



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 2 March 2023

by Mrs Chris Pipe BA(Hons), DipTP, MTP, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 March 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/J2373/D/22/3311508

25 Annesley Avenue, Blackpool FY3 7JD

- 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 Mr Zach Kennerley against the decision of Blackpool Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 22/0718 dated 4 September 2022, was refused by notice dated 9 November 2022.
 - The development proposed is erection of a first floor extension to the front of the dwelling and associated external alterations to fenestration to side.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Application for costs

2. An application for costs was made by Mr Zach Kennerley against Blackpool Borough Council. This application is the subject of a separate Decision.

Procedural Matters

3. The Council changed the description of development from that stated on the application form in the interests of clarity. I consider that the amended description accurately describes the appeal scheme and accordingly I have adopted the amended description in the heading above.
4. Since the submission of the appeal the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016 (2006) has been superseded by the Blackpool Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2023) (the Local Plan). In relation to this appeal Policies DM17 and DM20 of the Local Plan were referenced in the reason for refusal. Policy DM20 is unchanged however Policy DM17 has been modified prior to adoption I understand the modification relates to revised wording with regards to heritage assets and their setting. The aims of Policy DM17 has not changed and the appeal before me does not relate to a heritage asset. No party would be prejudiced or caused any injustice by me proceeding with the appeal in light of this change in policy.

Main Issue

5. The main issues in this appeal is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area of the area and the property itself.

Reasons

6. The appeal site is a semi-detached property within a predominantly residential area. In general, there is a harmony to the streetscene in terms of form, design and materials. Semi-detached properties are in general characterised by staggered front elevations. Some properties in the immediate area have been altered in terms of materials and/or have been extended, notwithstanding this there is a rhythm to the built form.
7. The appeal site has a front porch, infilling the staggered front elevation at ground floor. A canopy also extends over the window of the front elevation. Whilst this is different to the attached property there is a symmetry to the pair of properties.
8. My attention has been drawn by the Appellant to extensions which infill the set back two storey front elevation within the immediate area, photographs have been provided to allow me to assess these schemes against the proposal before me. I also observed these during my site visit. Whilst I appreciate the similarities between these extensions, these are not common features in the area, and do in general unbalance the properties. In any event each development must be considered on its individual merits, and I have reached my conclusion based on the individual merit of the appeal proposal.
9. The prevailing character of the streetscene are staggered front elevations on semi-detached properties. The proposed development would be an unsympathetic addition to the immediate area which would unbalance the pair of semi-detached properties. I find that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the area and the property itself.
10. There is conflict with Policy CS7 of the Blackpool Local Plan, Part 1: Core Strategy 2012-2027 (2016) and Policies DM17 and DM20 of the Local Plan which seek amongst other things to ensure developments are well designed and have regard to the local area. There is conflict with the Extending Your Home Supplementary Planning Document (2007) (the SPD) which seeks to ensure developments respect character of the surrounding area.
11. There is also conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (the Framework) which seeks amongst other things to ensure developments are of good design appropriate and sympathetic to their surroundings.

Conclusion

12. For the above reasons I conclude that this appeal should be dismissed.

C Pipe

INSPECTOR