
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 January 2018

by Debbie Moore BSc (HONS) MCD MRTPI PGDip

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd February 2018

Appeal Ref: APP/J2373/W/17/3187814
4 Bloomfield Road, Blackpool FY1 6DH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Dar-Pol against the decision of Blackpool Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 17/0216, dated 22 March 2017, was refused by notice dated 19 May 2017.
 - The development proposed is described on the appeal form as "erection of roof lift to form second floor, and use of second floor premises as altered as a self-contained permanent flat with integral roof garden and balcony to front elevation".
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are:
 - (i) The effect of the development on the living conditions of neighbouring occupiers, with regard to outlook and light;
 - (ii) Whether the proposal would be an appropriate form of development in the defined Inner Area of the town.

Reasons

Living Conditions

3. The appeal property is a detached two-storey building, comprising commercial uses and residential accommodation. The surrounding area is mixed in character, with other residential and commercial premises in the vicinity.
4. The building is close to houses and flats to the east, at Nos 1 and 3 John Street. These properties have facing windows to main habitable rooms at ground and first floor level. At the rear there is residential accommodation in The Old Warehouse, which contains windows to main habitable rooms over two levels in relatively close proximity to the rear of the appeal building.
5. The development would create a further storey through replacing the pitched roof with a flat roof. This would involve building up the walls on all sides, resulting in a rectangular roof form, although the maximum roof height would not be increased.

6. The development would form a blank wall at the rear, extending to the second floor. The resulting wall would be a dominant feature that would be directly in front of the windows on the facing elevations of The Old Warehouse, and in close proximity. I appreciate that this relationship exists at present, but the increase in the height of the eaves would lead to a greater impact. As such, the development would adversely affect the outlook from the main habitable rooms of the neighbouring property. Furthermore, it is highly likely that there would be a material loss of daylight and sunlight to those rooms as the existing pitched roof would allow more light to penetrate.
7. The increase in height of the side wall facing No 1 John Street would lead to a reduction in the levels of daylight to the ground and first floor windows of that property. Also, it is likely that levels of sunlight would be adversely affected as the appeal property lies directly to the west. No 3 John Street is positioned at an oblique angle from the appeal property and, consequently, the impact of the development would be less severe, in terms of loss of light.
8. The effect on the outlook from the first floor windows of Nos 1 and 3 John Street would be mitigated by the intervening road, which is wider than the alley between the appeal property and The Old Warehouse. Also, the outlook from No 3 would not be affected as the first floor windows would not be directly facing the development. However, this does not overcome my other concerns as set out above.
9. I appreciate that there is other similar development in the area, but the concern in this instance centres on the relationship between the appeal property and the surrounding development, which is a unique situation. I also looked at the development on the corner of Moon Avenue, but the site-specific circumstances in that case differ significantly from the appeal before me and it is not comparable.
10. I conclude on this issue that the development would have an adverse effect on the living conditions of the occupiers of No 1 John Street, due to loss of daylight and sunlight, and The Old Warehouse, due to loss of light and outlook. Consequently, the development would not accord with Policies LQ14 and BH3 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016 (adopted June 2006) and Policy CS7 of the Blackpool Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy 2012-2027 (adopted January 2016) which, amongst other things, seek to protect residential amenity. The development would not meet the aims of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) insofar as it seeks to promote good design and secure a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

Defined Inner Area

11. Policy HN5 of the Local Plan seeks to resist extensions for residential sub-divisions within the defined Inner Area of the town. The aim of the policy is to prevent proposals for conversion or sub-division for residential use which would further intensify existing over-concentrations of flat accommodation and conflict with wider efforts for neighbourhood improvement as a balanced and healthy community.
12. The Council is concerned that the development would contribute to a housing imbalance within the inner area of Blackpool. However, there is very limited evidence to support this assertion. I have no information about the existing

concentration of flats in the area or any examples of how the proposal would conflict with efforts for neighbourhood improvement. Although the development would add to the number of flats in the area, it would be of an adequate size and would contain three bedrooms, with an area of rooftop amenity space. There is no dispute over the standard of the residential accommodation proposed.

13. Consequently, on the basis of the evidence before me, it has not been demonstrated that development would contribute to a housing imbalance, contrary to Policy HN5 of the Local Plan.

Conclusion

14. The development would make a very small contribution to the local housing supply, but this would not outweigh the harm identified above in respect of living conditions.
15. For the reasons given above, the appeal is dismissed.

Debbie Moore

Inspector