

**COMMITTEE DATE:** [11/08/2014](#)

**Application Reference:** **14/0366**

WARD: Marton  
DATE REGISTERED: 12/05/14  
LOCAL PLAN ALLOCATION: No Specific Allocation

APPLICATION TYPE: Full Planning Permission  
APPLICANT: Miss A Cousins

**PROPOSAL:** Erection of two storey side extension following demolition of attached garage.

**LOCATION:** 24 LODGE COURT, BLACKPOOL, FY3 0EH

---

**Summary of Recommendation:** Grant Permission

#### **CASE OFFICER**

Miss S. Parker

#### **INTRODUCTION**

The current submission was preceded by application ref. 14/0115 which sought planning permission for a two storey side extension with a large gable feature to the rear to create a room in the roofspace. This application was refused on 11th April 2014 by the Head of Development Management using his delegated powers for the following reasons:

- The extension would not have been set back sufficiently from the frontage of the property to appear appropriately subordinate and, by virtue of its size in relation to the main house would have appeared overly dominant and incongruous within the streetscene. The detail of the extension was considered to be poor and the form of the gable proposed to the rear would have similarly created an overly-large, dominant and incongruous feature.
- By virtue of its position, the extension would have resulted in the loss of an off-street parking space unless existing landscaping were removed which would have been detrimental to the streetscene. As the extension would have increased the level of accommodation available and resulted in the loss of a parking space it was considered that the scheme would have an unacceptable impact on parking pressures and therefore residential amenity on the estate.

Following this decision the scheme has been amended to take into account the concerns detailed above and the requirements of the Extending Your Home Supplementary Planning Document.

#### **SITE DESCRIPTION**

The application property is an end-terrace house on a relatively modern housing development on the south-western edge of Staining village. The house is two-storey in height with an adjoining single storey garage with a pitched roof with a 1m wide gap

separating the garage from the neighbouring property at no. 26. The house and garage are constructed of red/orange multi brick with grey tiled roofs. The neighbouring property at no. 26 has a ground floor window just to the front of the neighbouring garage which gives natural daylight into the hallway. There are no other windows in the side elevation of no. 26.

### **DETAILS OF PROPOSAL**

The application seeks planning permission for the erection of a two-storey side extension following the demolition of the existing garage. The extension would recreate a garage at ground floor level with an additional bedroom and new family bathroom provided at first floor level.

The Committee will have visited the site on 11th August 2014.

### **MAIN PLANNING ISSUES**

The main planning issues are considered to be:

- the impact of the extension on the residential amenities of neighbours
- the acceptability of the design of the extension
- the impact of the extension on parking provision and highway safety.

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

### **CONSULTATIONS**

**Contaminated Land Officer:** no comments have been received in time for inclusion in this report. Any comments that are received will be communicated through the update note.

### **PUBLICITY AND REPRESENTATIONS**

Neighbours notified: 21st May 2014

A representation has been received from no. 26 Lodge Court relating to the loss of sunlight into the property's hallway and lounge and the potential for a parallel parking space to result in damage to existing landscaping because of the difficulty in manoeuvring into the space.

A representation has received from no. 22 Lodge Court raising the following issues:

- Property would be rented (not a valid planning consideration);
- Obstruction of the neighbours driveway;
- Additional parking demand;
- Insufficient space to manoeuvre into parking space shown;
- Encroachment onto the public highway;
- Inconsiderate parking (matter beyond planning control);
- Loss of hedgerow;
- Disruption during construction;
- Right of access during construction (private matter);

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

## **NATIONAL PLANNING POLICY FRAMEWORK**

In March 2012, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published. This document sets out the Government's approach and expectations with regard to planning and development. It places heavy emphasis on sustainable development and the need for the planning system to be proactive in driving economic growth. There is a presumption in favour of development where there are no over-riding material considerations. The Framework makes it clear that all developments should be of a high standard of design and should secure a good standard of residential amenity. Paragraph 64 states that permission should be refused for development of poor design that fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area and the way it functions. This emphasis on the need for good design is repeated in the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG) which was introduced in March 2014.

## **SAVED POLICIES: BLACKPOOL LOCAL PLAN 2001-2016**

The Blackpool Local Plan was adopted in June 2006 and the majority of its policies saved by direction in June 2009. The following policies are most relevant to this application:

- LQ1 Lifting the Quality of Design
- LQ2 Site Context
- LQ14 Extensions and Alterations
- BH3 Residential Amenity
- AS1 Access and Parking

The Extending Your Home Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) expands upon the requirements of Policy LQ14 with particular relevance to household extensions and is therefore directly relevant to this application.

## **EMERGING PLANNING POLICY**

### **Blackpool Local Plan: Part 1 - Core Strategy: Proposed Submission**

The Core Strategy Proposed Submission was agreed for consultation by the Council's Executive Committee on 16th June 2014 and by the full Council on 25th June 2014. The document was subsequently published for public consultation on 4th July 2014 for a period of eight weeks. Once this consultation period has closed, the intention is that the document will be submitted for consideration by an independent Planning Inspector through an Examination in Public in 2015.

Emerging policies in the Core Strategy Proposed Submission that are relevant to this application are:

- CS7 Quality of Design

This policy does not conflict with or outweigh the provisions of the adopted Local Plan policies listed above.

## **ASSESSMENT**

### **Principle**

There are no planning policy considerations that would preclude the extension of the property in principle.

### **Design**

The scale and position of the extension has been amended since the previous submission. The extension would now be set back from the front building line by 1m and down from the roof ridge by 0.5m as advocated by the Council's Extending Your Home SPD. A rear roof-lift had previously been proposed and been judged over-bearing. This has now been omitted from the scheme as has a front gable detail which would have unbalanced the frontage. A section of flat roof is proposed in place of a traditional ridge to maximise the footprint of the extension, whilst meeting the requirements of the SPD and ensuring that the roof pitch of the extension corresponds with that of the main house. This would not be noticeable from ground level. The fenestration proposed would align with what is existing and a condition would be attached to any permission granted ensuring appropriate materials are used. In light of the changes made since the previous application, the design of the extension is now in line with the Council's Extending Your Home SPD and is therefore considered acceptable.

### **Amenity**

The two-storey side extension proposed would sit further forward than the existing garage by 1m and would be 3.15m taller to the roof ridge. The extension would sit 1m from the side elevation of the neighbouring property to the north-east and, by virtue of its size and position, would reduce levels of natural daylight into the existing ground floor hallway window of this property. However, as this is not a habitable room, it is not considered that this could be sustained as a reason for refusal. It is not considered that the provision of an additional bedroom would generate additional noise or disturbance from activity so as to have a detrimental impact on neighbour amenity.

### **Parking and Highway Safety**

At present the property offers two bedrooms and an off-street parking space in the existing side garage. The scheme proposed would see the number of bedrooms increase to three, albeit the third bedroom would be a single bedroom. The side garage provision would be retained but would sit further forward than what is existing. At present, the distance from the back of pavement to the existing garage is 4.6m. Whilst this falls short of the 5m required by the Council for a parking space, it would nevertheless accommodate the parking of a small car off-street at the front of the property. Following the construction of the extension proposed, only 3.6m would be available to the front of the garage and this would not be sufficient for the parking of a vehicle.

The applicant has suggested that a car would be able to drive onto the front of the property curtilage and park parallel with the front elevation of the property. A parking space of some 5.3m by 2.6m has been indicated. However, when measured on site, the distance between the rainwater goods and the back of pavement was found to be 2.35m and the distance from the existing landscaped area to the edge of the shared access pathway was 4.35m. The removal of the existing landscaping to increase the size of the parking area would have a detrimental impact on the appearance of the property but it is not habitat landscaping and is not protected. It is not considered that a car would be able to access the space without driving over the shared access walkway. A relatively difficult manoeuvre would be required

to gain access to the space without causing damage to the neighbouring property's existing landscaping.

However, given the improvements to the extension itself since the first submission which overcome the design issues previously identified; the fact that the additional bedroom would be a single bedroom; and the fact that the existing parking space does not meet the Council's minimum standards, it is not considered that the application could reasonably be resisted on highway grounds alone.

#### **Other Matters**

It is not considered that sufficient disturbance would be generated during construction to warrant a requirement for a Demolition and Construction Management Plan.

#### **CONCLUSION**

The scheme has been amended significantly since the submission and subsequent refusal of the first application (ref. 14/0115). Although the proposal would increase the level of accommodation available at the property, a parking space would still be available within the garage and it would be possible for a second parking space to be created at the front of the property. Any damage to adjacent landscaping would be a private legal matter and the manoeuvre required to utilise the space would become easier with repetition. The extension has been amended since first submission to overcome the other issues identified as warranting refusal. The proposal now accords with the guidance set out in the Council's Extending Your Home Supplementary Planning Document. Given the inadequacy of the existing driveway parking space when judged against the Council's minimum standards, and the improvements to the design of the extension, it is considered that the application could not be reasonably resisted on parking grounds alone. As such, the Committee is respectfully recommended to approve planning permission for the extension proposed subject to the conditions listed below.

#### **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 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.

**Recommended Decision:** Grant Permission

### **Conditions and Reasons**

1. The development hereby permitted shall be begun before the expiration of three years from the date of this permission.

Reason: Required to be imposed pursuant to Section 91 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

2. The external brickwork and roof tiles to be used on the extension hereby approved shall be the same colour, texture and design as those on the existing dwelling, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Council as Local Planning Authority before the development commences.

Reason: In the interests of appearance of the locality, in accordance with Policies LQ1 and LQ14 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001 - 2016

3. Notwithstanding the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 1995 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order) the garage shall not be used for any purpose which would preclude its use for the parking of a motor car.

Reason: In the opinion of the Local Planning Authority the retention of parking space within the site is of importance in safeguarding the appearance of the locality and highway safety, in accordance with Policies AS1 and LQ1 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016.

### **Advice Notes to Developer**

1. Please note this approval relates specifically to the details indicated on the approved plans and documents, and to the requirement to satisfy all conditions of the approval. Any variation from this approval needs to be agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority prior to works commencing and may require the submission of a revised application. Any works carried out without such written agreement or approval would render the development as unauthorised and liable to legal proceedings.