



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: 26 August 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J2373/W/25/3365926

50 Solo Printers, All Hallows Road, Blackpool, FY2 0AY

- 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 James Parfitt against the decision of Blackpool Council.
 - The application Ref is 24/0581
 - The development proposed is the construction of a two-storey side extension, a roof lift to first floor and a two-storey front extension, ground-floor use as storage, and first-floor use as a dance studio.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. There are a number of inconsistencies within the application, including within the submitted plans. The application form indicates that there will be 3 parking spaces on-site, although the submitted plans indicate 4 spaces. On the plans available to me, there is no red line to show the extent of the site. On the 1:500 site plans, the site appears to have a front boundary that runs at an angle to the front elevation of the buildings on the site. As a result the cars shown as parking on the site encroach increasingly onto the footpath and carriageway from north to south. On the larger, proposed ground floor plan, the area for parking at the front of the site is not delineated, though the angle of the boundary is indicated by the angle of the boundary wall at the northern end of the site. I will refer to these inconsistencies in my considerations below.

Main Issue

3. The main issue is the effect of the proposed development on highway safety along All Hallows Road..

Reasons

4. The appeal buildings comprise 3 elements. The central building on the site is effectively 1.5 storeys in height with workshops on the ground floor and further accommodation in the roof space. To the rear is a single-storey building, set at right angles to the central building and apparently housing a small self-storage facility. To the front is a single-storey building with a mono-pitched roof which houses an office/retail area associated with the workshops. An area of concrete hardstanding is situated to the front and side of the buildings. Immediately to the south of the set of appeal buildings is a commercial unit ("The Warehouse") which also has a small concrete hardstanding to the front, conjoined with that serving the appeal buildings.

5. Policy DM41 of the Council's Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies document (SADMP) indicates that new development will only be permitted where the access, travel and safety needs of all affected by the development are met. This includes that there should be safe and appropriate connection to the road network for all transport modes requiring access to and within the development.
6. The proposed development would involve an increase in height of the central building to create a full two-storey structure that would also extend to the side, and the construction of a first floor above the front building. The ground floor of all three buildings would be given over to a self-storage facility and the extended first floor would be used as a dance studio, together with a small office.
7. With regard to on-site parking, I note that the submitted plans show the hardstanding to the front and side of the buildings to be occupied by 4 cars. However, the area to the front of the existing buildings would appear to be only a maximum of 4 metres deep at the northern end and reducing in depth across the front of the site. This is below the length normally required for a parking space. The cars shown on the plans are below the length of an average car and yet still appear to have to encroach over the narrow pavement, even when touching the wall of the building as shown on the plans.. There is a crossover/dropped kerb outside the site which is wide enough for only one car. It is not clear from any of the plans how much of the joint hardstanding serving the appeal buildings and 'The Warehouse' is available to each of the business uses.
8. From the plans and my own observations, I consider that there is realistically only space for two vehicles to park on the site without encroachment onto the pavement beyond the site boundary. One vehicle could park to the side of the front building, but the limited depth and configuration at the front of the site, along with the relatively narrow crossover, would mean that effectively only one car could manoeuvre into the remaining space and use it for parallel parking. Even then it appears that the car would partly obstruct the access. I also note that space would need to be left for safe access and exit for patrons from the staircase within the front building, and that there would be no space for the storage of any bins associated with the activities in the buildings. In addition, the planning application form indicates that there would be two full-time employees on site, both of whom may, of course require a parking space.
9. With regard to on-street parking, the appellant contends that there would be sufficient space for visitors to park on the road outside of the property. All Hallows Road is a busy but narrow road serving a mix of commercial, residential and education uses, and it is already subject to traffic calming measures in the vicinity of the appeal site. There are no parking restrictions on the road outside of the appeal buildings and 'The Warehouse', or on the road for some 30 metres beyond the site to the north. On the road opposite there are yellow line restrictions during the day. However, due to access requirements for the residential properties on that side of the road, there would only be one parking space available during the unrestricted hours, while any instances of parking on both sides of the road at the same time would significantly restrict the width of the road for normal usage.
10. At the time of my site visit there were two commercial vans parked outside of 'The Warehouse', servicing the three businesses/activities within it, namely All 4 Pets, All 4 Sweets, and Dickson's Coffee Co. Due to the narrowness of the road, both

vans were parked partly on the pavement and, in order to accommodate both, they projected beyond the frontage of 'The Warehouse' onto space that would be required for access to the parking area of the appeal buildings to the north, and onto a yellow line restricted parking area to the south. I have no details as to the amount of use this short length of road with unrestricted parking might result from the normal commercial activities of the 'The Warehouse', or at what times of the day, but it is clear that this space could not be relied on for sole use of visitors to the appeal buildings at all times of the day.

11. The 30 metre length of unrestricted parking to the north of the appeal buildings could potentially accommodate around 6 cars, although at the time of my visit I noted that cars parked here were using the pavement due to the restricted width of the road. The pavement here is itself narrow and such parking is undesirable. In addition, some of the potential parking space runs alongside railings leading up to a pedestrian crossing serving a large school on the opposite side of the road. In practice, the railings make it highly inconvenient for parking at this point, particularly given the restricted width of the road.
12. On the basis of the above, I consider that there would effectively only be room for 5 cars to park on this length of road and it would, in any case, not solely be for use of visitors or service vehicles using the facilities at the appeal buildings. The appellant has indicated that he would accept a condition to restrict times of activities in the dance studio to avoid school start and finish times but, given the likely number of patrons using the two facilities in the buildings at other times of the day, I do not consider that this would satisfactorily deal with potential parking problems in the vicinity of the appeal buildings. The appellant has also made note of parking availability elsewhere in the area, but it is unlikely that these would prove sufficiently attractive to patrons of the dance studio who might, in any case, choose to drop off users anywhere on the road nearby, or prove feasible for patrons of the storage facility who would be likely to need to load or unload at the premises.

Conclusion

13. In conclusion, I find that the significant increase in intensity of usage due to the proposed extensions and changes of use of the buildings, would be highly likely to result in unacceptable increases in pressure for on-street parking in the vicinity of the appeal site. Given the heavy usage of All Hallows Road and its limited width, such increases in parking pressures would be harmful to highway safety along the road. On this basis, it would conflict with Policy DM41 of the SADMP and accordingly, I dismiss this appeal.

J D Westbrook

INSPECTOR