



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 28 October 2025 by Kim Vo MPLAN

Decision by John Morrison BA (Hons) MSc MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 24 November 2025

Appeal Ref: APP/J2373/D/25/3367030

65 Wetherby Avenue, Blackpool FY4 1QA

- 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 Mrs. Moore against the decision of Blackpool Council.
- The application Ref is 25/0094.
- The development proposed is for the construction of a flat-roof, single-storey first-floor side extension.

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Appeal Procedure

2. The site visit was undertaken by a representative of the Inspector whose recommendation is set out below and to which the Inspector has had regard before deciding the appeal.

Main Issues

3. The main issues are the effect of the proposed development on a) the character and appearance of the host dwelling and surrounding area and b) highway safety with specific regard to parking provision.

Reasons for the Recommendation

Character and Appearance

4. The appeal building is two storeys and semi-detached, with a single storey extension to the rear. The surrounding area is characterised by uniform pairs of semi-detached properties. They feature hipped roofs with brick, stone or rendered facades, where original features such as bay windows, window lintels and sills, chimneys and low brick boundary walls and pillars are present, and which reinforces the area's traditional residential feel. This, together with the regular rhythm of even gaps to their non adjoined sides, establishes a sense of original consistency, which contributes positively to the character and appearance of the area. Some dwellings have extended over two storeys into the side gap.
5. The proposed extension would be set back from the front elevation, be fully open at ground floor level, finished in matching materials, with its overall height to align with the main eaves. Number 63 Wetherby Avenue also does not currently feature any side extension. Whilst the proposal would be sited close to the shared boundary, the combination of the setback, an open ground floor and its limited height would allow it to be read as a subordinate and distinguishable element, thereby avoiding any terracing effect.

6. Notwithstanding this, the proposal's flat roof form would fail to complement with the hipped roof of the original property. Moreover, the open ground floor design would make the addition appear 'top heavy', creating an unbalanced and bulky structure to the host dwelling. As such, it would appear discordant within the street scene, disrupting the established building rhythm and original consistency of the semi-detached pairs. Other two storey side extensions are typically of a sympathetic design. Additionally, the proposal would fail to fully comply with the roof design and setback guidelines as outlined within Design Note 3 under the Extending Your Home Supplementary Planning Document 2007 (SPD).
7. For these reasons, the proposal would cause unacceptable harm to the character and appearance of the host dwelling and the surrounding area. It would be contrary to Policy CS7 of the Blackpool Local Plan Part 1 2016 (LP P1); Policies DM17 and DM20 of the Blackpool Local Plan Part 2 2023 (LP P2) and the National Planning Policy Framework (Framework). Together, and amongst other things, these policies and guidance require new developments to be of a high quality and to enhance the character and appearance of the local area. Extensions and alterations must also be well designed, sited and detailed in relation to the original building and adjoining properties.

Highway Safety

8. The appeal site benefits from a paved driveway to the front for at least two vehicles accessed via a dropped kerb. There is also a gap to the side of the dwelling which could offer parking for an additional, smaller vehicle. Wetherby Avenue is a narrow road with no parking restrictions, where the majority of properties have their own off-street parking provision.
9. Appendix G1 as referred to by Policy DM41 of LP P2 specifies that a four bedroom dwelling should provide three parking spaces. The proposal would be open at ground floor. However, the introduction of steel columns would narrow the side access to a degree that it would render it impractical for vehicular parking. It would, therefore, fall short of the car parking standards by one space. Due to the increase in the number of bedrooms, the proposal has potential to generate additional parking demand under the standards. In the absence of sufficient on-site capacity, any surplus vehicles would be displaced onto the highway.
10. The narrowness of Wetherby Avenue means vehicles parking must partially mount the pavement. This takes away space for pedestrians, parents with young children and people with mobility needs using the public path. When cars are parked on both sides of the street, this would also reduce the available space within the carriageway for vehicles passing by. The appeal scheme would, therefore, impede upon the free flow of traffic and potentially be dangerous to pedestrians who might then be forced to use the vehicular carriageway to navigate the area.
11. The effect of this proposal is limited to one additional vehicle parking on the street. Nonetheless, allowing the appeal could result in a situation where it is difficult for the Council to resist similar future proposals resulting in the loss of on-site parking. This would consequently increase the need for on-street parking. This finding is based on a hypothetical scenario and there is no guarantee that one additional bedroom would result in more vehicles. However, it is likely that occupants of the property may change in the future and there is no certainty that two parking spaces would always suffice.

12. For these reasons, the reduction of on-site car parking would create additional pressures for on-street parking, resulting in harm to highway safety through unacceptably inhibiting the free flow of traffic and being a danger to pedestrians. It would therefore conflict with Policy CS7 of LP P1; Policies DM17, DM20 and DM41 of LP P2; the SPD and the Framework. Together, and amongst other things, these policies and guidance require new developments to have regard to the size and arrangement of streets and incorporate well integrated car parking in accordance with standards. Any loss should be justified and appropriately mitigated.

Other Matters

13. The cited examples of side extensions, which I saw on my site visit, are of different designs or are a result of historical planning approvals from a different plan period. They are also evident on a limited number of properties, and the cited flat roof side extension does not set any positive design precedent. These examples also have an integrated garage at ground floor, which maintains parking to the side.
14. The proposal would meet the occupant's need for additional space. However, there is no sufficiently conclusive evidence to demonstrate that the appellant's requirements cannot be met through alternative measures, which might have a lesser impact than the appeal scheme. I remain to be convinced that the proposal is the only way to achieve the outcome the appellant desires.
15. I have also had regard to the economic benefits of the scheme in creating local employment and the proposal's effective use of land. However, none of these considerations outweigh the harm that I have found. They would be time limited in their effect and the extension would be used in association with the existing dwelling, so its effectiveness as a use of land would not be a determinative issue.

Conclusion and Recommendation

16. For the reasons given above, the appeal proposal would conflict with the development plan and material considerations do not indicate a decision other than in accordance therewith. I therefore recommend that the appeal should be dismissed.

Kim Vo

APPEAL PLANNING OFFICER

Inspector's Decision

17. I have considered all the submitted evidence and my representative's report and on that basis the appeal is dismissed.

John Morrison

INSPECTOR