

Report to:	PLANNING COMMITTEE
Relevant Officer:	Gary Johnston, Head of Development Management
Date of Meeting	13 June 2017

PLANNING/ENFORCEMENT APPEALS DETERMINED/ LODGED

1.0 Purpose of the report:

- 1.1 The Committee is requested to note the planning and enforcement appeals lodged and determined.

2.0 Recommendation(s):

- 2.1 To note the report.

3.0 Reasons for recommendation(s):

- 3.1 To provide the Committee with a summary of planning appeals for information.

- 3.2a Is the recommendation contrary to a plan or strategy adopted or approved by the Council? No

- 3.2b Is the recommendation in accordance with the Council's approved budget? Yes

- 3.3 Other alternative options to be considered:

- 3.4 None, the report is for information only.

4.0 Council Priority:

- 4.1 The relevant Council Priority is 'The Economy: maximising growth and opportunity across Blackpool'

5.0 Background Information

5.1 Planning/Enforcement Appeals Determined

5.2 1 St. Lukes Road, Blackpool FY4 2EL (16/0474)

5.2.1 An Appeal by Mr. Smith against the decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of an extension at second floor level on top of the roof.
APPEAL ALLOWED

5.2.2 The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area; and the living conditions of the occupants of 512 Lytham Road, with regards to privacy.

5.2.3 The Inspector concluded that the proposals would represent a high quality design as it would respond to the site's character and appearance and the street scenes of St. Lukes Road and Lytham Road; and it would not result in an adverse loss of privacy to the occupants of 512 Lytham Road due to the obscure glazed flank elevation windows and the heavy screening of the rear garden by their garage and rear extension.

5.2.4 A copy of the Inspector's decision dated 28 April 2017 is attached as Appendix 3a.

5.3 Sainsbury's, 80 Red Bank Road, Blackpool FY2 9HH (16/0730)

5.3.1 An appeal by Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd against the decision of the Council to refuse advertisement consent for the display of 1 internally illuminated high level fascia sign and one non illuminated aluminium panel. **APPEAL ALLOWED.**

5.3.2 The main issues are the effects of the proposal on the character and appearance of the host building and its surroundings.

5.3.3 The Inspector concluded that the proposals would not be detrimental to the interests of amenity and public safety and cause no significant harm to amenity in terms of their effects on the character and appearance of the host building and its surroundings.

5.3.4 A copy of the Inspector's decision dated 4 May 2017 is attached as Appendix 3b.

5.5 Planning/Enforcement Appeals Lodged

5.5.1 None

5.9 List of Appendices:

- 5.9.1 Appendix 3a - A copy of the Inspector's decision dated 28 April 2017
Appendix 3b - A copy of the Inspector's decision dated 4 May 2017

6.0 Legal considerations:

- 6.1 None

7.0 Human Resources considerations:

- 7.1 None

8.0 Equalities considerations:

- 8.1 None

9.0 Financial considerations:

- 9.1 None

10.0 Risk management considerations:

- 10.1 None

11.0 Ethical considerations:

- 11.1 None

12.0 Internal/ External Consultation undertaken:

- 12.1 None

13.0 Background papers:

- 13.1 None