| Report to: | Planning Committee |
|-------------------|---|
| Relevant Officer: | Gary Johnston, Head of Development Management |
| Date of Meeting | 20 December 2016 |

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?
- 3.2b Is the recommendation in accordance with the Council's approved Yes budget?
- 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 Rear of 6 and 8 Carlin Gate FY2 9QX (15/0229)

- 5.2.1 An appeal by Belsfield Care against the decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for the use of part of the rear garden of the properties as a communal garden in association with the existing care homes at 4 St Stephens Avenue and 4 Carlin Gate following the demolition of existing rear extensions at the rear of 6-8 Carlin Gate. **APPEAL DISMISSED**
- 5.2.2 A copy of the Inspectors decision dated 21 November 2016 is attached at Appendix 3a.
- 5.2.3 The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring residents and on the character and appearance of the area.
- 5.2.4 The Inspector concluded that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the amenities of residents in adjoining properties at 10 Carlin Gate and 6-8 St Stephens Avenue through noise and disturbance but did not consider that it would adversely the character and appearance of the area as the site is landlocked.

5.3 4 St Stephens Avenue, Blackpool, FY2 9RG (15/0227)

- 5.3.1 An appeal by Belsfield Care against the decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of a rooflift to the existing single storey rear extension to provided five additional bedrooms and a lounge and the provision of three additional car parking spaces following the removal of an existing storage building. **APPEAL DISMISSED**
- 5.3.2 A copy of the Inspectors decision dated 22 November 2016 is attached at Appendix 3h.
- 5.3.3 The main issues are the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of neighbouring residents and on the living conditions of the occupants of the care home, particularly with regard to amenity space for the residents.
- 5.3.4 The Inspector concluded that the proposal would have a detrimental impact on the amenities of residents in adjoining properties at 6 and 8 St Stephens Avenue through overlooking and impact on privacy and would remove the limited amenity space currently available at the care home.

5.4 26 - 28 Red Bank Road, Blackpool, FY2 9HR (15/0713)

- 5.4.1 An appeal by Mrs S Clayton against the decision of the Council to refuse planning permission for the installation of a new shopfront, erection of a single storey rear extension and use of the ground floor rear as one self-contained flat at 26 Red Bank Road. **APPEAL DISMISSED**
- 5.4.2 A copy of the Inspectors decision dated 21 November 2016 is attached at Appendix 3c.
- 5.4.3 There are four main issues effect of the proposal on the living conditions of the occupiers of the flat, the effect of the proposal on the vitality and viability of the District Centre, the effect of the shopfront on the character and appearance of the area and whether the proposal would lead to an over concentration of flats in the area.
- 5.4.4 The Inspector felt that the location of the flat and its relationship to a rear external staircase meant the occupants of the flat would have a low level of amenity. He felt the changes to the ground floor of 26 Red Bank Road would leave a less attractive retail space and hence would adversely impact on the vitality and viability of the District Centre. He felt that the proposed UPVC shopfront would adversely affect the character and appearance of the District Centre. However, he did not consider that the flat element of the proposal would lead to an over concentration of flats in the area.

5.5 Planning/Enforcement Appeals Lodged

5.5.1 **3-5 READS AVENUE, BLACKPOOL, FY1 4BW (15/0772)**

5.5.2 An appeal has been lodged by Clarke & Co against the Council's refusal to grant a Certificate of Lawful Development for Proposed Use to use the premises as 10 self-contained permanent flats.

5.6 3-5 READS AVENUE, BLACKPOOL, FY1 4BW (15/0773)

5.6.1 An appeal has been submitted by Clarke & Co against the Council's refusal of planning permission for the removal of conditions 3 and 5 attached to planning permission 80/0013 to allow the use of premises as 10 self-contained permanent flats.

5.7 56 SPRINGFIELD ROAD, BLACKPOOL, FY1 2BA (16/0388)

5.7.1 An appeal has been submitted by Mr R Lewis against the Council's refusal of planning permission for formation of vehicular crossing.

| 5.8 | Does the information submitted include any exempt information? | No |
|-------|--|----|
| 5.9 | List of Appendices: | |
| 5.9.1 | None | |
| 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 | |
| | | |