



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 19 December 2023

by J D Westbrook BSc(Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 9 January 2024

Appeal Ref: APP/J2373/D/23/3332474

56 Maplewood Drive, Blackpool, Lancashire, FY5 1PW

- 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 Ms Joanne Lamb against the decision of Blackpool Council.
 - The application Ref 23/0550, dated 19 July 2023, was refused by notice dated 8 September 2023.
 - The development proposed is described as the erection of car port to side elevation with balcony above.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed car port and balcony on the character and appearance of the area around Maplewood Drive.

Reasons

3. No 56 is a semi-detached bungalow situated near the northern end of Maplewood Drive, close to its junction with Winsford Crescent. It occupies a plot on a bend in Maplewood Drive, such that the front elevation can be seen in the long view from the south-west along the road, and part of the north-western side elevation can be seen in the view from the junction of Maplewood Drive with Queens Promenade. The bungalow has rendered front and side elevations, and has a front gabled extension which mirrors that of the adjoining No 54, and a dormer window in the front roof space. There is a Juliet window serving an attic room in the north-western side elevation, and a garage set well back along the drive at the side of the dwelling. At the time of my visit, the bungalow had a car port with a balcony above to the front of the garage.
4. Policy CS7 of the Council's Local Plan - Core Strategy (LPCS) indicates that new development should be well designed, and enhance the character and appearance of the local area. It should be appropriate in terms of scale, mass, height, layout, density, appearance, materials and relationship to adjoining buildings.
5. Policy DM17 of the Council's Local Plan - Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (LPDMP) indicates that all development should be of a high quality, and should enhance and respond to any positive character of the local area to create well designed, attractive and distinctive neighbourhoods. New developments should have a consistent architectural style across the

whole building, and should have materials appropriate to the location and context in terms of their colour, texture, pattern and elements of detailing. Policy DM20 indicates that extensions and alterations must be well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the original building and adjoining properties, and that materials will need to match or be complementary to the original building.

6. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document on Extending Your Home (SPD) states that the form and design of side extensions should incorporate roofs which complement that of the original property.
7. The Council contends that the car port and first floor balcony would appear incongruous and would be harmful to the appearance, quality and character of the property and the street scene due to its siting, size and design.
8. The appellant contends that proposed extension would be set back from the front elevation and behind the front elevation of the adjacent dwelling to the north. The design of the balcony enclosure would appear as a traditional single storey extension with a discrete, obscure glazed enclosure above, and this would reduce the prominence of the appearance of the extension, which would, therefore, not be highly visible in the street scene. In addition, it would be well designed, would enhance the character and appearance of the local area and be appropriate in terms of scale, mass, height, layout, density, appearance, materials and relationship to adjoining buildings.
9. There is a car port with a balcony above already in place at the side of the property. The car port structure includes 3 pillars faced with a light blue composite cladding. The cladding currently extends vertically up by around 1 metre above the car port and surrounds the balcony. The proposal would involve the replacement of the cladding with a sloping, tiled roof having the appearance of a shallow hipped roof with a pitch to reflect that of the existing main roof. This roof alteration would extend around the front and side of the balcony and would surround a slightly smaller balcony area. There would be opaque glazing projecting further above the tiled roof area on all three sides, and by a similar height.
10. The existing car port and surround to the balcony are readily visible when viewed from the south-west and, to a lesser extent, when viewed from the north-west along Maplewood Drive. The scale, design and materials used present an incongruous addition to the bungalow within the wider street scene at the northern end of Maplewood Drive, which is characterised primarily by traditional brick and/or render-faced bungalows, with pitched or hipped roofs.
11. I acknowledge that the proposed replacement surround to the balcony, with a shallow-pitched, tiled 'roof' appearance, would be more in keeping and less prominent than the existing situation. However, the unsympathetic composite cladding to the pillars would remain and the obscure glazed element of the balcony surround would also still appear prominent and somewhat alien in its surroundings, both in respect of the main bungalow and the neighbouring buildings. Moreover, the glazing would cut across the pitch of the main roof at both the front and rear, which would result in a complex and awkward visual juxtaposition. This would have only limited direct visibility from the street, but would not represent high-quality design. The proposed car port/balcony arrangement would not appear as well-designed in the context of the original building, but as a somewhat incongruous addition.

12. In conclusion, I find that the proposed car port and balcony would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding local area. It would not be appropriate in terms of scale, appearance, and materials, nor with regard to its relationship to the main bungalow. On this basis, it would conflict with Policy CS7 of the LPCS, and Policies DM17 and DM20 of the LPDMP. Accordingly, I dismiss the appeal.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR