

Report to:	PLANNING COMMITTEE
Relevant Officer:	Susan Parker, Head of Development Management
Date of Meeting:	20 January 2021

PLANNING/ENFORCEMENT APPEALS LODGED AND DETERMINED

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 priorities are both 'The Economy: maximising growth and opportunity across Blackpool' and 'Communities: creating stronger communities and increasing resilience'.

5.0 Planning Appeals Lodged

5.1.1 20/0532 – 150 Lytham Road, Blackpool, FY1 6DJ - Installation of Automated Teller Machine (retrospective application)

An appeal has been lodged by Cardtronics UK Limited against the Council's refusal of planning permission.

5.1.2 20/0533 – 150 Lytham Road, Blackpool, FY1 6DJ - Retention of 1 non-illuminated ATM (Automated teller machine) sign.

An appeal has been lodged by Cardtronics UK Limited against the Council's refusal of planning permission.

5.1.3 19/0803 – 47-51 Shaftesbury Avenue, Blackpool, FY2 9TW - Erection of a two storey link extension, creation of additional car parking facilities and use of 51 Shaftesbury Avenue in conjunction with 47-49 Shaftesbury Avenue as an enlargement of existing care home.

An appeal has been lodged by Miss Madeleine Prenger against the Council's refusal of planning permission.

6.0 Planning/Enforcement Appeals Determined

6.1.1 20/0187 40 ABINGDON STREET – Alterations to front elevation and use of ground floor premises as altered as an adult gaming centre

Appeal Allowed

The Inspector considered that the proposal would not result in the loss of an existing retail unit. Whilst it would increase the number of adult gaming centres, either individually or cumulatively with the adjacent property, such uses would still be a small proportion of the overall offering; and, although its appearance would differ from a retail shop, it would bring a vacant unit back into use, improving the vitality of the street. He concluded that the proposal would have an acceptable effect on the vitality and viability of the centre, with particular reference to its character; nor did he consider that the proposal would give rise to an unacceptable level of noise and disturbance for town centre residents. The proposal would improve the appearance of the frontage to the benefit of the Conservation Area and make a small contribution to the local economy.

The award for costs was refused. The Inspector did not consider that a short delay in presenting additional information to the Committee led to wasted expense by the

appellant. It was not unreasonable for the Committee to exercise planning judgement on matters such as character. Given the particular characteristics of the appeal site, the adjacent unit and Abingdon Street as a whole, other schemes were not so similar that it was unreasonable for the Council to determine the application on its own merits. The Inspector found that the Council did not behave unreasonably, relative to the main issue in offering a different view to his own, given the planning judgement involved; and no unnecessary or wasted expense had been demonstrated.

6.1.2 20/0278 92 – 100 BOND STREET Conversion of part 2nd floor into 3 no. apartments and re-configuration of existing apartment

Appeal Dismissed

The Inspector considered that although there would be natural light within the apartments, this would not outweigh the harm with respect to poor outlook and absence of private amenity space. The proposal would not secure a high quality of new accommodation that delivers good living standards with commensurate private outdoor amenity spaces. Additional flats in an area already having a skewed mix towards small, flatted accommodation would not promote social cohesion through balanced and healthy communities. The introduction of multiple dormers would, together with the introduction of roof lights, create visual clutter which would whittle away at the building's overall quality and the character of this locally listed building. This would frustrate the Council's aims of strengthening the townscape character through the protection/enhancement of heritage assets.

6.3 The Planning Inspectorate decision letters can be viewed online at <https://idoxpa.blackpool.gov.uk/online-applications/>

6.4 Does the information submitted include any exempt information? No

7.0 List of Appendices

7.1 None.

8.0 Financial considerations:

8.1 None.

9.0 Legal considerations:

9.1 None.

10.0 Risk Management considerations:

10.1 None.

11.0 Equalities considerations:

11.1 None.

12.0 Sustainability, climate change and environmental considerations:

12.1 None.

13.0 Internal/ External Consultation undertaken:

13.1 None.

14.0 Background papers:

14.1 None.