

Report to:	Planning Committee
Decision or Item number	3
Relevant Officer:	Gary Johnston, Head of Development Management
Date of Meeting	11 th August 2014

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 The Committee is provided with details of the planning and enforcement appeals, lodged and determined for its 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:

None

4.0 Council Priority:

4.1 Not applicable

5.0 Planning/Enforcement Appeals Determined

5.1 673-677 NEW SOUTH PROMENADE, BLACKPOOL, FY4 1RN (13/0797)

Appeal by Mr Paul Manning against refusal of bedroom extension fronting Cardigan Place to provide additional bedspaces. **Appeal allowed.**

Two extensions were largely completed in advance decision being taken by the Planning Committee on 10th March 2014 to grant planning permission for the single front/ side extension with a section of the extension being taken off and the extension re-clad in a more suitable material, ref 13/0796, and the decision to refuse the appeal proposal ref 13/0797 despite the proposed re-cladding of the extension. The reason for refusal was as follows:-

The single storey side extension is, by virtue of its height, projection forward of the building line and proximity to the footpath in Cardigan Place, over-dominant, incongruous and out of keeping with the character of the immediate area. As such the extension is therefore significantly detrimental to the character of the property and the visual amenity of the wider area and is contrary to Policies LQ1, LQ14, RR8 and BH3 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016.

The main issue considered is the effect of the extension on the character and appearance of the street scene on New South Promenade and Cardigan Place.

The Inspector noted that the hotel has been refurbished to a standard capable of comfortably accommodating disabled guests and carers. The front/ side extension giving improved access and a more comfortable lounge and dining area. The appeal extension is 4.5m deep x 10m long and 3.7 m high and leaves a narrow 1.5m strip to Cardigan Place. The extension accommodates two double bedrooms that combine with two other rooms and en-suites to form a flexible block of fully equipped rooms for disabled guests, some using full bodied wheelchairs, and carers.

He noted that many of the hotels along the two crescents have been extended with a variety of structures, most noticeably at the front and often with significant amounts of glazing, in some cases paying little regard to the often fine and imposing original buildings. A significant number of hotels along NSP are in various stages of disrepair and dereliction and the appeal property stands out due to its refurbished condition.

On both sides of Cardigan Place properties are set back a generous distance and sit on the same building line. This has been breached by the front/ side extension. In the context of the approved extension to appeal proposal is relatively modest in size and scale. The extension follows the building line established by the approved extension and is no more prominent or incongruous. When seen from the Promenade it is relatively insignificant. The extension is not in a particularly sensitive or prominent

location and when seen from Clifton Drive the extension sits in front of the approved extension. The grey cladding draws attention to both extensions. Re-cladding the extension would further minimise any intrusive appearance.

Subject to this change of material and in the context of the approved extension the appeal proposal would not detract significantly from the character and appearance of New South Promenade and Cardigan Place. The appeal decision is however reliant on the extension being re-clad in a colour that matches the main building and a condition is imposed to achieve this.

Does the information submitted include any exempt information?

No

6.0 Planning/Enforcement Appeals lodged

6.1 Land to the rear of 1-7 Broad Oak Lane, Blackpool (13/0604)

An appeal has been lodged by Mr K Beardmore against the Council's refusal of outline planning permission for the erection of seven detached bungalows with associated access road and car parking.

6.2 23 Warbreck Drive, Blackpool (13/0650)

An appeal has been lodged by Mr G Jones against the Council's refusal of planning permission for external alterations including roof lift to existing single storey rear extension, installation of external staircase to rear first floor level and formation of first floor balcony to rear, and use of premises as altered as two self-contained permanent flats.

6.3 18-20 Empress Drive, Blackpool (14/0045)

An appeal has been lodged by Mr A Brooks against the Council's refusal of planning permission for external alterations including reinstatement of ground floor bay windows and the erection of four front dormers and use of premises as altered as 6 self-contained permanent flats with associated boundary treatment, car parking and bin store to rear, following demolition of existing front and rear extensions and outbuildings.

6.4 35 Alconbury Crescent, Blackpool (14/0143)

An appeal has been lodged by Mr K Maine against the Council's refusal of certificate of lawful development proposed for an erection of carport adjacent to Alconbury Crescent elevation of the property.

6.5 Wilkinsons, Dickson Road (14/0423)

An appeal has been lodged by Mrs Michelle Crossley against the Council's refusal of advertisement consent for display of three internally illuminated high level signs and two non-illuminated high level signs to various elevations.

Does the information submitted include any exempt information? No

List of appendices: None

7.0 Legal considerations:

7.1 None

8.0 Human Resources considerations:

8.1 None

9.0 Equalities considerations:

9.1 None

10.0 Financial considerations:

10.1 None

11.0 Risk management considerations:

11.1 None

12.0 Ethical considerations:

12.1 None

13.0 Internal/ External Consultation undertaken:

13.1 None

14.0 Background papers:

14.1 None