

Report to:

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Relevant Officer:

Gary Johnston, Head of Development Management

Date of Meeting

16 October 2018

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 Lodged

5.2 None

5.3 Planning/Enforcement Appeals Determined

5.3.1 15 Cocker Street, Blackpool FY1 2BY - 17/0787

5.3.2 The appeal was made by Cardtronics UK Ltd against the Council's decision to refuse planning permission for the retention of an ATM in the Dickson Road elevation of the shop-front. The appeal was **DISMISSED**.

5.3.3 The Inspector acknowledged the circumstances of the site, the relevant planning policy and the comments of Lancashire Constabulary. He did not find that there was a requirement for the applicant to demonstrate a need for the ATM. Nevertheless, he recognised that the wider area is very deprived and suffers from high levels of crime and that the proposal should promote public safety. The ATM was considered to be in a conspicuous position in a relatively busy area. The Appellant's willingness to install security mirrors, a wall light and a pin shield were also taken into account. However, the Inspector judged that the lack of anti-ram-raid bollards and the lack of clarity over the specification of the CCTV system were unacceptable. He also agreed that the existing wall could encourage congregation which could be intimidating to users of the ATM and could also reduce natural surveillance and security. On this basis he judged that the proposal would not adequately reduce crime and fear of crime to ensure public safety and security.

5.3.4 The Inspector also considered the impact of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area. Although he recognised the Appellant's aim to attract customers to the ATM, he found the machine to constitute visual clutter and prevent the provision of an active window display. The Appellant's willingness to remove the illumination and the surrounding panel were insufficient to address this concern. On this basis the Inspector judged the ATM to have an unacceptable impact on the character and appearance of the building and streetscene.

5.3.5 Following this decision, a letter has been sent to the Appellant seeking the removal of the ATM and the restoration of the former shop-front.

5.3.6 A copy of the Inspector's decision letter is attached as Appendix 3(a).

5.4 Does the information submitted include any exempt information? No

5.5 List of Appendices:

5.6 Appendix 3(a): Letter from the Planning Inspectorate dated 24 September 2018.

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