



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: 21 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J2373/D/25/3367389

451 Waterloo Road, Blackpool, FY4 4BW

- 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 Leon Gulliver against the decision of Blackpool Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/0136.
 - The development proposed is the provision of a first-floor rear balcony with 1.8m high privacy screen to sides and 1.1m glass balustrade to rear over existing ground floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matter

2. The submitted drawing showing existing plans and elevations includes details of a tree to be planted at the rear of the site and space allocated for refuse bins. The same details appear on the drawing showing the proposed plans and elevations but with notation to indicate that these are proposals. They do not have any significant direct bearing on the issue of the proposed balcony and screen, but I note their existence and I have taken them to be part of the overall scheme.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed balcony and screen on:
 - The character and appearance of the area around Waterloo Road, and
 - The living conditions of the occupiers of nearby residents by way of privacy, outlook and disturbance.

Reasons

4. The appeal property is an end-terraced, two-storey house. To the rear it has a full-width single-storey extension that projects some 4 metres from the main rear elevation, and which has a flat roof. There is also a large dormer extension in the rear roof, although it would appear that this does not benefit from express permission, and there is currently some debate as to whether it might benefit from permitted development rights. Beyond the rear extension is a wooden outbuilding and also a parking space with access from a lane at the rear of the properties along this side of Waterloo Road. The proposed development would involve the construction of a balcony screen around the roof of the rear extension using privacy glazing materials. The balcony would be 1.8 metres high at the sides and around 1.1 metres high at the rear.

5. Policy CS7 of the Council's Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (CS) indicates that development will not be permitted if it causes unacceptable effects by way of noise or other adverse impact on local character or amenity. Policy DM17 of the Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (DMP) indicates that development should have regard to scale, height and materials, and that new development should have a consistent architectural style across the whole building. Policy DM20 of the DMP indicates that extensions and alterations must be well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the original building and adjoining properties. In addition, materials will need to match or be complementary to the original building. Finally, extensions which have an unacceptable effect on neighbour amenity in terms of loss of privacy, loss of outlook, or have an overbearing impact will not be permitted.
6. The Council's Supplementary Planning Document on Extending Your Home (SPD) indicates that balconies should only be sited or screened so as not to cause loss of privacy to neighbours. In addition, first-floor extensions set off the boundary should not project by more than half the set off distance plus 1.5 metres from the first-floor rear wall of the adjoining neighbouring property. Moreover, where rear extensions can be visible from public areas, the effect they have on the appearance or character of the area will also have to be taken into account.

Character and appearance

7. The Council contends that the first-floor balcony would appear incongruous and would be harmful to the appearance, quality and character of the property and the streetscene due to its siting, size and design. The proposed balcony would, however, be at the rear of the property and would not be visible from the public realm along Waterloo Road or Whittam Avenue. There would be very limited visibility from the end of Ryburn Avenue, but I do not consider that it would have any significant impact on the character and appearance of the streetscene.
8. With regard to the impact of the proposal on the host property itself, I note that the house has a modern appearance, with large glazed patio doors to the rear elevation of the single-storey rear extension. The adjacent property at Nos 443-449 Waterloo Road also has a large, relatively modern single-storey rear extension, and I consider that the proposed glazed balcony screen above the existing rear extension at the appeal property would appear as complementary to the host building and would not be out of context with its design and materials, or with the design and scale of the rear extension at Nos 443-449.
9. In the light of the above, I consider that the proposed balcony and screen would not be harmful to the character or appearance of the area around Waterloo Road, and it would not conflict with Policy CS7 of the CS, with Policies DM17 and DM20 of the DMP, or with general guidance on design of rear extensions in the SPD.

Living conditions

10. The proposed balcony would occupy the whole of the roof area of the existing single-storey rear extension. The appellant considers that the most relevant part of the SPD is Design Note 5 – First Floor Rear Extensions, since the scale and massing of a first-floor rear balcony with side privacy screens could be considered similar to that of a first-floor rear extension. I concur with that view.

11. In this case, the existing rear extension at No 451 projects some 4 metres beyond the first-floor rear wall of No 453 and is separated from the boundary with No 453 by around 1 metre. On this basis, the balcony, as being similar to a first-floor extension, should extend only around 2 metres beyond the first-floor rear wall of No 453, as set out in the SPD. The combination of the side wall of the rear extension at No 451 with the additional 1.8 metre high privacy glazing would present something of an overbearing outlook to the occupiers of No 453 from the rear windows and the amenity area immediately outside the rear of the dwelling.
12. With regard to the impact of the proposal on privacy, I note that there is a long outbuilding to the rear of No 453 which projects along the boundary with the appeal property from around the line of the rear elevation of the existing rear extension. The presence of the outbuilding, along with the privacy screen at the side of the proposed balcony would, in my opinion, prevent any significant overlooking from the balcony or any significant loss of privacy to occupiers of No 453. Similarly, the distance between the balcony and the properties on Ryburn Avenue to the rear would be sufficient to protect the privacy of the occupiers of those houses.
13. Given the scale of the proposed balcony and the proximity to neighbouring properties, I consider that there is potential for significant noise pollution resultant from use of the balcony. I accept that there would appear to be a terrace at first-floor level to the rear of Nos 443-449, but I have no details as to the history of this and, in any case, this should not be seen as reason to allow a development that could add significantly to noise and disturbance in the immediate locality.
14. In conclusion on this issue, I find that the proposal would result in harm to the outlook from the rear of No 453 Waterloo Road, and would have the potential to result in significant noise and disturbance, harmful to the residential amenities of the occupiers of nearby dwellings. On this basis, it would conflict with Policy CS7 of the CS, Policy DM20 of the DMP, and with guidance on balconies and first-floor extensions in the SPD.

Conclusion

15. I find that the proposal would not be harmful to the character and appearance of the area around Waterloo Road, but that it would be harmful to the living conditions of the occupiers of nearby dwellings by way of outlook and disturbance. Accordingly, I dismiss the appeal.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR