

**COMMITTEE DATE:** 23/08/2016

**Application Reference:** **16/0394**

WARD: Ingthorpe  
DATE REGISTERED: 13/07/16  
LOCAL PLAN ALLOCATION: No Specific Allocation

APPLICATION TYPE: Full Planning Permission  
APPLICANT: Premier Inn Hotels Ltd

**PROPOSAL:** External alterations including erection of part two/part three storey extension to north elevation of existing bedroom accommodation to form 26 additional bedrooms, plant housing and air conditioning housing, three storey extension to south elevation of existing bedroom accommodation to form lift shaft, partial rendering of existing bedroom accommodation, and alterations to existing play area and car park to form 11 additional parking spaces.

**LOCATION:** PREMIER INN, RED LION HOTEL, DEVONSHIRE ROAD, BLACKPOOL,  
FY2 0AR

---

**Summary of Recommendation:** Grant Permission

**CASE OFFICER**

Mr G. Johnston

**SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION**

The principle of extending an existing hotel in an out of Resort Core location is considered acceptable given the demand for the extra bedrooms and the lack of sequentially preferable sites in the Resort Core. The design of the proposed extension is considered acceptable in being subservient to, but also complementary to, the existing bedroom block. It is not considered that the extension would significantly affect the amenities of the occupiers of houses in Village Way to the north of the site. It is not considered that the proposals would adversely affect the setting of the locally listed building. It is not considered that the proposal would represent an over-intensive use of the site and adequate on-site car parking would be provided.

## **INTRODUCTION**

This application has resulted from a pre-application discussion which was originally for a three storey extension to the existing Premier Inn hotel and removal of part of the semi-circular amenity area on the Devonshire Road frontage of the site. The discussions sought to retain the semi-circular area but allow for a slight reduction in its size and to achieve a break between the existing hotel and the extension and a stepping down of the extension towards the northern boundary of the site.

The history behind the site is that a two storey extension to the original Red Lion Public House to create a 48 bedroom Premier Inn hotel was refused in 1988. In 1996, a three storey extension to the original Red Lion Public House to create a 40 bedroom Premier Inn hotel was approved. In 2007, a three storey extension to the hotel was approved to add 27 bedrooms to the existing hotel (67 in total).

## **SITE DESCRIPTION**

The application site is on the eastern side of Devonshire Road approximately 300 metres to the north of its junction with Red Bank Road and the District Centre. The site has frontages to Devonshire Road and All Hallows Road and has St Bernadette's primary school to the south, housing to the north (fronting Devonshire Road and Village Way), housing opposite on Devonshire Road and housing and Montgomery Secondary School to the east on All Hallows Road. The site has a frontage of some 105 metres to Devonshire Road and a depth of some 115 metres. It comprises the Red Lion Public House, a locally listed building, with the existing 67 bedroom Premier Inn hotel to the rear and areas of car parking on all sides of the building (132 spaces in total) and a semi-circular amenity area on the Devonshire Road frontage.

## **DETAILS OF PROPOSAL**

The application is for a part three storey/part two storey extension to the existing Premier Inn hotel to provide 26 additional bedrooms to make a total of 93 bedrooms. There would be an increase in the total number of car parking spaces from 132 spaces to 143 spaces. The extension would measure 20.5 metres by 13.2 metres with the height going from 8.8 metres to 11.4 metres and then down to 9.4 metres and 5.4 metres at its northern extent which would be some 9.4 metres from the northern boundary of the site. The extension would be of brick and tile construction to match the existing bedrooms when viewed from Devonshire Road.

The elevation facing All Hallows Road would be part brick/part render and the northern elevation would be rendered. The All Hallows Road elevation of the existing hotel would also be amended to include rendering to the two gable features.

In addition, it is proposed to erect a three storey extension to the southern elevation of the hotel to create a lift to serve the accommodation. This would be of brick construction and would have a tiled roof. The semi-circular amenity area on the Devonshire Road frontage of the site would be reduced in area and the car parking area would be remodelled to create an

additional 11 spaces. A bin storage compound would be provided at the rear of the Pub/Restaurant, between the Pub/Restaurant building and the hotel accommodation, and parking for eight cycles would be provided adjacent the hotel entrance on the southern side of the building.

The application is accompanied by an Environmental/Ground Conditions/Contamination report, Heritage Statement, Planning Statement, Transport Statement and Design Statement.

### **MAIN PLANNING ISSUES**

The main planning issues are considered to be:

- principle of the development
- impact on the amenities of local residents
- impact on highways and traffic
- design of the proposal
- impact on the setting of the locally listed building

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

### **CONSULTATIONS**

**Built Heritage Manager:** I refer to the application for proposed alterations and an extension at the Premier Inn, Red Lion Hotel, Devonshire Road. Although the development will not involve removing any historic fabric from the locally listed Red Lion Hotel, it will have some impact on its setting when viewed from Devonshire Road. If you are minded to approve the application I would ask that some planting is undertaken at the front of the new extension in order to soften its impact when viewed from Devonshire Road. In addition, the heritage statement considers that the development may disturb buried archaeological remains from earlier uses of the site, and I would ask that groundworks be subject to archaeological monitoring in the form of a watching brief, as recommended in the Heritage Statement.

**Head of Highways and Traffic Management:** No comments have been received at the time of preparing this report. Any comments that are received before the Committee meeting will be reported in the Update Note.

**Service Manager, Public Protection:** I have looked at the Phase 1 Desk Study and agree with the recommendations that have been made. A Phase 2 and Gas monitoring is required to ensure there is no significant likelihood of contamination being present within the ground conditions.

**Waste Services Manager:** No comments have been received at the time of preparing this report. Any comments that are received before the Committee meeting will be reported in the Update Note.

## **PUBLICITY AND REPRESENTATIONS**

Site notices displayed: 15 July 2016

Neighbours notified: 14 July 2016

### **Mr S Christy, 7 Village Way, Blackpool, FY2 0AH (Objects)**

My concerns regarding the Red Lion/Premier Inn (issues prior to the proposed extension):-

- \* bins/skips back directly onto the back of my property these are emptied throughout the day sometimes as early as 5.30 am
- \* empty bottles are tipped into the skips throughout the day 7.00 am till midnight numerous neighbours have commented on the noise
- \* vermin from the skips/bins there has been an influx of mice, flies and seagulls
- \* Friday 15th July 2016 the Red Lion car park was completely full with teachers and parents cars double parked, all of All Hallows Road was full and half of Village Way was full. 14.45-15.15 pm is a ridiculously busy time. The council doesn't respond to the problems caused now by ignorant parents who park over residents' drives. This will get worse because the Red Lion will lose numerous car park spaces.

### **Further comment submitted on Monday 25 July 2016**

To follow on from my concerns on the 18 June 2016, regarding the proposed extension to the Premier Inn.

I would like to object strongly to the development of the Premier Inn. In my previous communication I have highlighted issues which are a concern before the new plans have been taken into consideration.

This will have a detrimental impact on my property and residential amenities and will have a visual impact of a development. The Premier Inn already has enough bedrooms and this will cause density and will be over-developed. I already have concerns about the noise, smell, pollution and vermin as quoted in my previous correspondence.

New boundaries of the proposed building will be closer to my property and close to the tree line. Rooms will be in the direction of my property, so I will have loss of privacy and will be overlooked. I have asked the Premier Inn/Red Lion on several occasions to trim their trees down as this blocks out the light in my garden. Therefore new development will add to overshadowing/loss of light.

As we are extremely close to two schools the traffic is already a problem on the Red Lion car park and down Village Way. This will increase traffic, causing road capacity and difficulties with access and visibility, car parking and effects on pedestrians, cyclists and children's health and safety, causing a burden on highway safety. There have been several road accidents already, outside school/Premier Inn including a child being knocked down. We have already complained to the Council with build up of school traffic and people parking over drives but to no avail. (I have photographic evidence if needed).

We feel the Premier Inn/Red Lion haven't adhered to the human rights act where a person has the right to peaceful enjoyment of all their possessions, home and land. This is due to bin lorries emptying skips at 5.30am and bottle skips being emptied at midnight! We have complained on numerous occasions about the bins/skips being too near our property.

**Mrs V M Haydock, 690 Devonshire Road, Blackpool, FY2 0AW (Objects)**

The noise and inconvenience that this work will entail to all in the surrounding area. The increase in heavy traffic to carry out this work. Devonshire Road is a very busy road and at times has problems dealing with the traffic that uses it at present, especially in term times due to the proximity of the two schools, St Bernadette's and Montgomery High School. The hotel already takes coach parties and if this extension is allowed, there is no reason to believe that they will not have more coach parties, which means that the coaches take up spaces in the car park and there are less for the cars.

At present the large delivery lorry that comes a few times a week, already has difficulty getting into the gap between the hotel and the present buildings, and this development will only makes things worse. The present 'play' area is not used always by small children and many times, walking on the pavement outside the Red Lion I have seen balls being kicked into the oncoming traffic and children running out after them, with all the inherent dangers both to the children and the road users. Less space means that the parents of the schoolchildren will be parking on both sides of Devonshire Road, making it difficult for buses and large vehicles (including the Emergency Services) to get through. This has been experienced in the past week or so before the school breakup. This also makes it difficult to get out of the driveway, as the cars are parked sometimes for up to 30 minutes whilst the parents wait and they are not always considerate as to where they park, sometimes blocking the driveways. Can you guarantee that the drainage service on Devonshire Road will not be compromised? At present the drain by the north Devonshire Road entrance does not take any water and in fact has plants growing in it. Why do we need the hotel to be extended? This is a residential area and surely this will take business from the Blackpool hotels that are struggling as it is. There is mention from the firm that did the survey that implied the Red Lion was in an industrial area. It is not. The 'garages' mentioned are a food shop and a business building. The proposed development will alter the look of the Red Lion. At present it looks ok from the front but with this extension it will be out of keeping with the building and will be out of the building line of the hotel. If this development causes inconvenience to the residents, can we ask for a reduction in our rates etc? I am not against development where it is needed but feel that at the present time this one is inappropriate.

**Mrs S Wroe, 17 Village Way, Bispham, Blackpool, FY2 0AH (Objects)**

### **1. The Hotel and Premier Inn**

The Red Lion was, according to the documents online, refused planning for a 48 bed hotel in 1988 but was then given consent in January 1996 for a 39 bed hotel. At a later date (details not available online hence date unknown) this appears to have increased to 67. The extra 26 rooms will make a total of 93. This is unacceptable in a residential area and the extension will be far too near the houses on the south end of Village Way.

This is somewhat incomprehensible that originally a 48 bed was refused and now a proposal for almost double is being submitted; this also coinciding with increased development in the area due to the schools. What will follow in 10 years' time if permission granted - more rooms still until every blade of grass is covered?

The proposed site is outside the Blackpool Regeneration Project taking much needed business away from the Town Centre, particularly the hotels and guest houses. We are a residential area and this should remain the case.

The Red Lion is a 'non-designated (locally listed) Heritage asset' (HER no. MLA22163). At present the Hotel is hardly visible from Devonshire Road but the new North End proposal would extend beyond the existing northerly building line; indeed the original Heritage asset building would become hardly discernible.

Village Way does already have noise from the Red Lion site (and cooking smells) in the form of car alarms and particularly the emptying of glass waste into bins very early in the morning and the extension can only make it worse.

The north side of Red Bank Road in Bispham is residential and not tourist / commercial / industrial. Evidence for this is the Blackpool Council local plan. It would appear looking at the local plan map in the 2011 adopted plan as above, the Red Lion Premier Inn had not been extended to the 67 capacity!

Bispham is residential, not tourist and the development would represent a major increase compared to the original Red Lion building. It is lamentable that the poor householder has strict limits on development density imposed on them; even just adding a simple porch on the front!

### **2. Local Traffic around the Red Lion and Hotel**

The area is already gridlocked at peak times (particularly All Hallows Road) with the school having been allowed to expand but not seeming to provide enough parking for teachers and staff. Montgomery at present uses the parking area where the proposed extension will be built. It is inevitable that if the car parking places are lost and replaced more towards Devonshire Road I feel parents and staff will seek to park closer to the school i.e. on Village Way and Codale Avenue.

We already have problems with some staff parking on Village Way some from 8am to 5.30 (although Montgomery School has told me they instruct staff not to) and I feel it will make matters much worse. We have had, on occasions, cars parked restricting access for emergency vehicles should they be needed.

All Hallows Road is also losing the laybys where the new houses are being built opposite the church again taking much need parking away from the area.

It is a fact that parents and staff at Montgomery and St Bernadette's schools will use cars and All Hallows Road is a narrow road with traffic calming that does not work, signage which is often ignored (witness the need for temporary 'do not park' signs outside St Bernadette's school).

The footprint of the proposed extension is such that pedestrians walking from Devonshire Road to All Hallows Road through the Red Lion site will encounter dangerous blind bends at the southerly and northerly ends of the development.

### **3. Proposal to help residents.**

If against the majority of residents' wishes the consent is granted for the extension could a few demands be put in place to help residents in that:

The applicant (Premier Inn Hotels Ltd) pay the fees / charges to the Council to have erected No Entry sign posts displaying (Cars and Motor Cycles in the centre) with the wording under 'Except for access', particularly for Village Way, Codale Avenue and perhaps more streets. This has been done around Unity Academy on Warbreck Hill Road with signs at all streets that lead off Warbreck Hill Road near the school, plus restriction of 2hours in the laybys in front of the school.

Subject to consultation with local residents another alternative is Permit holders only parking. Last year the Council said they didn't have the money to proceed with the above but there would appear to be no reason why the applicant (Premier Inn Hotels Ltd) cannot be asked to pay as a pre-condition of the application; this is not unheard of.

### **4. Further information for the public domain**

- a) As discussed above it is unclear from the property history, when permission was granted for the existing 67-bed extension. Please make this available.
- b) Is there a limit on the extension allowed to an existing building in a commercial context and if not what criteria is applied when considering an application?

**Mr I Wroe, 17 Village Way, Bispham, Blackpool, FY2 0AH (Objects)**

I wish to strongly object to the proposal to extend the hotel accommodation at the Red Lion site, Bispham.

Application 07/0289, which for some reason does not feature on the property history, at [http://idoxpa.blackpool.gov.uk/online-applications/propertyDetails.do?activeTab=relatedCases&keyVal=\\_BLCKP\\_PROPLPI\\_10099\\_1](http://idoxpa.blackpool.gov.uk/online-applications/propertyDetails.do?activeTab=relatedCases&keyVal=_BLCKP_PROPLPI_10099_1) was for an extension to the hotel with a reduction in car parking spaces from 147 to 134.

Information in support of that application stated that 'The forms of development in the surrounding area are mainly residential. The housing style is typically two storey semi-detached, brick built dwellings circa 1930'. This statement clearly and manifestly disregarded the immediately adjacent detached properties in Village Way and terraced properties on All Hallows Road.

The previous application as above states that the previous extension 'maximizes the potential of this site'.

Bispham, which already has many hotels properly sited in the tourist areas, does not need more hotel accommodation and certainly not a 93 bedroom hotel in a residential, gridlocked area.

Premier Lodge's own website describes the existing hotel as being 'on a leafy street at the edge of town'. The website makes no reference to access by public transport, neither bus nor train and yet the application under reference 07/0289 made great play about this and annual travel plans; were they received?

The hotel is no architectural wonder and indeed detracts from the original heritage building of the Red Lion. This application exceeds the mark in terms of visual impact as it will exceed the northern building line and represents over-intense exploitation of the land.

Again the application to extend previously stated 'There are residential properties to the north side of the site, however it is considered that these will not be affected by the proposed development as there are generous privacy distances between the properties and the proposed extension'. Clearly the current proposal means there will no longer be 'generous privacy distances'.

The application 07/0289 includes a statement from the out of town planning consultants that 'the proposed extension will have minimal impact on neighbouring uses, which it is considered will sit comfortably with the surrounding built development.'

Montgomery School has materially increased in size in my time in Bispham, as has St Bernadette's School. This has brought traffic chaos, disregard for yellow lines and, since Lancashire County appear to have insisted the former route through the Red Lion car park was blocked some years ago, All Hallows Road is often gridlocked. Clearly inadequate



provision has been made for parking at both schools and the result is that staff/students/visitors park in the Red Lion car park, Codale Avenue, Village Way and All Hallows Road.

To permit the development of yet more hotel beds in a residential area outside of the designated areas in Blackpool can only mean that my understanding of the local plan is misguided or is it that the local plan is just a glossy waste of council tax payer's money and anything goes in reality?

**Miss Maria Curran, 37 Crofton Avenue, Blackpool, FY2 0BB (Objects)**

Please find listed below my objections for not proceeding with the extension:

1. The hotel already has 67 rooms and does not need 11 more rooms.
2. I understand there are plans for a further Premier Inn hotel will be built on the Yates Wine Lodge site in Blackpool Centre.
3. It will cause more traffic in the area and the road is already very busy. More people are going to be parking on the surrounding roads, especially at school times.
4. This is a residential area and we don't need a larger building spoiling the area. The present view from the back of the current hotel is big enough.
5. It is close to 2 nursery schools, infant/junior and 1 senior school.
6. There will be more noise pollution and parking issues from increased traffic in All Hallows Road, Village Way, Codale Avenue and Crofton Avenue.
7. There will be a further strain on the already old drainage system, and the waste collection system.

**L and V Haydock, 690 Devonshire Road, Blackpool, FY2 0AW (Objects)**

Please find listed below arguments for not proceeding with the extension:

1. The hotel already has 67 rooms and does not need even more. The restaurant cannot cope with the current number of guests and general public as it is. This is also going to take business away from the town centre.
2. 11 more spaces won't make much difference as some others are going to be lost with the extension.
3. It will cause more traffic in the area and the road is already very busy. More people are going to be parking on the road, especially at school times.
4. This is a residential area and we don't need a larger building spoiling the area. The present view from Devonshire Road mainly hides the current hotel, which is big enough, but this north extension takes it out of the building line and will be visible. It will also be much nearer private houses on the north side.
5. It is close to two nursery schools, infant/junior and one senior school.
6. There will be more noise from increased traffic. Connecting into existing drains will put a further strain onto an already old system. The waste bins have already been a problem due to overflowing and smells, and are currently situated nearer to houses than they should be. This will only make matters worse.

We have lived in the area for many years and have seen the Red Lion change, and not necessarily for the better.

**Mr Brian Summers, 5 Village Way, Blackpool, FY2 0AH (Objects)**

My property is directly affected by this proposed application as it will be in direct line and, if approved, will be much closer to the Premier Inn.

The extension would result in vehicles, including delivery vehicles much closer to my home, resulting in increased noise levels.

Also, in quantifying the number of parking places available, I believe that the applicants are guilty of double counting. Parking slots originally in place (stipulated in previous planning applications??) have been used to park several skips. The applicants are suggesting that if and when the skips are moved, the parking slots will be additional ones.

A further point that I wish to raise is that many staff from Montgomery High School use this exact area to park during the day, as do those on the afternoon school run. Human nature being what it is, the extension will deter them from parking at the Premier Inn and will seek to park close to the school. The most likely places are All Hallows Road (already very congested at school runs times) and Village Way. Residents in Village Way already experience increased numbers of staff parking there during the day. At the time of school runs, the situation often becomes intolerable. Whilst I appreciate that this is not an issue for Premier Inn, I believe that it will lead to problems and confrontations between residents and those connected with the school, something which will result in the Council being drawn into disputes.

I urge the Council to decline the application on grounds of overdevelopment.

**Further comment submitted on Sunday 17 July 2016**

I am directly affected by this application as my property is directly on the other side of a fence / shrubs to the proposed extension. The extension would bring cars and delivery vehicles closer to my boundary resulting in increased noise, especially in the early morning.

Furthermore, I believe that when identifying increased parking onsite, Premier Inn is guilty of double counting and mis-leading. Some parking slots that are already in existence have in fact been used to park several skips closer to the properties in Village Way. The proposal to move the skips elsewhere is being offered by Premier Inn as new, additional slots, when in fact they already exist, but mis-used by Premier Inn. A further problem relates to the use of the site of the extension currently being used by staff at Montgomery School throughout the day and by many parents on the school run. The proposed extension and layout would result in many of these seeking somewhere closer to park, human nature being what it is. Village Way would be, in my opinion, the likely place chosen. Those of us living there already suffer from school staff parking outside our homes every day and severe congestion during the school run. Increased parking and traffic in this cul-de-sac would add to our problems, resulting in

aggravation and confrontation. Whilst I realise that this is not directly Premier Inn's problem, I believe that the resulting impact would end up on the doorsteps of the Police and Council.

**Mrs S Summers, 5 Village Way, Blackpool, FY2 0AH (Objects)**

The increased proximity to our home is sure to bring increased traffic closer to our boundary thus increasing the noise disturbance. I also believe that the extension will displace Montgomery School staff who park there throughout the day, leading them to form alternative on-street parking in Codale Avenue and Village Way where problems already exist.

Furthermore, when Premier Inn last extended in 2007, they had to pile the land. We could feel the vibrations throughout this operation. As the proposed extension is even closer, I fear that the piling, which must be done in Blackpool, will have a profound effect on the structure of our home.

**Mrs R Mahoney, 10, Village Way, Bispham, Blackpool, FY2 0AH (Objects)**

The proposal to further increase the number of bedrooms at the Red Lion Premier Inn goes directly against the policy of Blackpool Town Council Planning. The policy is outlined under CS21 "Leisure, Business and Tourism" and centres on the need to physically and economically regenerate Blackpool's core area and town centre. It states that it will actively encourage proposals for visitor accommodation to be located in core areas. There is no basis to justify further accommodation outside of those areas. The proposed development is in a residential area, not a holiday area. Booking information shows that weekend leisure visits (holiday visitors) outweigh any business visits. There are few businesses in the locality so no need for further development to accommodate these. Parking in All Hallows Road and Village Way is a big problem. Since the local secondary school has been extended, there is not enough parking within the grounds and therefore parking takes place in All Hallows, Village Way and the Red Lion car park. If this space were to be decreased, further problems would occur in the surrounding, already overburdened areas.

**Mrs Linda Edgar, 29 Village Way, Blackpool, FY2 0AH (Objects)**

I refer to the application to the alterations/extension to the Premier Inn, Red Lion Hotel, FY2 0AR. I have only today been made aware of the application even though the proposed extension would impact on my life. Apparently Blackpool Council did not see fit to notify all the residents who would be affected.

My main concern is the fact that such an alteration would result in more traffic and less parking. There are two schools in the immediate vicinity, one of which is a primary school. As it is, at 'school rush hour' the volume of traffic on All Hallows Road and Village Way is horrendous. It's difficult to navigate a way through the parked cars which are often parked over drives. When asked to move their vehicles some parents are abusive or simply refuse. At these times it would be impossible for an emergency vehicle to pass through. If the proposed alterations were to go ahead the situation would only worsen. I understand that the staff of Montgomery School are allowed to park in the Red Lion car park during the school day. As a

result of the extension being built there would be less parking at the Red Lion and therefore more cars parked in the surrounding roads and avenues causing danger to the schoolchildren and the residents. This is a residential area, not a commercial or industrial area. As one neighbour has already pointed out, the residents are entitled to enjoy their homes in peace. I sincerely hope the application doesn't succeed. Whitbread Premier Inn is the UK's largest hotel chain. They already have plans to build a Premier Inn on the Yate's Wine Lodge site - let them be content with that. If it does succeed I would ask that Blackpool Council take into account the traffic/parking problems already encountered by local residents and consider putting restrictions in place with regard to access and parking. I personally would like Village Way to be 'Access Only' and I would think that residents in avenues in the surrounding area would be in favour of something similar.

**Mr A Wood, 31 All Hallows Rd, Blackpool, FY2 0AS (Objects**

Regarding the development of extra bedrooms at the Red Lion Hotel, I would make the following observations:

1. The development is in a residential area, and the extension will increase the use of the site, therefore increasing the likelihood of noise nuisance from the site.
2. There has been no provision for coach parking in the plan.  
Coaches regularly use the Premier Inn and are more likely to do so if the development is allowed.
3. The building increases the likelihood of antisocial incidents affecting Village Way as it is closer to the houses there e.g. associated vehicle noise from traffic passing nearer to the houses, the noise from the visitors having less distance to travel.
4. The grounds of the Red Lion are currently used by staff and visitors to Montgomery School. The development may displace the associated car parking to Village Way or Codale Ave, especially if accessing the car park is less convenient.
5. This extension is detrimental to the development of the hotel industry in the town centre.

Should planning permission be approved for this development, then the following should be considered as part of that restriction:

1. Use of rubbish bins both filling and emptying should be between 0700 and 2200.
2. An 'access only' or 'residents parking permit scheme' should apply to Codale Ave and Village Way, both of which experience severe congestion due to parking associated with the two schools that have access on All Hallows Rd.
3. Service deliveries should be restricted to being between 0770 and 2200.
4. Designated parking for coaches should be incorporated in the plan.

**Mrs J Lawton, 15 Village Way, Bispham, Blackpool, FY2 0AH (Objects)**

Proposed development is in a residential area not in a commercial area. A major concern is parking nearby; Montgomery High School, St Bernadette's and the nursery school all use the Red Lion car park to drop off and pick up children. Traffic problems will therefore increase due to the loss of parking on the Red Lion.

There will be an increase in parked vehicles on All Hallow's Road, which will have an impact on vehicle access to Bispham Parish Church, Village Way and Codale Avenue. This is already congested with traffic at school times. In addition, emergency vehicle access will be inhibited due to the number of parked vehicles as a result of the proposed plans. Emptying of bins and refuse collections, specifically glass collection is a noise disturbance. Works access and noise levels during construction will have an impact on the community, schools and residents.

In Policy Core Strategy 7 of CBRE Planning Statement it states: '4.9 (b) Ensure amenities of nearby residents are not adversely affected', this should be taken into account when considering this application. The houses that back directly onto the proposed development will be affected by visual intrusion, overlooking, shading, noise, and privacy will be impeded on. If the development goes ahead then consideration should be given to make Village Way and other streets nearby access only or introduce a residents parking permit scheme.

**Mr and Mrs Gregson, 9 Village Way, Bispham, Blackpool (Objects)**

Concerned about proximity of extension to residential properties in Village Way. Concerned about loss of privacy. Concerned about increased noise disturbance. Concerned about additional traffic exacerbating existing parking issues with Montgomery High School and St Bernadette's primary school.

**Mr and Mrs Baldwin, 3 Village Way, Bispham, Blackpool (Objects)**

Our property is in direct alignment to the north of the proposed extension and therefore very close to the pounding that took place when pile-driving the previous foundations on the 2007 extension. As that extension was some 30m from our boundary fence, I fear for the damage that the vibrations may cause to the structure of our property through further pile-driving being undertaken within 10m of that boundary fence. In the event that planning consent is granted, would it be feasible to get the applicant to pay for fees regarding the survey of properties that would be in direct danger to possible structural damage prior to any construction, as proof, in case damage did occur?

A further concern is the parking on the east side of the development and All Hallows Road where parents park on the school run, as do the teaching staff at Montgomery School. Access to this area on the north side, taking the trees into consideration, will be narrow with two-way traffic in and out.

Because of the extension, the entrance turning the corner will be partially blind. The parking spaces on the corner into this parking area are in an inconvenient position and may need to be removed with two-way traffic turning that corner. The inconvenience for parents on the school run to park there will only push them further down Village Way and in that vicinity for longer periods, as they fight for space to get there earlier, so they can be as close to the school when picking up their children. As a supposed residential area there are enough problems regarding traffic without further deterioration from this latest proposal.

**Mrs D Dennett, 37 Village Way, Bispham, Blackpool, FY2 0AH (Objects)**

My objection to the proposed extension to the Premier Inn at the Red Lion of 26 further rooms is because of the certain exacerbation in the already chaotic parking arrangements and disorderly traffic in relation to Montgomery High School which is in the immediate vicinity of the site in question. Cars park partially on the pavements both on All Hallows Road and Village Way, causing unnecessary difficulty and danger to pedestrians with pushchairs, wheelchairs and to those with visual impairment. This already unsatisfactory situation can only be made worse by the significant reduction in parking spaces resulting from the proposed extension.

As a local resident who would be directly affected by this proposal, I strongly object to any further deterioration in the disorderly and at times illegal parking and traffic gridlock on All Hallows Road and Village Way which would without doubt be the adverse consequence should this planning application be approved.

**Mrs M Kirkland, 1 Codale Avenue, Blackpool FY2 OBA (Objects)**

Concerned that the proposal is for 26 additional bedrooms and only 11 extra car parking spaces. Concerned that school staff and parents park on the car park at the Red Lion where the extension is proposed. Concerned that the proposal will worsen the on street parking situation in the area and be detrimental to the health and safety of schoolchildren.

**NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK**

Paragraph 2 requires applications to be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The National Planning Policy Framework is a material consideration in planning decisions.

Paragraph 11 reiterates this requirement.

Paragraph 12 states that the National Planning Policy Framework does not change the statutory status of the development plan as the starting point for decision making. Proposed development that accords with an up to date Local Plan should be approved and proposed development that conflicts should be refused unless material considerations indicate otherwise. It is highly desirable that Local Planning Authorities have an up to date plan in place.

Paragraph 14 states - at the heart of the National Planning Policy Framework is a presumption in favour of sustainable development, which should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking. For decision-taking this means:

- approving development proposals that accord with the development plan without delay; and
- where the development plan is absent, silent or relevant policies are out-of-date, granting permission unless:
  - any adverse impacts of doing so would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in this Framework taken as whole; or
  - specific policies in this Framework indicate development should be restricted.

Paragraph 17 sets out the 12 core land-use planning principles which should underpin both plan-making and decision-taking which include to proactively drive sustainable development and secure a high standard of design and a good standard of amenity.

Paragraph 24 requires a sequential test to be undertaken where a 'main town centre use' is proposed in an out of centre location.

Paragraph 56 states that good design is a key aspect of sustainable development and is indivisible from good planning and should contribute positively to making places better for people.

Paragraph 61 states that although visual appearance and architecture of individual buildings are very important factors, securing high quality and inclusive design goes beyond aesthetic considerations.

Paragraph 135 requires the impact of a proposal on a non-designated heritage asset to be taken into consideration and the extent of any harm to be assessed as part of the consideration of an application.

Paragraph 150 emphasises the importance of Local Plans in delivering sustainable development. It reiterates the point that planning decisions should be made in accordance with the 'Local Plan' unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Paragraph 186 states that local planning authorities should approach decision-taking in a positive way to foster the delivery of sustainable development. The relationship between decision-taking and plan-making should be seamless, translating plans into high quality development on the ground.

Paragraph 187 states that local planning authorities should look for solutions rather than problems, and decision-takers at every level should seek to approve applications for sustainable development where possible. Local planning authorities should work proactively with applicants to secure developments that improve the economic, social and environmental conditions of the area.

Paragraph 196 states that the planning system is plan-led. Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. This Framework is a material consideration in planning decisions.

Paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework 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 National Planning Policy Framework.

### **BLACKPOOL LOCAL PLAN PART 1: CORE STRATEGY**

The Blackpool Local Plan: Part 1 - Core Strategy has been adopted by the Council at its meeting on 20 January 2016. The document will be published on the Council's website in due course. In accordance with paragraph 216 of the National Planning Policy Framework significant weight can now be given to the policies of the Core Strategy. Certain policies in the Saved Blackpool Local Plan have now been superseded by policies in the Core Strategy (these are listed in the appendices to the document). Other policies in the Saved Blackpool Local Plan will remain in use until Part 2 of the new Local Plan is produced.

The policies in the Core Strategy that are most relevant to this application are -

Policy CS1: strategic location of development

Policy CS5: connectivity

Policy CS7: quality of design

Policy CS9: water management

Policy CS10: sustainable design

Policy CS21: leisure and business tourism

Policy CS23: managing holiday bedspaces

### **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** states that new development will be expected to be of a high standard of design and to make a positive contribution to the quality of its surrounding environment.

**Policy LQ2 Site Context** states that the design of new development proposals will be considered in relation to the character and setting of the surrounding area. New developments in streets, spaces or areas with a consistent townscape character should respond to and enhance the existing character. These include locations affecting the setting



of a Listed Building or should be a high quality contemporary and individual expression of design.

**Policy LQ4 Building Design** states that in order to lift the quality of new building design and ensure that it provides positive reference points for future proposals, new development should satisfy the following criteria:

- A. Public and Private Space - New development will need to make a clear distinction between areas of public and private landscaping utilising appropriate landscaping treatments. Residential developments will be expected to achieve a connected series of defensible spaces throughout the development.
- B. Scale - The scale, massing and height of new buildings should be appropriate for their use and be related to:
  - (i) the width and importance of the street or space.
  - (ii) the scale, massing a height of neighbouring buildings.
- C. Design of Facades - The detailed appearance of facades will need to create visual interest and must be appropriate to the use of the building. New buildings must have a connecting structure between ground and upper floors composed of:
  - (i) a base, of human scale that addresses the street.
  - (ii) a middle, of definite rhythm, proportions and patterns, normally with vertical emphasis on the design and positioning of windows and other architectural elements.
  - (iii) a roof, which adds further interest and variety.
  - (iv) a depth of profile providing texture to the elevation.
- D. Materials - need to be of a high quality and durability and in a form, texture and colour that is complementary to the surrounding area.

**Policy BH3 Residential and Visitor Amenity** states that developments will not be permitted which would adversely affect the amenity of those occupying residential and visitor accommodation by:

- (i) the scale, design and siting of the proposed development and its effects on privacy, outlook, and levels of sunlight and daylight;  
and/or
- (ii) the use of and activity associated with the proposed development;  
or by
- (iii) the use of and activity associated with existing properties in the vicinity of the accommodation proposed.

**Policy BH4 - Public Safety** - seeks to ensure air quality is not prejudiced, noise and vibration is minimised, light pollution is minimised, contaminated land is remediated and groundwater is not polluted.

**Policy AS1 General Development Requirements** states that development will be permitted where the access, travel and safety needs of all affected by the development are met as follows:

- a) convenient, safe and pleasant pedestrian access is provided.
- b) appropriate provision exists or is made for cycle access.
- c) effective alternative routes are provided where existing cycle routes or public footpaths are to be severed.
- d) appropriate access and facilities for people with impaired mobility (including the visually and hearing impaired) are provided.
- e) appropriate provision exists or is made for public transport.
- f) safe and appropriate access to the road network is secured for all transport modes requiring access to the development.
- g) appropriate traffic management measures are incorporated within the development to reduce traffic speeds; give pedestrians, people with impaired mobility and cyclists priority; and allow the efficient provision of public transport.
- h) appropriate levels of car, cycle and motorcycle parking, servicing and operational space are provided, in accordance with standards set out in Appendix B.

Where the above requires the undertaking of off-site works or the provision of particular services, these must be provided before any part of the development comes into use.

## **ASSESSMENT**

- **principle of the development** - this is an existing Premier Inn hotel which currently has 67 bedrooms, having been extended in 2008 by the addition of 27 bedrooms. The Premier Inn hotel is in an out of centre location and is outside the resort core but it is adjacent a longstanding Public House/hotel.

Policy CS21 of the Blackpool Local Plan Part 1:Core Strategy seeks to ensure that 'new visitor accommodation' is focused in the Town Centre, in the Resort Core and in the defined Holiday Accommodation Areas identified in the Council's Holiday Accommodation Supplementary Planning Document unless exceptional circumstances for a location outside these areas is demonstrated (criteria b). It could be argued that, as this is an extension to an existing hotel, Policy CS21 (criteria b) does not strictly apply. However the applicant's agent has been asked to provide justification for the need for a further expansion of the existing hotel given its location. The argument put forward is that the hotel is having to turn away demand and that it is an attractive and convenient location. In addition the applicant's agent has been asked to undertake a 'sequential assessment' of other sites.

The agent has discounted the town centre as the applicant is proposing to provide a 150 bedroom hotel on the site of the former Yates building on Talbot Road and has considered three available sites in the Resort Core - 9 to 11 Station Road, 7-11 Bond Street and 397-399 Promenade, none of which are considered suitable primarily for reasons of size and cost. I have requested further information on the suitability of some vacant hotels in the Resort Core.

- **impact on the amenities of local residents** - The current bedroom block is some 30 metres to the north of the boundary with the rear gardens of houses fronting Village Way at three storeys in height. The proposed extension would bring the building to between 9.4 and 10.1 metres of the boundary but at this point the height would be two storeys (5.4 metres) and the roof would slope away from the boundary. At 16.5 metres from the boundary the building would be 9.5 metres high and at its highest point of 11.5 metres it would be some 22 metres from this boundary. It is recognised that the houses in Village Way are set at a slightly lower level than the application site but these distances combined with the rear garden lengths of some 10-15 metres would mean that the proposed extension would not significantly overshadow the rear gardens and houses.

There would be no windows in the end elevation of the extension and only a fire door at ground floor level. It is acknowledged that there would be windows in the west and east facing elevations of the extension but these would only permit angled views of the rear gardens of 1-7 Village Way and the lesser the angle the further the garden is away (1 and 7 Village Way rear gardens would have a shallower angle of view but the nearest bedroom windows would be some 15 metres away). This relationship is considered acceptable, particularly bearing in mind they are hotel bedrooms and people do not tend to spend long periods of time in the bedrooms. The proposal would remove some of the car parking close to the boundary with the properties in Village Way and would move the bin storage area to a point some 30 metres from this boundary. This, coupled with a restriction on the hours of bin collection/bottle collection, would be a benefit to local residents. It is not considered that the proposals would conflict with the aims of Policy BH3 of the Local Plan and Policy CS7 of the Core Strategy.

- **impact on highways and traffic** - The extension would mean that there would be 93 bedrooms and the maximum car parking requirement would be 93 spaces (one per room). The standards allow for a reduction based on the degree of accessibility of the site. In the case of this site it is a 'medium' accessible site which permits a 10% reduction in demand. The maximum requirement would be 83 spaces for the 93 bed hotel. The restaurant in the Red Lion has a floor area of some 857 square metres and hence would attract a parking requirement of 95 spaces. As two independent uses, the maximum parking requirement would therefore be 178 spaces. The proposal is to increase the number of car parking spaces on the site from 132 to 143 which would fall below the maximum requirement for the two independent uses. However it needs to be recognised that the two uses do not operate wholly independently and that the actual usage of the car park needs to be considered.

The applicant's transport consultant has undertaken a survey of the usage of the car park and officers have looked at usage on site. The existing car park has not been witnessed at full capacity. There is no doubt that the car park is used by parents and staff at the two nearby schools but this does not coincide with peak demands for the hotel and restaurant. In addition, it would be unreasonable to expect the applicants to resolve issues associated with the two nearby schools. It is considered that the additional 11 car parking spaces would be sufficient to cater for the additional 26 bedrooms proposed. It is

not considered that the proposal would conflict with Policies AS1 and AS2 of the Local Plan

- **design of the proposal** - The extension has been designed to create a break between the existing bedroom block and to taper down towards the northern boundary of the site. The extension would therefore appear subservient to the existing bedroom block but would appear complementary to it in that its design and materials would match the existing block. The introduction of rendered elements to the existing bedroom block would assist in breaking up the elevation to All Hallows Road and adding some interest to the elevation. The design approach has evolved through discussions with officers who were concerned to avoid an elongation of the existing block in a wholly three storey form. It is considered that the design approach is consistent with the LQ policies in the Local Plan and Policy CS7 in the Core Strategy.
- **impact on the setting of the locally listed building** - It is recognised that the extension would be visible behind the Red Lion when viewed from Devonshire Road but because it would be lower than the Red Lion and the existing bedroom block and would taper as it projects northwards it is not considered that it would have an adverse impact on the setting of the locally listed building. Similarly, whilst there would be a reduction in the size of the semi-circular grassed area in front of the Red Lion, it would still retain the open character and strong symmetrical appearance. It is not considered that the reduction in this area would harm the setting of the locally listed building. It is therefore considered that there would be no conflict with Policy CS8 of the Core Strategy.
- **Other Issues** - As there may be archaeological remains under the site, a condition is required to ensure that a watching brief is undertaken during excavation work. Possible damage to neighbouring property is a private matter.

## **CONCLUSION**

The principle of extending an existing hotel in an out of Resort Core location is considered acceptable given the demand for the extra bedrooms and the lack of sequentially preferable sites in the Resort Core. The design of the proposed extension is considered acceptable in being subservient to, but also complementary to, the existing bedroom block. It is not considered that the extension would significantly affect the amenities of the occupiers of houses in Village Way to the north of the site. It is not considered that the proposals would adversely affect the setting of the locally listed building. It is not considered that the proposal would represent an over-intensive use of the site and adequate on site car parking would be provided.

## **LEGAL AGREEMENT AND/OR DEVELOPER FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTION**

None needed.

## **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) 16/0394 which can be accessed via the link below:

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

**Recommended Decision:** Grant Permission

## **Conditions and Reasons**

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2. The development shall be carried out, except where modified by the conditions attached to this permission, in accordance with the planning application received by the Local Planning Authority on 4th July 2016 including the following plans:

Location Plan stamped as received by the Council on 4 July 2016  
Drawings numbered CHQ.15.11382-PL05 Rev A, CHQ.15.11382-PL06A,  
CHQ.15.11382-PL07/1, CHQ.15.11382-PL07/2.

Reason: For the avoidance of doubt and so the Local Planning Authority can be satisfied as to the details of the permission.

3. Details of materials to be used on the external elevations shall be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to the development being commenced.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the locality, in accordance with Policy LQ14 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016.

4.
  - a) No development shall take place until full details of both hard and soft landscaping works have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. These details shall include any proposed changes to existing ground levels, means of enclosure and boundary treatment, areas of soft landscaping, hard surfaced areas and materials, planting plans specifications and schedules (including plant size, species and number/ densities), existing landscaping to be retained, and shall show how account has been taken of any underground services.
  - b) The landscaping works shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details within the first planting season following completion of the development hereby approved or in accordance with a programme agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority (whichever is sooner.)
  - c) Any trees or shrubs planted in accordance with this condition which are removed, uprooted, destroyed, die, or become severely damaged or seriously diseased within 5 years of planting shall be replaced within the next planting season by trees or shrubs of similar size and species to those originally required to be planted, unless the Local Planning Authority gives its written consent to any variation.

Reason. To ensure the site is satisfactorily landscaped in the interests of visual amenity and to ensure there are adequate areas of soft landscaping to act as a soakaway during times of heavy rainfall with regards to Policy LQ6 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016.

5. Prior to the development hereby approved being first brought into use the refuse storage provision shown on the approved plans shall be provided and shall thereafter be retained.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the locality and the residential amenity of occupants and neighbours, in accordance with Policies LQ1 and BH3 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016.

6. Prior to the development hereby approved being first brought into use the secure cycle storage provision shown on the approved plans shall be provided and shall thereafter be retained.

Reason: To enable access to and from the property by sustainable transport

mode, in accordance with Policy AS1 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016.

7. Prior to the development hereby approved being first brought into use the car parking provision shown on the approved plans shall be provided and shall thereafter be retained.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the locality and highway safety, in accordance with Policies LQ1 and AS1 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016.

8. No development shall take place until a Construction Management Plan has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The Construction Management Plan shall include and specify the provision to be made for the following:

- dust mitigation measures during the construction period
- control of noise emanating from the site during the construction period
- hours and days of construction work for the development
- contractors' compounds and other storage arrangements
- provision for all site operatives, visitors and construction loading, off-loading, parking and turning within the site during the construction period
- arrangements during the construction period to minimise the deposit of mud and other similar debris on the adjacent highways
- the routing of construction traffic.

The construction of the development shall then proceed in accordance with the approved Construction Management Plan.

Reason: In the interests of the amenities of surrounding residents and to safeguard the character and appearance of the area in accordance with Policies LQ1 and BH3 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016.

9. (a) No development or other operations shall commence on site until a scheme (hereinafter called the approved protection scheme) which provides for the retention and protection of trees, shrubs and hedges growing on or adjacent to the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

(b) No operations shall commence on site in connection with the development hereby approved (including any tree felling, tree pruning, demolition works, soil moving, temporary access construction and or widening or any operations involving the use of motorised vehicles or construction machinery) until the protection works required by the approved scheme are in place.

(c) No excavations for services, storage of materials or machinery, parking of

vehicles, deposit or excavation of soil or rubble, lighting of fires or disposal of liquids shall take place within any area designated as being fenced off or otherwise protected in the approved scheme are in place.

(d) The fencing or other works which are part of the approved protection scheme shall not be moved or removed, temporarily or otherwise, until all works including external works have been completed and all equipment, machinery and surplus materials have been removed from the site, unless the prior written agreement of the Local Planning Authority has first been sought and obtained.

Reason: To secure the protection, throughout the time that the development is being carried out, of trees, shrubs or hedges growing within or adjacent to the site which are of amenity value to the area, having regards to Policy LQ6 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016.

10. No development shall take place on the site until the applicant, or their agent or successors in title, has secured the implementation of a programme of archaeological work for each phase of the development. This must be carried out in accordance with a written scheme of investigation which shall first have been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason; To ensure and safeguard the recording and inspection of matters of archaeological / historical importance associated with the site in accordance with Part 12 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

11. The building/use hereby approved shall not be occupied/first commenced until the servicing provisions, including manoeuvring areas, have been provided in accordance with the approved details; such areas shall not be used thereafter for any purpose other than that indicated on the approved plan and all servicing within the site including loading and unloading shall take place from within the servicing area shown.

Reason: In the interests of the appearance of the locality and highway safety, in accordance with Policies LQ4 and AS1 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016.

12. The bin, bottle and skip collections from the premises shall not operate outside the hours of 8am to 8pm on Mondays to Saturdays and 10 am and 8pm on Sundays and Bank Holidays.

Reason: To safeguard the living conditions of the occupants of nearby residential premises, in accordance with Policy BH3 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016.



## **Advice Notes to Developer**

1. Please note this approval relates specifically to the details indicated on the approved plans and documents, and to the requirement to satisfy all conditions of the approval. Any variation from this approval needs to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to works commencing and may require the submission of a revised application. Any works carried out without such written agreement or approval would render the development as unauthorised and liable to legal proceedings.