



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 5 June 2025

by **S Brook BA (Hons) MA MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 13 June 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J2373/D/25/3362253

99 North Park Drive, Blackpool FY3 8NE

- 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 Mr & Mrs A Baker against the decision of Blackpool Borough Council.
 - The application reference is 24/0528.
 - The development proposed is formation of a single-storey side extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the formation of a single-storey side extension at 99 North Park Drive, Blackpool, FY3 8NE, in accordance with the terms of the application, reference 24/0528, and the plans submitted with it, 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 approved plans: 24115_LOC Location Plan, and 24115_110 Revision A Proposed Plans and Elevations.
 - 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.

Preliminary Matters

2. An amended plan was provided to the Council in December 2024. However, the Council's decision notice does not reference this amended plan. It is important that I consider the same plans as the Council, and the plans on which interested parties were consulted. Accordingly, I have determined this appeal based on the plans originally submitted with the planning application.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development upon the character and appearance of the dwelling and the area, which includes the Stanley Park Conservation Area (CA).

Reasons

4. The proposed development relates to a two-storey detached property, with additional accommodation in the roof space. It is constructed of brick, with stone detailing to the doors and windows, which are positioned within three projecting

bays at ground and first floor level, with the central bay extending above eaves height. Substantial chimney stacks are positioned to either side. The property is of a distinctive design, dating from the interwar period, and its symmetry is an attractive quality. A driveway allows for parking to the front and side, along with some planting. A boundary wall and fencing, topped with hedging forms a high boundary to the site's frontage.

5. The appeal site lies at the northeastern extent of the CA. The CA comprises two distinct character areas, the park itself, and the bordering residential streets. The Stanley Park Conservation Area Appraisal, October 2017, (CAA), recognises that the tree lined North Park Drive with its large, detached houses, with spacious front gardens and low boundary treatments, gives the area an open aspect, which contributes to the leafy character of the CA. The CAA recognises that many houses along North Park Drive provide a contemporary interpretation of the Arts and Crafts style. While these dwellings vary in style, they are tied together with a unified palette of materials, typified by the use of mullioned windows, soft or textured brick, varied roof silhouettes, Westmorland slate, and interesting chimney forms. The quality of the appeal building and its spacious plot, contribute positively to the significance of the CA.
6. The proposed side extension would be single storey only and it would be relatively narrow, given the limited space available to the side boundary of the plot. The roof would be hipped to complement the design of the existing roof. The extension would use brickwork and slate to match the existing dwelling. While it would only be set back marginally from the front wall, it would appear more so, as a result of the dominant projecting bays. As such, the proposal would not unbalance the attractive symmetry of the dwelling to any significant extent, given its small scale and subservient appearance. As such, having had regard to advice contained in the Council's Extending Your Home Supplementary Planning Document, November 2007, I am satisfied that in design terms, the proposal would be both sympathetic and subservient to the host property. It would maintain the positive contribution the dwelling makes in architectural terms, to the significance of the CA.
7. The Stanley Park Conservation Area Management Plan, October 2017, recognises that side spaces, together with front gardens and boundary treatments, contribute to the setting of individual houses, and should be retained. Given its limited set back, the proposal would result in some erosion of the space around the dwelling, and between this property and No 101.
8. However, this area is largely screened from public views by the high boundary treatments that already exist at the host property, and at No 101. Fleeting views are only possible when passing the driveway entrances. As such, the enclosure of this side space at ground floor level only, would not unduly impact on the open aspect of the area. The spacing between these two properties would be retained at first floor level, where it makes a greater contribution to the open aspect of the area, given its visibility in the street scene.
9. The proposed side extension would prevent parking in the existing garage and to the side of the property. However, the proposed plans show parking for one vehicle within the garage of the proposed extension, while the frontage of the property is already laid out to provide parking. As such, while I appreciate that spacious front gardens and low boundary treatments along North Park Drive

contribute to the open aspect of the area, and in some cases, the loss of front gardens for parking purposes would erode this contribution, this would not be the case at the appeal site, where frontage parking already exists, along with a high wall and fence. As such, the appeal site does not make the same contribution as other properties along North Park Drive to this open aspect, and there is little evidence that this is likely to change. Consequently, I am satisfied that the proposal would not adversely impact on the significance of the CA derived from this open aspect.

10. To conclude, the proposal would not have a harmful impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling itself, or the wider area. The significance of the CA would not be adversely affected and its character and appearance would be preserved. Consequently, I find no conflict with policies CS7 and CS8 of the Blackpool Local Plan Part 1¹, or with policies DM17, DM20, and DM27 of the Blackpool Local Plan Part 2², which collectively, and amongst other matters, seek to ensure well designed development that conserves or enhances the character and appearance of the area, including the significance of heritage assets, through the careful consideration of scale, mass, layout, height, appearance and architectural style, materials, relationship to adjoining buildings, and parking provision.

Other Matters

11. Stanley Park is a Grade II* listed park and garden. The CAA explains that the encircling tree-lined boulevards and roads, and the building plots lining them, were seen as an integral part of the Park's development. As such, the housing along North Park Drive is an established part of the park's setting, which contributes towards an understanding of the park's historic development in the inter war period. The proposal is small scale and for the reasons set out above, I have found that it would not adversely impact on the character and appearance of the dwelling itself, or the area. As such, the proposal would have no harmful impact on any significance derived from the setting of this heritage asset, or the ability to appreciate that significance.

Conditions

12. I have imposed a condition specifying the approved plans as this provides certainty. I have also imposed a condition requiring matching materials to safeguard the character and appearance of the appeal property and surrounding area.

Conclusion

13. For the reasons set out above, having had regard to the development plan as a whole and all other material considerations, I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

S Brook

INSPECTOR

¹ Blackpool Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2012-2027), January 2016.

² Blackpool Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies, February 2023.