



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/25/3367724

26 Duncan Avenue, Blackpool, FY2 9DB

- 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 Harry and Charlotte Dawson and Greenwood against the decision of Blackpool Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/0089
 - The development proposed is the construction of a single-storey rear extension; a new hip-to-gable roof onto new footprint; a loft conversion including dormers; a replacement detached garage; and new rendered finish & window/door frames to property.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Main Issue

2. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area along Duncan Avenue.

Reasons

3. No 26 is a detached bungalow situated on the northern side of Duncan Avenue. In common with most of the properties along the road it has a pyramid style roof. It also has a small front projection and a small utility room extension at the rear. The proposal would involve the construction of a full width single-storey rear extension 2.35 metres deep. The pyramid roof would be extended to form a roof with gable ends, and would be extended over the single-storey extension at the rear. The loft area would be converted into living accommodation with a large, full width, flat-roofed dormer to the rear and two small dormers to the front roof slope. The existing garage at the rear would be replaced with a larger combined garage and gym building.
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. Policy DM17 of the Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (DMP) indicates that development should have regard to scale, height, massing, 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.

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.
6. In this case, the Council finds the proposals regarding the replacement garage building and the principle of the single-storey rear extension to be acceptable, and I concur with that view. There are, however, issues with regard to the hip-to-gable conversion, and the scale and design of the dormer extensions to the front and rear of the extended roof.
7. The Council contends that the roof alterations would result in two gable ends, and that this would unacceptably change the appearance of the property within the streetscene. The Council acknowledges that there are some properties along the road that already have gable ends, and I note that there are such examples in close proximity to the appeal property, including Nos 23, 29 and 31. These may or may not be the original designs of the properties but the fact is that they form part of the existing streetscene in close proximity to No 26, and I consider that the hip-to-gable conversion at the appeal property would not, in itself, have an adverse impact on local character.
8. With regard to the two front dormers, the design is largely consistent with guidance in the SPD. They would be aligned above the front bay window and the front door. While the cheeks of the dormers would be rendered, this would match the proposal to render the whole property and I note that there are several examples of bungalows along this part of Duncan Avenue that are either wholly or partly rendered. I do not consider, therefore, that, in this case, the front dormers would necessarily have an adverse impact on local character.
9. With regard to the rear dormer, however, I find that its scale and overall design, on what would be the extended width and depth of the rear roof, would be an over-dominant and uncharacteristic feature in the context of the host property and the surrounding area. Whilst there would be limited set-back and set down, along with limited set-in from the sides, it would occupy almost all of the rear roof slope. It would not have a pitched roof and the materials would not match any other part of the property. Moreover, by reason of its limited set-in nature, it would be readily visible from the public realm along Duncan Avenue and would be harmful to the streetscene. On this basis, it would conflict with Policy CS7 of the CS and with Policies DM17 and DM20 of the DMP.
10. The appellant has made note of other examples of rear extensions and the use of dormers along Duncan Avenue and nearby roads. However, I note that the examples at Nos 16 and 18 Duncan Avenue have retained the basic pitched roof element of the host property, and that dormers used in the vicinity are of a significantly smaller scale than that proposed for No 26. I have no detailed information relating to the example quoted of dormers at No 61 Norbreck Road, but the context is different and, in any case, I consider that example to be one that should not be used as a precedent.

11. Finally, the appellant contends that the hip-to-gable element and the dormers could be permitted development. I have no evidence of a Certificate of Lawfulness relating to this and cannot, therefore, conclude on this matter.

Conclusion

12. The National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) states that development that is not well designed should be refused, especially where it fails to reflect local design policies and government guidance on design, taking into account any local design guidance and supplementary planning documents such as design guides and codes. In this case, the proposed development would conflict with policy in the Framework along with policies in the Council's Local Plan and guidance in the SPD. The proposal would be harmful to the character and appearance of the host property and the surrounding area along Duncan Avenue. Accordingly, I dismiss this appeal.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR