

Report to:	PLANNING COMMITTEE
Relevant Officer:	Susan Parker, Head of Development Management
Date of Meeting:	25 January 2022

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.

3.2 Is the recommendation contrary to a plan or strategy adopted or approved by the Council? No

3.3 Is the recommendation in accordance with the Council's approved budget? Yes

4.0 Other alternative options to be considered:

4.1 None, the report is for information only.

5.0 Council Priority:

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

6.0 Planning Appeals Lodged

- 6.1 21/0496 – 495-497 PROMENADE, BLACKPOOL, FY4 1BA – Retention of Automated Teller Machine to front elevation. An appeal has been lodged by Cardtronics UK Ltd, trading as CASHZONE against the Councils refusal of planning permission.
- 6.2 21/0497 – 495-497 PROMENADE, BLACKPOOL, FY4 1BA – Display non illuminated logo panel. An appeal has been lodged by Cardtronics UK Ltd, trading as CASHZONE against the Councils refusal of advertisement consent.

7.0 Planning Appeals Determined

- 7.1 21/0599 9 Maida Vale, Blackpool, FY5 1NP

Appeal Allowed

The Inspector agreed that the main issue is the effect of the proposal on the living conditions of No.11 Maida Vale with regard to outlook, visual amenity and natural light.

The Inspector stated that the Councils SPD is guidance only and as the proposal for a 5 metre projection, it is a technical conflict with the SPD, nonetheless complies with the development plan. As the rear garden at No.11 is long and open it would afford natural light and as the boundary treatment consists of a high close boarded boundary fence, the height of the conservatory at 2.35m at eaves level would not be overly dominant or excessive, there would be no overbearing impact on the neighbour and it would not appear visually dominant or excessive. Outlook from the rear windows of No.11 is principally over the long garden and this would not materially change as a consequence of the proposed extension.

Therefore, the proposals would not result in harm to the living conditions of the occupiers of No.11 with regards to outlook, visual amenity and loss of natural light.

- 7.2 21/0203 60A Stockydale Road, Blackpool, FY4 5HR

Split Decision

The single storey rear extension was not a reason for refusal and not a point of contention. The Inspector agreed.

Though the roof lift would conflict with Policy LQ14 which sets out that no roof lifts will be permitted, the Inspector considered that the already expansive roof plane is a characteristic of the host dwelling and the increase would not appear disproportionate or incongruous with the setting and surrounding properties. The Inspector considered that the proposed rear dormers would be consistent with the guidance of the Extending Your Home SPD concerning their design and due to the context would appear as a sympathetic addition to the rear elevation. Though the dormers would be clad in a lead finish as opposed to slate to match the new roof, the Inspector concluded that the colour of the lead would complement the materials of the main roofing.

The Inspector noted that the existing hedgerow and trees at the front of the site contribute positively to the overall verdant and semi-rural character of the relevant part of Stockydale Road. The design and extent of the proposed wall would give a hard, urban appearance to the site to the detriment of the character of the area. The existing hedgerow is well established and a reasonable height and the rear garden is enclosed by a close boarded fence, therefore the justification for the proposal to erect a solid boundary treatment to enclose the front garden in order to safeguard children was not given sufficient weight to outweigh the harm caused by the development.

As the provision of the boundary wall is clearly severable both physically and functionally from the remainder of the appeal proposal, the Inspector issues a split decision wherein the appeal was dismissed in relation to the boundary wall but allowed in relation to the erection of the rear extension, roof lift, and dormers.

7.3 Does the information submitted include any exempt information? No

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

8.0 List of Appendices

8.1 None

9.0 Financial considerations:

9.1 None

10.0 Legal considerations

10.1 None

11.0 Risk Management Considerations

11.1 None

12.0 Equalities considerations

12.1 None

13.0 Risk management considerations:

13.1 None

14.0 Sustainability, climate change and environmental considerations

14.1 None

15.0 Internal/ External Consultation undertaken:

15.1 None

16.0 Background papers:

16.2 None