



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 8 August 2025

by **J D Westbrook BSc (Hons) MSc MRTPI**

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 11 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J2373/D/25/3367095

46 Exchange Street, Blackpool, FY1 2DZ

- 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 S Bixi against the decision of Blackpool Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/0111
 - The development proposed is the construction of a first-floor rear extension with flat roof, and a front dormer extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issues

2. The main issues are the effect of the proposed extensions on:
 - The character and appearance of the area along Exchange Street, and
 - The living conditions of future occupiers of the property and occupiers of the neighbouring No 44 by way of amenity space, privacy and overlooking.

Reasons

3. The appeal property is an end-terraced house situated on the western side of Exchange Street. It is a two-storey house with a two-storey rear outrigger, a short single-storey projection beyond the outrigger, small rear outbuildings, and small front garden and back yard. At the time of my visit, it was unused and appeared to be in the process of repair and/or renovation. The proposal would involve the construction of a dormer extension in the front roof slope and an extension to the rear outrigger at first-floor level, above the existing single-storey projection.
4. Policy CS7 of the Council's Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (CS) indicates that development will not be permitted if it causes adverse impact on local character, or if the amenities of nearby residents or potential occupiers are adversely affected. Policy DM1 of the Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (DMP) indicates that developments should safeguard the privacy and amenity of the occupiers of neighbouring properties and future occupiers of the development, and provide adequate private, defined and useable amenity space for existing and new occupants. Policy DM17 of indicates that development should have regard to scale, roofscapes, and materials, and that new development should have a consistent architectural style across the whole building. Policy DM20 of the DMP indicates that roof extensions will be acceptable where

they will not be detrimental to the appearance or undermine the unity or roofscape of the original and nearby buildings. It also specifies that past unsympathetic alterations and extensions of other properties should not be regarded as a precedent for further similar proposals.

5. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document on Extending Your Home (SPD) indicates that, in general, dormers should be contained well within the body of the roof, by being well set back from the party/end walls, below the ridge of the roof and above the eave gutter line; 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; line up vertically with the existing fenestration below; have a pitched roof in matching materials wherever possible; and be constructed with cheeks and pitched roofs clad in tiles or slates of a matching colour and texture of the existing roof. Exceptions may include whether there are a large number of dormer extensions of a particular style in the immediate area.

Character and appearance

6. In this case, the proposed first-floor rear extension would be very small and, whilst it would be visible through a narrow gap between buildings on Lewtas Street, it would not be a significant feature in the streetscape and would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the surrounding area.
7. In the case of the proposed front dormer, however, this would be a prominent feature in the streetscene along Exchange Street. It would be flat-roofed and, whilst there would be limited set-back from the eaves, there would be no set down from the ridge and only very limited set-in from the sides. On this basis, it would occupy a significant amount of the front roof slope and would be an over-dominant and uncharacteristic feature in the context of both the host property and the surrounding area along Exchange Street. I acknowledge that there is a large front dormer at the adjacent No 44, but it would appear that this may be unauthorised and was constructed before the current Development Plan and SPD were adopted. In addition, I consider it to be an unsympathetic feature in the streetscape that should not be seen as a precedent for the current proposal, particularly as there are no other dormers evident in the area.
8. In conclusion on this issue, I find that the proposed front dormer would be an over-dominant and unsympathetic feature on the host property. By reason its scale and design, it would have an adverse impact on the local character and would conflict with Policy CS7 of the CS, Policies DM17 and DM20 of the DMP, and guidance on the design of dormers in the SPD.

Living conditions

9. The Council contends that the rear extension, by reason of its height, its siting near the boundary, and the addition of a side window, would adversely affect the living conditions of the occupiers of the adjacent No 44, by way of unacceptable levels of overlooking, loss of privacy and an overbearing, visually intrusive impact. However, the side window is not the only window serving the extended rear room at No 46, and it could be conditioned to use opaque glazing. Moreover, the extension would be only some 1.5 metres deep and would be seen against a backdrop of larger buildings immediately to the rear. I do not, therefore, consider that the rear extension would have a visually intrusive impact or be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of No 44 by way of overlooking or loss of privacy.

10. The submitted plans do not show the internal configuration of the additional living accommodation in the loft space, but there would appear to be sufficient space for a further 2 rooms. In addition, the rear extension would allow for a larger first-floor room at the rear of the house. The existing private amenity space at the rear of the property is confined to a very small, L-shaped yard which may or may not also have to be used for bin and cycle storage. Although the property is currently unused, it would appear to be of a reasonable size for family usage. I consider that the existing amenity area at the rear would be inadequate for use by a what could be a significantly larger family should the additional space proposed by the current scheme become available.
11. In conclusion on this issue, I find that the proposal would result in inadequate private amenity space for potential occupiers and that it would, therefore, conflict with Policy CS7 of the CS and with Policy DM1 of the DMP.

Conclusion

12. In the light of the above, I find that the proposed development would be harmful to the character and appearance of the area along Exchange Street, and that it would be harmful to the living conditions of the potential future occupiers of the appeal property itself by way of inadequate private amenity space. Accordingly, I dismiss the appeal.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR