

COMMITTEE DATE: [12/01/2016](#)

Application Reference: 15/0227

WARD: Warbreck
DATE REGISTERED: 31/07/15
LOCAL PLAN ALLOCATION: No Specific Allocation

APPLICATION TYPE: Full Planning Permission
APPLICANT: Belsfield Care

PROPOSAL: Erection of roof lift to existing rear extension to provide five additional bedrooms and lounge and provision of three additional car parking spaces to rear following removal of existing storage building.

LOCATION: 4 ST STEPHENS AVENUE, BLACKPOOL, FY2 9RG

Summary of Recommendation: Refuse

CASE OFFICER

Mr Gary Johnston

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

The proposal represents a further intensification of development on this plot within an increase in the height of built form, windows overlooking neighbouring properties, numbers of residents and lack of amenity space. Whilst there is a need for additional dementia bedspaces there are currently 97 bedspaces in three properties very close together - 3 St Stephens Avenue, 4 St Stephens Avenue and 4 Carlin Gate. There is no requirement to provide additional bed spaces in this location; indeed the addition of five bedrooms would add to the disproportionate level of provision in this local area. It is acknowledged that in its broadest sense there would be economic and social benefits to the proposal (extra jobs and bedspaces) but these would be outweighed by the environmental impacts. The new bedrooms would not be exceptional quality and would result in the bulk of the building being increased and additional windows overlooking neighbouring properties. There is little in the way of amenity space for the existing residents of the home and this proposal would not alter that situation (increase in number of bedrooms from 31 to 36). As such the proposal is considered contrary to paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies LQ1, LQ2, LQ14, BH3 and BH24 of the Blackpool Local Plan and Policy CS7 of the Blackpool Local Plan: Part 1 - Core Strategy.

INTRODUCTION

Some Members will recall that applications relating to 6-8 Carlin Gate, 4 Carlin Gate and 4 St Stephens Avenue have been before the Committee before (details are listed below). This application is one of three applications for the properties which are owned by the applicants. The three applications are -

1. 15/0227 -Erection of roof lift to existing rear extension to provide five additional bedrooms and lounge and provision of three additional car parking spaces to rear following demolition of existing lounge. (**4 St Stephens Avenue**).

2. 15/0228 -Use of premises as 4 self contained permanent flats with associated landscaping and works following demolition of existing rear extensions and alteration to existing garage. **(6-8 Carlin Gate)**.
3. 15/0229 - Use of land as communal garden in association with existing rest homes at 4 St Stephens Avenue and 4 Carlin Gate following demolition of existing rear extensions at 6-8 Carlin Gate. **(6-8 Carlin Gate and 4 Carlin Gate/4 St Stephens Avenue)**.

These applications follow on from previous applications which sought to link 4 St Stephens Avenue to 4 Carlin Gate and redevelop 6-8 Carlin Gate. Outline planning applications with references 12/0700 and 13/0754 were withdrawn. Outline Planning Application reference 13/0301 for the erection of a two storey link extension to connect existing rest homes at 4 Carlin Gate and 4 St Stephens Avenue to form an additional lounge and 12 bedrooms, and erection of two semi-detached, two-storey dwellinghouses with integral garages, with associated access, parking and landscaping to the rear for use by the extended rest homes following demolition of 6-8 Carlin Gate, was refused by the Planning Committee at its meeting on 22 July 2013 (a subsequent application 14/0150 - *Erection of two storey link extension to connect existing rest homes at 4 Carlin Gate and 4 St Stephens Avenue to form an additional lounge and 10 bedrooms, and erection of two semi-detached, two-storey dwellinghouses with associated vehicle access, parking and landscaping to rear for use by rest homes following demolition of 6-8 Carlin Gate was withdrawn*).

The reasons for refusal for 13/0301 are listed below:

1. The proposed extensions and alterations, linking 4 Carlin Gate and 4 St. Stephens Avenue and extending into residential gardens at the rear of 6-8 Carlin Gate would constitute an over-development of the plots and would have a significantly detrimental impact on the residential amenities of adjoining occupants and the visual amenities and character of the wider area by virtue of their size, scale, massing, close proximity to the boundaries and fenestration resulting in, overlooking, visual intrusion and a development which is overly intensive and out of character within a residential setting. The proposed link extension would also be detrimental to future occupants by virtue of the proximity of windows to boundary walls resulting in lack of natural light and lack of outlook. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies LQ1, LQ14, BH3 and BH24 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016.
2. The proposal would create an inadequate vehicle access off Carlin Gate to substandard parking facilities to the rear of 6-8 Carlin Gate which would result in vehicle conflict, leading to vehicles having to reverse out of Carlin Gate and around tight corners with poor visibility. This would be contrary to highway safety and the free flow of traffic within the site. Furthermore the under-provision of useable parking spaces would lead to additional on street parking within the vicinity of the site which would lead to congestion and impede the free flow of traffic and would be detrimental to residential and visual amenity. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies LQ1 and AS1 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016.
3. It has not been demonstrated that 6-8 Carlin Gate could not be brought back into viable use and the demolition of 6-8 Carlin Gate is therefore unsustainable. Furthermore, the two-storey domestic scale of the replacement dwellings proposed at 6-8 Carlin Gate would be out of character with the neighbouring properties at 4 Carlin Gate and 10-12 Carlin Gate and would therefore be an incongruous feature in the streetscene. The proposal would therefore be contrary to Policies LQ1, LQ4 and LQ8 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016.

There have been numerous applications for the use/new build and extensions to 4 St Stephens Avenue, 4 Carlin Gate and 6 Carlin Gate in recent years and they are listed below:

4 St Stephens Avenue:

86/0420 – Use of premises as a rest home. Granted 22 April 1986.

86/0916 - Erection of two-storey side extension and extension to rear dormer and erection of external staircase. Granted 06 August 1986.

88/1571 - Erection of part two-storey and part single-storey rear extensions. Granted 29 November 1998.

92/0667 - Erection of first floor rear extension to rest home. Granted 20 October 1992.

93/0810 - Erection of first floor rear extension to rest home. Granted 19 October 1993.

95/0574 - Use of premises as a rest home and nursing home. Granted 11 October 1995.

98/0019 - Erection of single storey rear extension to provide additional bedrooms with en-suite facilities. Refused 06 April 1998 for the following reasons:

- The proposal would be contrary to the provisions of Policy E13 of the Blackpool Borough Local Plan, because the development, by reason of its size and site coverage is out of character with the surrounding area and the general residential scale of properties in St Stephens Avenue, Holmfield Road and Carlin Gate. Approval of the development would make it difficult for the Council to resist other similar extensions elsewhere in the vicinity, which cumulatively would have a seriously detrimental effect upon the character of the area by significantly reducing the space about properties.
- The proposal would be contrary to the provisions of Policy TR6 of the Blackpool Borough Local Plan because the development, by increasing demand for car parking whilst reducing the available parking spaces at the premises, would lead to increased on street parking to the detriment of highway safety and residential amenity.

98/0319 - Erection of single storey rear extension to provide additional bedrooms with en-suite facilities and creation of vehicular access and car parking space to front. Refused 22 June 1998 but granted on appeal.

10/1309 - Erection of three storey side extension, first floor rear extension and alterations to main roof to create mansard roof with a gable to the front elevation, dormer windows to the front, sides and rear. Extensions and alterations would form 32 en-suite bedrooms at existing care home. Granted 14 January 2011.

11/0510 - Erection of three storey side extension, first floor rear extension and alterations to main roof to create mansard roof with a gable to the front elevation, dormer windows to the front, sides and rear. Extensions and alterations would form 38 en-suite bedrooms at existing care home. Refused 08 September 2011 for the following reason:

- The proposed extensions and alterations would constitute an over-development of the plot and would have a significantly detrimental impact on the residential amenities of adjoining occupants and the visual amenities and character of the wider area by virtue of their size, scale, massing, close proximity to the common boundaries and fenestration resulting in an overbearing impact, overlooking, visual intrusion, loss of natural light, loss of outlook, loss of car parking facilities and a lack of useable amenity space for the residents of the home. In addition it is considered that the proposals would lead to additional on street parking within the vicinity of the site which would lead to congestion and would be detrimental to residential and visual amenity. The proposals would therefore be contrary to Policies LQ1, LQ14, BH3, BH24 and AS1 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016.

11/1000 - Erection of three storey side extension, first floor rear extension and alterations to main roof to create mansard roof with a gable to the front elevation, dormer windows to the front, sides and rear. Extensions and alterations will form 36 en-suite bedrooms at existing care home. Refused 19 January 2012 for the following reason:

- The proposed rear extension, when added to other constructed and approved extensions, would constitute an over-development of the plot and would have a significantly detrimental impact on the residential amenities of adjoining occupants by virtue of its size, close proximity to the common boundaries and fenestration resulting in an overbearing impact, overlooking, visual intrusion, loss of natural light, loss of outlook and a lack of useable amenity space for the residents of the home. The proposals would therefore be contrary to Policies LQ1, LQ14, BH3 and BH24 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016.

4 Carlin Gate:

06/0203 - Erection of three-storey detached building with basement, additional accommodation within the roofspace and two-storey section at the rear to form 37 bedroom nursing/ care home with provision of eight car parking spaces. Refused 12 June 2006 for the following reason:

- The proposal would be contrary to policies BH3 and BH24 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016 by reason of the intensity of development within the application site, the resultant number of properties in such use in the locality and impact on amenity of nearby residents.

06/0524 - Erection of three-storey detached building with basement, additional accommodation within the roofspace and two-storey section at the rear to form 37 bedroom nursing/care home with provision of car parking spaces at the front and rear. (Re-submission of application 06/0203). Granted 04 September 2006.

07/0998 - Erection of three-storey detached building with basement and two storey section at the rear, both incorporating accommodation within the roofspace, to form 40 bedroom nursing/care home with provision of six car parking spaces at the front and rear. (Amendment to planning permission 06/0524). Granted 28 April 2008.

08/1198 - Elevational alterations to three storey detached care/nursing home (amendments to planning permission 07/0998). Granted 12 January 2009.

6-8 Carlin Gate:

04/0523 - Use of premises as single private dwellinghouse and conversion of rear extension to form additional living accommodation to provide guest facilities for private use. Granted 13 July 2004.

07/0593 - Use of premises as a single private dwellinghouse by no more than six residents living together as a single household (including a household where care may be provided for residents) (Certificate of Lawfulness for Proposed Use). Refused 18 October 2007 for the following reason:

- The applicant has failed to provide sufficient information, with particular reference to the intended future residents and the nature and extent of any care to be provided for those residents, to enable the Local Planning Authority to properly assess the application submission and to be in a satisfactory position to confirm whether the proposed use falls within Class C3 of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended).

The site has no allocation in the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016.

SITE DESCRIPTION

4 St Stephens Avenue is a detached, three-storey care home which has been significantly extended to the sides and rear to provide 31 bedrooms, currently catering for people suffering from dementia. Across the road from 4 St Stephens Avenue at number 3 St Stephens Avenue is another large, detached care home for dementia patients operated by the applicants with 26 bedrooms. To the east of the site there are two-storey, semi-detached houses fronting onto St Stephens Avenue. A large single storey extension at the rear of 4 St Stephens Avenue almost abuts the rear boundary with 4 Carlin Gate, which contains a three storey detached care home with 40 bedrooms, also operated by the applicants.

DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

The proposal is to extend above the existing single storey rear extension at the home. The part to be increased in height projects 17 metres beyond the two storey wing at the rear of the home and is currently 3.6 metres high. It is set between 1 metre and 5.5 metres from the boundary with 6 St Stephens Avenue and is 1 metre from the boundary with 4 Carlin Gate (also in the applicants' ownership). The single storey rear extension has a false pitch roof and because of the height of the roof there are no windows in the roof. It is proposed to increase the height of the roof to an overall height of 5.1 metres (i.e. increase it by 1.5 metres) and undertake internal changes which would mean that the number of beds in the home would increase from 31 to 36. Two of the new bedrooms would have windows facing the rear gardens of houses fronting St Stephens Avenue and these would be set 3.8 metres above ground level. One window would be approximately 4.5 metres from the boundary and one approximately 6.5 metres from the boundary. In addition there would be a lounge window which would face the rear of the home but it would be approximately 3 metres from the boundary with 6 St Stephens Avenue. In effect the design of the current extension would be altered such that the roof would no longer appear subordinate to the single storey extension. On the western side of the single storey rear extension it is proposed to remove a freestanding storage building and a section of the boundary wall and gates to provide three car parking spaces. Two car parking spaces are also proposed on the St Stephens Avenue frontage of the property.

The application is accompanied by -

- demonstration of need statement

- management plan
- design and access statement
- planning statement

MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main planning issues are considered to be:

- principle of the development
- impact on residential amenity
- design and standard of development
- impact on highway safety

These issues will be discussed in the assessment section of this report.

CONSULTATIONS

Head of Transportation: Three additional off street spaces are provided. Five additional staff are proposed, what parking or travel arrangements are envisaged for these staff?

PUBLICITY AND REPRESENTATIONS

Site notice displayed: 6 August 2015

Neighbours notified: 6 August 2015 and 7 December 2015

Mrs Susan Giacomini, 3 CARLIN GATE - I object to this as it constitutes overdevelopment of the plot. This was refused last year. Nothing has changed to alter that decision. No extra beds are needed especially now the new large mental health unit has been opened on Preston New Road. In response to the re-notification in December I re-iterate my objection as stated in my previous letter.

Mr D Jolly, 34 ST STEPHENS AVENUE - My concern with the new applications is the lack of management direction given to the staff and lack of forethought to our neighbourhood. It is clear there is a lack of training to the management team, they do not consider the neighbourhood they are working and operating in as their responsibility. When you trade in an area, you should look after the area. Increasing capacity of the homes will only create more work and staffing opportunities. This will then lead to additional waste, more cigarette butts and a general degradation of the area.

FC Cove, 10 CARLIN GATE - Considers the proposal to be overintensive given the extent of development on the site and questions the need for additional beds.

Mr B and Miss G Walsh and Laird, 10 ST STEPHENS AVENUE - is concerned that the proposal would cause overlooking of gardens and a loss of privacy. Is concerned that the proposal would create additional on street parking and extra noise and disturbance.

Mr M Farrell, 8 ST STEPHENS AVENUE - We object to this planning application. Although the plan is a reduction of the number of bedrooms to last year's application which was refused, there would still be an overdevelopment of the plot. There would be a detrimental effect on the neighbouring residences. The extension would have a visual impact on our and neighbouring properties in terms of overlooking and dominance. A large mental health unit has been built at the end of the M55 and therefore would

think there would be enough capacity so as there not to be a need for extra bedrooms at 4 St Stephens. The provision for car parking spaces is irrelevant as most staff and visitors park on the road. Indeed a previous application was recommended to be refused by Traffic and Transport management due to traffic increase. For the last few years plans have been submitted by Belsfield care and every time ourselves and neighbours have objected. This has become a form of harassment. This property has been developed enough. Last year Members of the Planning Committee visited our garden to view the then proposed planning application. The application was refused as it constituted overdevelopment. This application would again mean overdevelopment. When will Belsfield finally accept the care home has been developed to its limit. Enough is enough and no should mean NO!

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

Paragraph 14 establishes a presumption in favour of sustainable development

Paragraph 17 sets out the core principles of which a good standard of design and amenity is one

Paragraphs 56 – 65 deal with design

SAVED POLICIES: BLACKPOOL LOCAL PLAN 2001-2016

The Blackpool Local Plan was adopted in June 2006 and the majority of its policies saved by direction in June 2009. The following policies are most relevant to this application:

Policy LQ1	Lifting the Quality of Design
Policy LQ2	Site Context
Policy LQ4	Building Design
Policy LQ6	Landscape Design and Biodiversity
Policy LQ8	Energy Resource and Conservation
Policy LQ14	Extensions and Alterations
Policy BH3	Residential and Visitor Amenity
Policy BH4	Public Health and Safety
Policy BH24	Residential Institutions and Community Care Residential Use
Policy AS1	General Development Requirements

EMERGING PLANNING POLICY

The Core Strategy Proposed Submission was submitted to the Planning Inspectorate in December 2014 and an Inspector conducted an examination of the Core Strategy in May 2015. Consultation has taken place on modifications to the Core Strategy arising from the examination and the results of this consultation have been forwarded to the Inspector and he has considered them. He has now published his final report on the Core Strategy and the document will be adopted early in 2016.

Paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) allows relevant policies to be given weight in decision-taking according to the stage of preparation of the emerging plan (the more advanced the preparation, the greater the weight that may be given); the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies (the less significant the unresolved objections, the greater the weight that may be given); and the degree of consistency of the relevant policies in the emerging plan to the policies in the NPPF. Overall, a limited number of representations were received to the Proposed Submission document. Of those representations made expressing concern with the proposed policies, it is not considered that the issues raised justify the need for modifications to be made to the policies prior to submission (other than minor modifications to improve clarity for

example). Therefore, the Council considers that, due to the advanced stage of the Core Strategy all relevant policies to this development should be given considerable weight in decision making.

Emerging policies in the Core Strategy Submission version that are most relevant to this application are:

- CS1 Strategic Location of Development
- CS7 Quality of Design
- CS12 Sustainable Neighbourhoods
- CS15 Health and Education

None of these policies conflict with or outweigh the provisions of the adopted Local Plan policies listed above.

ASSESSMENT

- **Principle of the development**

Members will see from the planning history listed in the introduction to the report that this property has been subject to numerous planning applications to extend the size of the home. The applicants are arguing that there is a need for the additional bedrooms on the basis of a borough wide need for additional beds and cite the fact that there were only 14 vacant bedspaces across the borough in 2013 and on the basis that the northern part of the borough is relatively under provided in comparison to the central and southern areas of the borough. Whilst it is recognised that there are economies of scale in terms of providing bed spaces, need is only one aspect of Policy BH24 of the Local Plan and the existence of need does not mean it has to be provided in one location. Indeed an Inspector in dealing with an appeal for an additional two bedrooms at 3 St Stephens Avenue commented - *'There is no dispute between the parties that there is a general shortage of bedspaces for people suffering from dementia. However, from the evidence before me there is nothing to suggest that there is a specific local need for additional bedspaces within the local area. There are already about 100 bedspaces for people suffering from dementia within 100 metres of the appeal property and whilst I appreciate that the appeal proposal would only provide a further two bedspaces, it would nevertheless increase that number further. Accordingly, I cannot be satisfied that the appeal proposal would not result in the local area making a disproportionate level of provision of such accommodation, contrary to the aims and provisions of Policy BH24 of the Local Plan'*. So whilst there may be a lesser number of bedspaces in the northern part of the borough this statement would apply to the current proposal which is an increase of five bedspaces. In any event it is considered that another aspect of Policy BH24 carries more weight in this case and that is 'the intensity of the use and its effect on adjacent properties'. This property has been extended significantly in the past to the extent that around 80% of the site area is covered by built form. There is in reality no more site area to cover and hence the only way to achieve additional bedrooms is by increasing the height of existing parts of the built form.

The home currently has 31 beds and the proposal would increase this to 36 beds. It also has to be borne in mind that the applicants have homes at 3 St Stephens – opposite the application site and at 4 Carlin Gate - to the south of the application site. Cumulatively these homes currently provide 97 beds. There is therefore the issue of the principle of the individual proposal and the cumulative impact of the proposal. Whilst there may be a generic need for additional beds, it is not considered that this need is appropriately satisfied in this location and the reasons are set out below in terms of the impact of how that need will be provided on the application site. Whilst it is also recognised that the location of the site is sustainable and that there is a presumption in favour of sustainable development in the

National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 14) and that there are economic and social benefits with the proposal (jobs and extra bedspaces), these benefits are outweighed by the environmental impacts of the proposal in terms of its bulk and impact on the amenities of local residents, which will be explained in more detail below.

- **Impact on residential amenity**

The proposal would increase the height of the existing single storey rear wing from 3.6 metres to 5.1 metres. This would be over a length of some 17 metres and this would be between 1 metre and 5.5 metres from the boundary with 6 St Stephens Avenue to the east. In addition, it would involve two additional bedroom windows facing this and other rear gardens on the southern side of St Stephens Avenue. These windows would be approx. 4.5 metres and 6.5 metres from the boundary (the normal distance required would be 10.5 metres). The increased height of the extension and the windows when coupled with the existing built form at 4 St Stephens Avenue (between 3.6 metres and 9 metres high) and 4 Carlin Gate (between 8 metres and 11 metres high) would have an overbearing impact on the residents of 6 and 8 St Stephens Avenue. In addition, there would be the potential for overlooking of these gardens. It is not felt that this impact could be diminished by the imposition of conditions (the use of obscure glazing in the windows would diminish the amenity of the occupiers of the rooms). It is considered that the proposal individually and when added to the existing home and the home at 4 Carlin Gate, cumulatively would have an adverse impact on the amenity of local residents. Paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has as one of its core principles the need to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity, Policy BH3 of the Blackpool Local Plan seeks to ensure that the amenity of local residents is not adversely affected by the scale, design and siting of proposals and their impact on privacy, outlook and levels of sunlight/daylight. Policy BH24 is supportive of care homes if (amongst other things) the intensity of the use does not adversely affect adjacent properties. Policy CS7 of the emerging Core Strategy similarly seeks to ensure that the amenities of local residents are not adversely affected. For the reasons set out above the proposal is considered to be contrary to paragraph 17 of the NPPF and the policies quoted and those adverse impacts of the proposal significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits so as to justify the refusal of the application.

- **Design and standard of development**

The home does not currently have any external amenity space. There is a small conservatory on the eastern side of the building (3.5 metres by 4 metres) and in isolation this proposal would further reduce the space around the building through the provision of five car parking spaces. The addition of five extra residents would do nothing to improve the situation. In this context the proposal is contrary to Policy LQ14 of the Blackpool Local Plan which prohibits roof extensions where they would result in an overintensive development with inadequate levels of private amenity space and parts (c) and (d) of Policy BH24 - the intensity of the use and suitability of the premises . It is acknowledged that the applicants are seeking to address this issue through application reference 15/0229 but that is a standalone proposal. The accommodation to be provided is single bedrooms each with a small toilet and no en-suite facilities so the accommodation cannot be described as exceptional quality and the occupiers of some of the rooms would rely on overlooking the gardens of neighbouring residents which would compromise their privacy. The proposal would conflict with a core principle of paragraph 17 of the NPPF regarding a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings as well as conflicting with Policies LQ1, LQ2, LQ14 and BH24 of the Blackpool Local Plan and Policy CS7 of the emerging Core Strategy.

- **Impact on highway safety**

The proposal would provide five car parking spaces – two on the St Stephens Avenue frontage and three off the alley linking Carlin Gate with St Stephens Avenue. The requirement is for one space for every five residents and hence the requirement is for seven spaces for 36 bedrooms. However, given this is a reasonably accessible location with bus services and the tram services on Queens Promenade, it is not considered that five car parking spaces would be inappropriate.

LEGAL AGREEMENT AND/OR DEVELOPER FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTION

None

HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

Under Article eight and Article one of the first protocol to the Convention on Human Rights, a person is entitled to the right to respect for private and family life, and the peaceful enjoyment of his/her property. However, these rights are qualified in that they must be set against the general interest and the protection of the rights and freedoms of others. It is not considered that the application raises any human rights issues.

CRIME AND DISORDER ACT 1998

The contents of this report have been considered in the context of the Council's general duty, in all its functions, to have regard to community safety issues as required by section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998

BACKGROUND PAPERS

Planning Application File(s): 15/0227 which can be accessed via the link below:

<http://idoxpa.blackpool.gov.uk/online-applications/search.do?action=weeklyList>

Recommended Decision: Refuse

Reasons for Refusal

1. The proposed rooflift to the existing rear extension would have an adverse impact on the amenities of neighbouring residents by reason of its bulk, its proximity to the boundary, the inclusion of windows which would overlook neighbouring gardens and its cumulative impact with the existing built form on the application site and at 4 Carlin Gate . As such the proposal would be contrary to a core principle of paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework regarding a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings, Policies BH3 and BH24 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016 and Policy CS7 of the Blackpool Local Plan - Part 1: Core Strategy
2. The proposal would conflict with a core principle of paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework regarding a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings as well as conflicting with Policies LQ1, LQ2, LQ14 and BH24 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016 and Policy CS7 of the Blackpool Local Plan - Part 1: Core Strategy in that it would further intensify development on the application site

which would be out of context with the neighbouring residential properties and would not alleviate the existing lack of amenity space for the residents of the home and would in fact exacerbate the situation.

3. **ARTICLE 35 STATEMENT (NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK para 187)**

The Local Planning Authority has sought to secure a sustainable development that would improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of Blackpool but in this case there are considered factors - conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework and policies of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016 and the Blackpool Local Plan - Part 1: Core Strategy - which justify refusal.

Advice Notes to Developer

Not applicable