



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 November 2021

by R Jones BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13TH December 2021

Appeal Ref: APP/J2373/D/21/3276605

60A Stockydale Road, Blackpool FY4 5HR

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Powell & Morrison against the decision of Blackpool Council.
 - The application Ref 21/0203, dated 7 March 2021, was refused by notice dated 20 April 2021.
 - The development proposed is erection of a single storey extension following demolition of conservatory; roof lift; erection of 3 rear dormers; alterations to existing front dormer; and provision of 2m high boundary wall.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed insofar as it relates to provision of 2m high boundary wall. The appeal is allowed insofar as it relates to erection of a single storey extension following demolition of conservatory; roof lift; erection of 3 rear dormers; alterations to existing front dormer and planning permission is granted for erection of a single storey extension following demolition of conservatory; roof lift; erection of 3 rear dormers; alterations to existing front dormer at 60A Stockydale Road, Blackpool, FY4 5HR in accordance with the terms of the application, Ref 21/0203, dated 7 March 2021, and the plans submitted with it, so far as relevant to that part of the development hereby permitted and subject to the following conditions:
 - 1) The development hereby permitted shall begin not later than 3 years from the date of this decision.
 - 2) The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: Proposed Site Plan ref. PCE-Morrison-June-20-Site Plan; and Existing and Proposed Floor Plans, Elevations ref. PCE-Morrison-June-20-Planning.
 - 3) The materials to be used in the construction of the external surfaces of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.

Procedural Matters

2. The description of the development in the banner heading above is taken from the appeal form and Council's decision notice, save the omission of reference to resubmission of an earlier planning application (resubmission of 20/0320). This differs from the description contained in the planning application form, but I

consider that the Council's description more accurately reflects the proposal before me.

3. The Council's reason for refusal relates only to the proposed roof lift, rear dormers and boundary wall. The single storey rear extension and alterations to the existing front dormer are not a point of contention between the parties, and I have no reason to disagree. These proposals have not therefore been determinative in considering this appeal.
4. Since the appeal was submitted, a revised version of the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) was published on in July 2021. In my opinion, the revised document does not materially alter the policy context in relation to the main issue and, in reaching my decision, it was not necessary to seek comments from the main parties.

Main Issue

5. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the host house and surrounding area.

Reasons

6. No.60A Stockydale Road (no.60A) is a two-storey detached house located on the corner of Stockydale Road and Jubilee Lane North, an unmaintained private road. The front elevation of the house is designed with a large roof plane, low eaves and a first-floor flat roofed dormer.
7. Policy LQ14 of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016 (June 2006) (LP) states that '*roof lifts will not be permitted.*' It is proposed to raise the ridge height of no.60A by around 1m and there would therefore inevitably be conflict with this part of the policy. However, although the raised ridge height would increase the size of the already expansive roof plane, this is a characteristic of the host house and it would not appear a disproportionate addition to the front elevation. Further, the neighbouring house at No.60 Stockydale Road and the new build houses opposite are higher than No.60A and generally have larger roof proportions. The proposed increase in height and resulting scale of the roof would not therefore appear overly dominant or incongruous in this setting.
8. To the rear, the ridge and eaves of the roof are proposed to be raised to accommodate 3no. dormer windows. The existing first-floor windows of No.60A are set just below the eaves with a minimal gap and the proposal would increase this gap to around 1m. I saw on my site visit that the design and fenestration of houses on this part of Stockydale Road is mixed and I did not find windows located directly below the eaves of houses to be a particular characteristic of the area. Although the rear elevation of No.60A would be very visible from Jubilee Lane North, it would also be seen in the context of the double gable and varied window location of its neighbour at No.60.
9. The guidance in the Council's '*Extending Your Home*' *Supplementary Planning Document* (November 2007) (SPD) sets out criteria that, in general, dormer extensions should meet. The proposals are consistent with the guidance in so far as the 3no. dormers are off set from the eave gutter line and end walls, have a pitched roof and align with the existing first-floor windows. Although the pitch of the proposed dormers are very close to the new ridgeline of the main roof, they would nonetheless be well contained within the body of the roof. There would be a conflict with part of the SPD guidance that dormers should

'not normally occupy an area which is greater than 35% of the area of the plane of the roof into which it will be sited.' The SPD however recognises that there can be exceptions to this requirement and whilst there would be coverage of around 42%, the dormers still would appear a sympathetic addition to the rear elevation of the house.

10. Section 5 of the planning application form describes the new roof as finished in slate. The appellant's evidence and the Council's Delegated Report and Recommendation refer to the cheeks of the proposed dormer windows as having a lead finish. Whilst I have not been provided with full details of the finish, I am satisfied that the colour of the lead would match, or at least complement, the proposed slate for the main roof.
11. Consequently, the proposed roof lift and rear dormers would not cause harm to the character and appearance of the host house or wider area. They would therefore accord with paragraph 130 of the Framework, LP LQ1 and Policy CS7 of the Blackpool Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy, 2012-2017 (January 2016) (CS) which together require new development to be well designed and sympathetic to the character and appearance of the local area. CS Policy CS26 relates to remaining land at Marton Moss and I do not find it relevant to the householder extension before me.
12. There is an existing hedgerow on the frontage of the appeal site that turns the corner of Jubilee Lane North. This hedgerow, in combination with the trees on the frontage of the site that are subject to a Tree Preservation Order, positively contribute to the overall verdant and semi-rural character of this part of Stockydale Road. It is proposed to replace the existing hedgerow along the Stockydale Road and Jubilee Lane North frontages with a boundary wall.
13. I note that there are local examples of low walls, brick piers and gates, including at No.62 and 64 Stockydale Road, but the majority of houses, including the new build housing opposite, have hedgerows on their boundaries. The natural, or at least part natural frontages, are an important part of the character of the street scene.
14. Section 5 of the planning application form, and the appellant's evidence, described the wall as finished in brick, with railing inserts. The Proposed Wall Detail on the planning application drawing (PCE-Morrison-June-20-Planning) shows brick columns of around 2m in height set at regular intervals, with very closely spaced railings above a brick wall of around 1m. Irrespective of whether the inserts are a metal or close boarded timber finish, the design and extent of the wall would give a hard, urban appearance to the site to the detriment of the character of the area. I do not have details before me of the proposed landscaping on the internal wall, but I am not persuaded this would mitigate the harm I have identified.
15. I also recognise the benefits of enclosing a garden for families with children and dogs. However, I saw on my site visit that the hedgerow along the Jubilee Lane North boundary was well established and a reasonable height and the garden of No.60A is enclosed to the rear by a close boarded fence. I do not therefore give this sufficient weight to justify the harm caused by the removal and replacement of the existing hedgerow.
16. For these reasons, I conclude that the proposed boundary wall would have a significant detrimental impact on the character and appearance of the

surrounding area. It would conflict with LP Policy CS7 because it does not provide appropriate landscaping as an integral part of the development.

Conditions

17. The standard time limit and a condition specifying the approved plans are required to provide certainty. In the interests of the character and appearance of the area, a condition is also necessary requiring external materials of the proposed extensions, to match the existing house.

Conclusion

18. The construction of the boundary wall is clearly severable both physically and functionally from the remainder of the appeal proposal. I therefore shall issue a split decision. For the reasons given above I conclude the appeal should be allowed in respect of the single storey extension, roof lift, rear dormers and alterations to the existing front dormer, and dismissed in respect of the boundary wall.

R Jones

INSPECTOR