



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 23 September 2025

by F Rafiq BSc (Hons) MCD MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 30th September 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J2373/D/25/3368722

30 Dunes Avenue, Blackpool FY4 1PY

- 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 Craig Darling against the decision of Blackpool Council.
 - The application Ref is 25/0158.
 - The development proposed is the erection of a single storey rear extension and a first floor rear extension.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is allowed and planning permission is granted for the erection of a single storey rear extension and a first floor rear extension at 30 Dunes Avenue, Blackpool FY4 1PY in accordance with the terms of the application Ref 25/0158 subject to the conditions in the attached schedule.

Preliminary Matter

2. I have utilised the description of development from the decision notice as this more accurately describes the proposal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on (i) the character and appearance of the host building and the area, (ii) the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers with regards to light and outlook, and (iii) protected species.

Reasons

Character and appearance

4. The appeal property comprises of a semi-detached property which is situated on the corner of Dunes Avenue and Alderley Avenue. The area comprises predominantly of semi-detached dwellings which are sited on consistent building lines and have regular features, such as front bay windows which provide for a cohesive, residential character to the area.
5. The first-floor extension would face Alderley Avenue and would bring the two-storey element of the appeal property close to that of the neighbouring property at 24 Alderley Avenue. There is regular spacing on the eastern side of Alderley Avenue between buildings, but overall within the streetscene, there is variation in the spacing, with properties on the opposite side of the road having irregular spacing between buildings. As the appeal proposal would incorporate a hipped roof, this

would provide a degree of separation with the neighbouring property at No. 24 and prevent a terracing effect.

6. Reference has been made to the tall fencing around the front boundary, but this is referenced as an existing feature and does not form part of the proposal, and nor does the outbuilding or any changes to hardstanding. As this part of the proposal is at first floor level, I don't consider these features at a lower level would cumulatively result in an overdeveloped appearance.
7. The proposal also includes a single storey rear extension but given its size and location away from the surrounding highway network, it would not have a harmful visual impact.
8. I therefore conclude that the appeal development would not have an unacceptable adverse impact on the character and appearance of the host building and the area. As such, it would comply with Policies CS6 and CS7 of the Blackpool Local Plan Part 1: Core Strategy (2012-2027) (Core Strategy) and Policies DM17, DM20 and DM21 of the Blackpool Local Plan Part 2: Site Allocations and Development Management Policies (Local Plan Part 2), which seek, amongst other matters, well designed development. Although the development would be contrary to certain specific guidance in the Extending Your Home Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), it would not conflict with its aims, which includes ensuring development fitting with the character of the area.

Living conditions

9. The first-floor extension would bring the development close to the side elevation of No. 24 which has a number of windows at ground and first floor levels facing the appeal site. These windows are however obscure glazed and have been referred to as serving non-habitable rooms. As such, and given that the levels of light to and the outlook from other windows to the front and rear of No. 24 would not be unduly impacted by the first-floor element of the proposal, the living conditions of occupants within this neighbouring property would not be unduly harmed. Reference has been made to the first-floor extension significantly enclosing the only external access to the rear of No. 24, but this passageway is a transient space and is not one that serves as a functional outdoor amenity area such as for sitting out in or recreation. Consequently, I do not consider the proposal would be unacceptable in this regard.
10. The Council has raised no concerns relating to the single storey rear extension owing to its size, roof design and existing boundary treatment and I have no reason to reach a different view.
11. Accordingly, I conclude that the proposal would be acceptable in relation to its effect on the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers with regards to light and outlook. As such, it would comply with Policies CS7 of the Core Strategy and Policies DM17, DM20 and DM36 of the Local Plan Part 2, which seek, amongst other matters, that development is compatible with adjacent existing uses and would not lead to unacceptable adverse effects on amenity. It would also not be contrary to the SPD or Paragraph 135 of the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework), which seek, amongst other matters, to provide a high standard of amenity for existing and future users.

Protected species

12. Policy DM35 of Local Plan Part 2 sets out development will not be permitted if it would have an adverse impact on animal or plant species protected under national or international legislation. The proposal involves the demolition and alteration of an existing pitched roof. There is however no evidence before me that the proposal could have a potential impact on bats particularly as it involves a relatively modern structure.
13. I therefore conclude that the proposal would not have an unacceptable harmful impact on protected species, and as such, it would not be contrary to Local Plan Part 2 Policy DM35 or Section 15 of the Framework.

Other Matter

14. The Council Officer's report raises concern on the increased parking demand arising from this proposal, but from my site observations there is sufficient on-street parking availability to provide for the increased demand, and I do not therefore consider there would be unacceptable highway safety impacts arising.

Conditions

15. I have considered the suggested conditions, having regard to the six tests set out in the Framework. For the sake of clarity, conciseness and enforceability, I have amended the wording of some of the suggested conditions as appropriate.
16. A materials condition is necessary in the interests of the character and appearance of the host building and the area, as is a condition for this same reason which requires windows and doors to be recessed in the elevation in which they are set.
17. A condition is also necessary requiring the window in the eastern flank elevation of the first floor extension to be fitted with obscure glazing and be non-opening, unless the part of the window that can be opened is more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which the window is installed, in the interests of the living conditions of neighbouring residential occupiers.

Conclusion

18. The proposal would accord with the development plan as a whole, and there are no other considerations, including the Framework, that indicate that I should take a decision other than in accordance with this. I conclude that the appeal should be allowed.

F Rafiq

INSPECTOR

Schedule of 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 the following approved plans: Location and Site Plans (Drg No. 25/BL/PL/DU/001), Existing and Proposed Layouts (Drg No. 25/BL/PL/DU/002), Existing and Proposed Elevations Sheet One of Two (Drg No. 25/BL/PL/DU/003) and Existing and Proposed Elevations Sheet Two of Two (Drg No. 25/BL/PL/DU/003).
- 3) The external materials of the development hereby permitted shall match those used in the existing building.
- 4) The windows in the development hereby permitted shall be recessed behind the front face of the elevation in which they are set by the same degree as the existing windows in that elevation.
- 5) The window in the eastern elevation of the first floor extension shall be permanently glazed with obscure glass not less than level 5 on the Pilkington Glass levels of obscurity or other equivalent rating and shall thereafter be maintained, and also be non-opening unless the parts of the window which can be opened are more than 1.7 metres above the floor of the room in which the window is installed.

End of conditions