

COMMITTEE DATE: 20/06/2018

Application Reference: **18/0122**

WARD: Highfield
DATE REGISTERED: 01/03/18
LOCAL PLAN ALLOCATION: Main local centre
Local centre

APPLICATION TYPE: Full Planning Permission
APPLICANT: Mr P Nuttall

PROPOSAL: Installation of new shop front.

LOCATION: 296-298 HIGHFIELD ROAD, BLACKPOOL, FY4 3JU

Summary of Recommendation: Refuse

CASE OFFICER

Ms P Greenway

BLACKPOOL COUNCIL PLAN 2015 -2020

This application accords with the principles of **Priority one of the Plan** - The economy: Maximising growth and opportunity across Blackpool, but is still in conflict with national and local policies and guidance relating to design, width and materials.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATION

The modern frontage (already installed in advance of the Council's consideration of its merits) is considered to be at odds with this traditional parade of shops, detracting from its overall appearance and is recommended for refusal.

INTRODUCTION

This application relates to an established travel business which wishes to expand into an adjoining unit. The application came in without pre-application advice and whilst the expansion of the business is welcomed, officers have sought to make positive suggestions as to how the application could be amended, but these have been declined by the applicant.

SITE DESCRIPTION

The application relates to two mid-terraced properties in a parade of nine shops on Highfield Road, almost opposite Highfield Leadership Academy (Secondary School) and to

the east of Fishers Field. There are three more shops across the junction with Acre Gate. Many of the first floor premises are residential.

DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

The proposal is for the installation of a new shopfront across the two properties, with one access door and a continuous fascia across both properties.

MAIN PLANNING ISSUES

The main planning issues are considered to be:

- appearance in the streetscene
- impact on neighbours' amenities

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

CONSULTATIONS

None.

PUBLICITY AND REPRESENTATIONS

Neighbours notified: 1st March 2018

No representations have been received.

NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK

Planning law requires that applications for planning permission must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.

Paragraph 7: There are three dimensions to sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. These dimensions give rise to the need for the planning system to perform a number of roles:

- an economic role – contributing to building a strong, responsive and competitive economy. By ensuring that sufficient land of the right type is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth and innovation; and by identifying and coordinating development requirements, including the provision of infrastructure;
- a social role – supporting strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by providing the supply of housing required to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by creating a high quality built environment, with accessible local services that reflect the community's needs and support its health, social and cultural well-being; and

- an environmental role – contributing to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; and, as part of this, helping to improve biodiversity, use natural resources prudently, minimise waste and pollution, and mitigate and adapt to climate change including moving to a low carbon economy.

Paragraph 9: Pursuing sustainable development involves seeking positive improvements in the quality of the built environment, as well as in people’s quality of life, including replacing poor design with better design.

Paragraph 17: Within the overarching roles that the planning system ought to play, a set of core land-use planning principles should underpin both plan-making and decision-taking. These 12 principles include that planning should:

- always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants of land and buildings.

Paragraph 56: The Government attaches great importance to the design of the built environment.

Paragraph 64: Permission should be refused for development of poor design.

BLACKPOOL LOCAL PLAN PART 1: CORE STRATEGY

The Blackpool Local Plan: Part 1 - Core Strategy was adopted by the Council in January 2016. The policy in the Core Strategy that is most relevant to this application is:

CS7: Quality of Design

SAVED POLICIES: BLACKPOOL LOCAL PLAN 2001-2016

The Blackpool Local Plan was adopted in June 2006. A number of policies in the Blackpool Local Plan (2006) have now been superseded by policies in the Core Strategy (these are listed in Appendix B of the Core Strategy). Other policies in the Blackpool Local Plan are saved until the Local Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies is produced.

The following policies are most relevant to this application:

LQ1 Lifting the quality of design

LQ11 Shopfronts

Applications for new or alterations to existing shop fronts will be considered having regard to the character of the building and the street scene. Particular attention will be paid to:

- (a) the relationship of the ground floor with the upper floors of the property
- (b) the retention of original features such as pilasters, mullions, toplights, doors and stall risers
- (c) the use of appropriate materials

- (d) the relationship with adjoining properties, in terms of fascia height, materials and design
- (e) the use of recessed doorways to provide a transition between the street and to provide disabled access
- (f) the provision for signage and security measures where appropriate.

LQ14 Extensions and Alterations

BH3 Residential and Visitor Amenity

ASSESSMENT

Principle

In principle, an improvement to a shop front and expansion of a business is to be welcomed.

Design

The design as submitted showed the shopfront all in one plane, with very narrow pilasters and had a continuous deep fascia across both properties. The plan stated that the shopfront would have aluminium glazed frames; and what has been constructed is in grey upvc. The location of the door into the property was not as shown on the originally submitted drawing either.

The majority of shops in the block have shallower and more traditional fascias. Although the property immediately adjacent on the western side does have a deep fascia, officers would expect to negotiate an improved fascia/design on any application for a new shopfront. The depth of fascia proposed is at odds with this concept and does not result in an improvement to the parade, particularly as it would extend across two frontages. The fascia makes no allowance for the split between the two properties, nor the concept of stallrisers at either end and in the middle, which are an integral element of traditional shopfronts. Also, the location of the door does not reflect the relationship with the upper floors in terms of lining through and would be better located under a single pane window, rather than under the edge of a bay window.

Amended plans were requested to improve the shopfront to one which better fitted in with this local parade of shops, but the applicant has declined to amend the proposal; instead, the plan has been corrected to show the door in the location in which it has been constructed and has been annotated to show a grey upvc shopfront.

It is considered that although the proposal is modern, it does not follow the design criteria within Policy LQ11 and so results in a frontage which is out of keeping with the traditional nature of this parade and is detrimental to the appearance of this range of neighbourhood shops.

Amenity

The applicant has not applied for a change of use, stating that the existing ground, first and second floors of both properties were in use as offices. Although not strictly part of this application, further investigation into this shows that the existing plans are incorrect with respect to the use of 296 Highfield Road as it was not in office use at the time of the

application. The ground floor (vacant) was a sweet shop within Use Class A1 and the first floor was a residential flat within Use Class C3, with a separate door from Highfield Road and is registered as such with the Valuation Office.

The applicant's original premises at 298 Highfield Road was granted planning permission in 2001 (01/0574 Use of premises as travel reservation and administration offices) and at that time was considered by all parties to be a mixed Use Class A1 travel agency and a Use Class B1 telesales offices. The ground floor front retained the active shop use with the B1 use to the rear and on the first floor.

The proposal needs a change of use for both the ground and upper floors of 296 Highfield Road. Since this is a shopping parade, it is important to be able to retain an active frontage to the ground floor front and particularly important to be able to control the hours of operation of the use as there is potential for a residential use at first floor adjacent, which needs to be protected from noise in the evenings. The plans also show a canteen at second floor level in a rear rooflift to 296 Highfield Road, with full length patio doors and Juliette balcony, from which residential neighbours to the rear also need to be protected in terms of privacy to their gardens.

CONCLUSION

Whilst the desire to improve the shopfront and the business is accepted, rather than consider the Council's suggestions (in terms of policies which consider design and appearance) during the course of the application, the applicant has installed a frontage which is not appropriate in the context of the parade and detracts from its overall appearance.

In addition, it is considered that the applicant should be invited to apply for planning permission for the change of use, in order for the Council to be able to retain control over the issues raised above under amenity.

A further minor amendment (Rev G) was received after this report had been prepared, which will be reported on the Update Note.

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 shopfront 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) 18/0122 and 01/0574, which can be accessed via the link below:

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

Recommended Decision: Refuse

Conditions and Reasons

1. The proposed shopfront would be out of character within the streetscene due to its width, design and extent and depth of the fascia and would therefore be contrary to paragraphs 17, 56 - 65 of the National Planning Policy Framework, Policies LQ11 and LQ14 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016 and Policy CS7 of the Blackpool Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy 2012-2027.

2. **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 which conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework and policies of the Blackpool Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy 2012-2027 and the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016, which justify refusal.

Advice Notes to Developer

Not applicable