



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 13 February 2025

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

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 March 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J2373/D/24/3357106

69 North Park Drive, Blackpool FY3 8NH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Miss Kerry Kirk against the decision of Blackpool Borough Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/0536.
 - The development proposed is proposed single storey side extension to create garage and kitchen extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. Since the submission of the appeal the National Planning Policy Framework (2023) has been superseded by the National Planning Policy Framework (2024) (the Framework). However, in relation to this appeal the aims of both sets of policies are similar. No party would be prejudiced or caused any injustice by me proceeding with the appeal in light of this change in policy.

Main Issues

3. The main issues in this appeal are the effect of the proposed development on (i) the character and appearance of the conservation area and the host property itself; and (ii) the living conditions of occupiers of 67 North Park Drive.

Reasons

Character and Appearance

4. The site is within the Stanley Park Conservation Area. In accordance with the statutory duty imposed by section 72(1) of the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990; I am required to have special regard to the effect of the proposed development on the character or appearance of the area.
5. The appeal site is a detached property within a predominantly residential area characterised by large, detached properties of varying designs.
6. Paragraph 212 of the Framework states that great weight should be given to the conservation of a designated heritage asset when considering the impact of a proposal on such an asset. This is irrespective of the level of harm.

7. The Conservation Area Appraisal (2017) confirms that the conservation area is centred on Stanley Park itself. North Park Drive comprises high quality housing facing the park, set predominately within large plots which adds to the significance of the conservation area.
8. The appeal site is elevated above road level with a relatively open front aspect. The Council's Extending Your Home Supplementary Planning Document (2007) (the SPD) seeks to ensure developments respect character of the surrounding area. The SPD provides guidance in terms of single storey side extensions which the proposed development would comprise.
9. The SPD highlights that single storey side extensions should be set back from the main wall of the property. The proposed development is not set back. The lack of set back along with the mono-pitch roof design which does not complement the design of the existing property would not be subservient and would appear out of keeping with the host property and the conservation area in general. The proposed development is contrary to the guidance contained in the SPD.
10. The proposed development would remove the existing side driveway leading to the detached garage to the rear which is likely to result in car parking on the drive to the front of the property. Whilst this maybe the case cars can park anywhere on the existing driveway now, including to the front of the property. I therefore give this limited weight.
11. Whilst the proposed development would be incongruous to the existing property, it would have a neutral effect on the significance of the conservation area. Notwithstanding this I conclude that the proposed development would harm the character and appearance of the conservation area and the host property itself.
12. There is conflict with Policies CS7 and CS8 of the Blackpool Local Plan, Part 1: Core Strategy 2012-2027 (2016) (the Core Strategy) and Policies DM17, DM20 and DM27 of the Blackpool Local Plan, Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (2023) (the SADMP) which seek amongst other things to ensure developments are well designed, having regard to the local area and heritage assets.
13. There is also conflict with the Framework which seeks amongst other things to ensure developments are of good design sympathetic to their surroundings and protects heritage assets.

Living Conditions

14. The appeal site is at an elevated floor level compared to the adjacent property No. 67 North Park Drive. The proposed development would infill the majority of the space between the existing property and the shared boundary with No. 67.
15. There is an existing timber fence along the shared boundary in the area where the proposed development would be located. Whilst this would screen to a degree the proposed development due to the difference in levels and the existing bay window to the side of No. 67 which faces the appeal property, the built form would be dominant above the fence resulting an overbearing outlook and a loss of light into the room the window serves.
16. I find that the proposed development would harm the living conditions of occupants of 67 North Park Drive. There would be conflict with Policy CS7 of the Core

Strategy and Policies DM17, DM20 and DM36 of the SADMP which seek amongst other things to protect the living conditions of the occupants of neighbouring properties. There is also conflict with the SPD which echoes the Development Plan policies.

17. The proposed development conflicts with the Framework which seeks to ensure developments have high standards of amenity for existing and future users.

Conclusion

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

Chris Pipe

INSPECTOR