

**Report to:**

**PLANNING COMMITTEE**

**Relevant Officer:**

Susan Parker, Head of Development Management

**Date of Meeting:**

24 January 2023

## **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 22/0102 – Holy Trinity Church, Dean Street, Blackpool, FY4 1BP - Installation of 3 antennas to church tower and associated ancillary works.

An appeal has been lodged by NET on behalf of Cornerstone against Blackpool Council's refusal of planning permission

- 6.2 22/0250 – 58 Dean Street, Blackpool, FY4 1BP - Use of premises as a self-contained holiday let.

An appeal has been lodged by Mr Wooley against Blackpool Council's refusal of planning permission

6.3

22/0432 – 23 Ackroyd Place, Blackpool FY4 4ZD – Installation of window to front elevation and use of garage as ancillary living accommodation.

An Appeal has been lodged by Mrs C McKnight against Blackpool Council's refusal of planning permission.

## **7.0 Planning/Enforcement Appeals Determined**

- 7.1 21/1073 6A – 10A Dickson Road, Blackpool - Retention of an automated teller machine (ATM) and 21/1074 6A-10A Dickson Road, Blackpool- Retention of internally illuminated automated teller machine surround and internally illuminated "logo" panel.

### Appeal Dismissed

The Inspector considered that the main issues are whether the proposal preserves or enhances the character or appearance of the Town Centre Conservation Area; and the effect of the proposal on community safety, having regard to crime, together with the effect of the proposed advertisement on the visual amenity of the area.

The Inspector stated that the site is highly visible in the immediate area and the installation is a noticeable feature in the streetscene. In addition, the vinyl materials of the panel serves to highlight the prominence of the ATM in the vicinity. Similarly, due to its location the proposed signage is also readily experienced in the surrounds. Its illumination is a conspicuous element in the immediate setting that serves to further signal its presence.

He also said the introduction of the proposals, both individually and in combination, contribute to a busy and visually disruptive shopfront. They protrude from the property and fail to match the flat, matte signage prevalent at the site, appearing visually jarring. In addition, while the black panel surrounding the ATM would reflect the colour scheme of the unit, viewed with the already covered windows it would result in an overall oppressive frontage. This would be at odds with the generally more constrained nature of shopfront signage and advertisements within this section of the Conservation Area.

He acknowledged that the ATM offers a public benefit by providing cash to the community and services to those that do not have access to online banking. He also noted its accessible design. However, other ATMs are within short walking distance. As such, there is little evidence that the proposal would result in any significant benefit to the local economy

He concluded that that the proposal would not have a significant adverse effect on community safety, having regard to crime, and the proposals neither preserve nor enhance the character or appearance of the Conservation Area and that the advertisements would have a harmful impact on the visual amenity of the area.

## 7.2 22/0169 93-101 Promenade, Blackpool - Retention of ATM to front elevation

### Appeal Dismissed

The Inspector considered that the main issues are whether the proposal affects the character and appearance of the area and the locally listed building and the effect of the proposal on community safety, having regard to crime.

He stated that The Huntsman building is a prominent feature in the vicinity. While it is surrounded by a variety of development styles and characters, its corner plot location allows the traditional upper floors to be experienced in their own right, positively contributing to the surrounds. Located close to the junction, the appeal site is a highly visible section of the building within the immediate area.

He thought that the ATM and surrounding panel pill the space of a full height window, such that they form a noticeable feature further highlighted within the area by the incongruous vinyl material of the panel. He acknowledged that the installation of glazing would alter the shopfront and widen the pane, it remains that in replacing a significant element of glazing with black vinyl, and the proposal reduces the active and open frontage of the unit so as to appear jarring. Even acknowledging that the proposal would remove the wording on the current white panel, the ATM would contribute to an overall busy and disruptive shopfront. He said in combination with the wide variety of signage and shop front fascia present it would create a sense of visual clutter along the street level of the building. As the only installation of this nature within the wider building, the installation appears incongruous and fails to successfully integrate with the street level commercial frontage and detracts from the historic floors above.

He acknowledged that the ATM offers a public benefit by providing cash to the community and services to those that do not have access to online banking, aiding the local economy. He also noted its accessible design. However, other ATMs are

within short walking distance. As such, even acknowledging that it has been well-used, there is little evidence that the proposal would result in any significant benefit.

He concluded that the proposal would have a significant adverse effect on the character and appearance of the area and the non-designated heritage asset but would not have a significant adverse effect on community safety.

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

7.4 Does the information submitted include any exempt information? No

**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 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.