at the pier due to the existence of an Article 4 Direction. He referred to Policy RR11 of the Local Plan that set out the areas to be comprehensively improved and enhanced and reported his view that the ride was an appropriate leisure activity for the area and not detrimental to the Promenade. He also provided comparisons with other leisure activities that had received planning permission in the area which included a temporary permission at the adjacent Go-Kart site and 18 hole mini golf course. He asked the Committee, if it was not minded to approve a permanent permission, to grant a further temporary permission until May 2021, the same time period as the Go-Kart site.

Mr Johnston responded by informing the Committee that the Policy in relation to the location of rides was very prescriptive and as the ride was not within any of the designated locations, granting planning permission would be contrary to Policy. In response to a question regarding the granting of planning permission for the Go-Kart site, Mr Johnston explained that the Go-Kart track had had to be relocated to facilitate erection of the tram depot and that an alternative long term location for the Go-Kart track continued to be sought.

The Committee noted that no objections had been received from residents for the current application. However, it also noted that the intended improvements to the pier that had been a key justification in granting the original temporary permission had not been undertaken and that the proposal conflicted with several policies in the Blackpool Local Plan and Core Strategy.

**Resolved:** To refuse the application for the reasons set out in the Appendix to the minutes.

Background papers: Applications, plans and replies to consultations on the application.

# 9 PLANNING APPLICATION 18/0420 LAND NORTH SIDE OF MOSS HOUSE ROAD

The Committee considered planning application 18/0420 that sought outline planning permission for the erection of seven two storey detached dwellings and garages, new access road and associated works at Land North Side (adjacent 17 and 21) Moss House Road, Blackpool.

Mr Mark Shaw, Principal Planning Officer, provided the Committee with an overview of the application and presented site location and elevational plans and an aerial view of the site. He also circulated an A3 plan of the application site. He advised that it was an outline application that only dealt with the access, appearance and scale of the development. Mr Mark Shaw acknowledged that the principle of development of the site was considered acceptable and in accordance with policies within the Core Strategy. However, the indicative position of the houses was considered to have a detrimental impact on the amenities of existing neighbours, particularly 17 and 21 Moss House Road. Mr Mark Shaw reported on further issues with the proposal which included the means of access to the proposed development and the lack of submission of a tree survey.

**Resolved:** To refuse the application for the reasons set out in the Appendix to the minutes.

Background papers: Applications, plans and replies to consultations on the application.

#### 10 PLANNING APPLICATION 18/0436 420 WATERLOO ROAD

The Committee considered planning application 18/0436 for the erection of a two storey rear extension and formation of vehicle crossing to Waterloo Road at 420 Waterloo Road, Blackpool.

Mr Johnston, Head of Development Management provided the Committee with an overview of the application and presented site layout, location and elevational plans and an aerial view of the site. He advised Members of the amendments made to the application since the refusal of planning permission in 2017 in relation to a reduction in the ridge line and the eaves. Mr Johnston referred to the applicant's additional representation in the Update Note and the letter of support received from Mr Gordon Marsden MP which had been published subsequent to the Update Note. With regards to the representations relating to precedents being set at 420 Waterloo Road and 1 Pine Avenue, Mr Johnston highlighted that permission for these pre-dated the 2006 Local Plan and 2016 Core Strategy and the 2007 Extending Your Home Supplementary Planning Document. Mr Johnston acknowledged the amendments made to the proposal, however, in his view the development would still have a detrimental impact on the amenity of the residents of neighbouring properties and that this justified the recommendation for refusal.

Mr Knight, a member of the public, spoke in objection to the application. He provided reasons for his objection which included the detrimental impact on the amenity of residents of neighbouring properties in terms of loss of light, outlook and noise.

Mr John Shaw, applicant, spoke in support of the application and reported his view that the development would not result in a loss of light. He also advised the Committee on his reasons for the requiring the extension of the building. He reported his view of the community benefit of Blackpool Music Centre and the detrimental impact on the students and the local community should permission not be granted.

In response to questions from the Committee, Mr Johnston acknowledged the amendments to the application in terms of a reduction in the overall scale of the development but in his view the changes from the previously refused scheme were insufficient to justify a change to the recommendation for refusal for the current application.

The Committee considered the application and notwithstanding the amendments made to the original scheme, considered that the adverse impact on the neighbours in terms of light and over dominance which had formed the basis for the prior refusal still existed.

**Resolved:** To refuse the application for the reasons set out in the Appendix to the minutes.

Background papers: Applications, plans and replies to consultations on the application.

# 11 PLANNING APPLICATION 18/0517 18 BEECH AVENUE

The Committee considered planning application 18/0517 for the erection of a single storey rear extension at 18 Beech Avenue, Blackpool.

Mr Mark Shaw, Principal Planning Officer, provided the Committee with an overview of the application and presented site location, layout and elevational plans and an aerial view of the site. He acknowledged that the proposed extension would project beyond the existing rear elevation by 3.5 metres. Whilst policy guidelines allowed for the projection of rear extensions to be 3 metres from the wall of the adjoining property, the position of the bay window to the rear of the adjoining property projected a minimum of 0.5 metre and as such the proposal was considered to be in accordance with policy guidelines. The proposed extension would be to the north of the adjoining property and therefore it was considered not to have a significant adverse impact on loss of sunlight. It was also considered that the proposed development would have minimum impact on the Stanley Park Conservation Area.

**Resolved:** That the application be approved, subject to the conditions, and for the reasons set out in the appendix to the minutes.

Background papers: Applications, plans and replies to consultations on the application.

#### Chairman

(The meeting ended 7.20 pm)

Any queries regarding these minutes, please contact: Bernadette Jarvis Senior Democratic Governance Adviser

Tel: (01253) 477212

E-mail: bernadette.jarvis@blackpool.gov.uk