

Public Document Pack

MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING - TUESDAY, 9 APRIL 2024

Present:

Councillor Roe (in the Chair)

Councillors

Baker	Farrell	Jackson
P Brookes	Flanagan	Sloman

In Attendance:

Keith Allen, Highways and Traffic Development and Control Officer

Jenni Cook, Democratic Governance Senior Adviser

Ian Curtis, Legal Officer

Susan Parker, Head of Development Management

1 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Baker declared a prejudicial interest in Item 12, application number 23/0848 as a family member worked for the chain of hotels owned by the applicant. Councillor Baker left the meeting for the duration of this item.

2 MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 27 FEBRUARY 2024

Resolved:

To agree the minutes of the meeting held on 27 February 2024 as a true and correct record.

3 PLANNING/ENFORCEMENT APPEALS LODGED AND DETERMINED

The Planning Committee considered a report on Planning/Enforcement Appeals lodged and determined since the last meeting held on 27 February 2024.

The Committee noted the details of the five appeals lodged and the appeal that had been determined and upheld.

Resolved:

The Committee noted the update.

4 PLANNING ENFORCEMENT UPDATE REPORT - FEBRUARY 2024

The Committee considered an update on planning enforcement activity within Blackpool, between 1 February 2024 and 29 February 2024.

In February 2024, 29 new cases had been registered for investigation and as at 29 February there had been 280 "live" complaints outstanding. Seven cases had been closed without recourse to formal action and 28 cases had been closed.

MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING - TUESDAY, 9 APRIL 2024

Resolved:

The Committee noted the update.

5 PLANNING APPLICATION 22/0168 - 611-613 NEW SOUTH PROMENADE, BLACKPOOL FY4 1NJ

The Committee considered application number 22/0168 for the Erection of part 4, 5 and 6 storey building comprising of 40 self-contained apartments with associated cycle/waste storage, and provision of 45 car parking spaces with access from Harrowside West, following demolition of existing hotel (Outline application for access, appearance, layout and scale).

Ms S Parker, Head of Development Management, advised the Committee that this application was linked to the next item on the agenda, application number 22/0178 and delivered a joint presentation outlining both applications.

Ms Parker outlined both applications and advised that these were outline applications for two part 4, 5 and 6 storey buildings on the Promenade following demolition of existing holiday accommodation on the sites. Both sites were located within the Pleasure Beach Promenade frontage and Policy CS23 was therefore relevant in respect of the loss of sites used as holiday accommodation and the need for developments to meet high design standards and deliver clear regeneration benefits. The proposal was outlined as being 40 apartments on the south site, 49 on the north site with all 89 offering permanent residential accommodation. Ms Parker advised that given the Boulevard Hotel and the recently extended Hampton by Hilton development, the expectation for a wider mix of permanent residential and holiday usage would be satisfied on balance. Neither of the sites had been allocated for housing and the Council continued to have a comfortable housing supply of approximately 14 years.

Ms Parker advised that the apartments proposed on both sites met national space standards and that most would have outdoor amenity space provided by terraces and/or balconies, with an outlook over the Promenade. Since the first submission of the applications the height of the apartments had been reduced to minimise impacts of neighbours and visual impacts. It was proposed that each block would be 18 metres tall which was taller than the Hampton by Hilton development, but no taller than the Coastal Point Development and the scale was considered to be acceptable. In respect of the main elevations, these would be light brick and white stone with full height windows and decorating curtain walling and panelling which would be arranged in ordered bays.

Access to the South Site would be via Harrowside West with ground floor parking and the North Site would be accessed via the Promenade Crescent with accommodation on the ground floor and parking to the rear. Each apartment would have at least one parking space and the local Highway Authority considered this provision to be acceptable. A loading bay would be provided for each block for servicing and waste collection, with other off-site highway works securable by condition.

In respect of amenity, Ms Parker advised that the separation distances involved would prevent undue impact. No heritage impacts had been identified for the North Site, however the South Site was within the setting of the locally-listed Solaris building, but

MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING - TUESDAY, 9 APRIL 2024

Planning Officers considered that the scheme would improve the setting rather than harm its significance. The sites were situated within flood zones two and three, and both blocks would be constructed in accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment and no unacceptable flood risk or drainage issues had been identified.

The Committee was advised that both applications had been supported by a Habitats Regulation Assessment and that Natural England had not objected to either application, subject to the appropriate mitigation measures being implemented and on the understanding that the Habitats Regulation Assessment was adopted. In relation to biodiversity net gain, Ms Parker noted that provision of 10% provision was not a statutory requirement for either site as the applications pre-dated the legislation.

Ms Parker advised the Committee that neither site contributed the full level of required planning obligations in respect of green infrastructure, health contributions or affordable housing due to viability issues and it was the view of the Planning Officer that the wider benefit from development was sufficient to outweigh any shortfall in planning obligations.

The Committee was asked to adopt the Habitats Regulation Assessment and resolve to support the scheme and delegate approval to the Head of Development Management subject to entry into Section 106 agreements and the conditions listed in the Committee report. In addition, the Update Note requested that the Head of Development Management be authorised to make changes to the wording of the conditions as may be appropriate as long as the changes would not materially affect what the condition is trying to achieve or the permission overall.

Ms D Love, Agent for the applicant, spoke in favour of both this application and in favour of application number 22/0178 and advised the Committee that the development was of a high-quality and would complement the Hampton by Hilton and Coastal Point developments. The design and layouts were supported by Planning Officers, however the viability had been the cause of negotiations and delays. Ms Love advised the Committee that the provision of affordable housing would not be viable for the development but that sums of £196,000 and £136,000 had been identified as a contribution for provision at other sites. The Committee was advised that the applicants were hotel owners and local people and it was their intention to sell the site in order for a developer to fully realise both applications and to further elevate the area.

The Committee discussed the application in conjunction with application number 22/0178 and in response to questions, Ms Parker advised that it would likely not be feasible to provide the limited amount of affordable housing that could be funded on site as it would not be attractive to a Registered Provider, and that contributions would be secured for off-site provision and advised that Policy CS14 allowed for contributions to be directed off-site to support regeneration objectives.

The Committee expressed its disappointment that no affordable housing would be provided within either of the application sites, however it noted the high-quality nature of the development.

Resolved:

1. To adopt the Habitats Regulations Assessment.

MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING - TUESDAY, 9 APRIL 2024

2. To resolve to support the application and delegate approval to the Head of Development Management subject to the completion of a S106 legal agreement and the conditions listed within the Committee report.
3. To authorise the Head of Development Management to make changes to the wording of the conditions as may be appropriate as long as the changes would not materially affect what the condition was trying to achieve or the permission overall.

6 PLANNING APPLICATION 22/0178 - 569-577 NEW SOUTH PROMENADE, BLACKPOOL, FY4 4JN

The Committee considered application number 22/0178 for the Erection of part a 4, 5 and 6 storey building comprising 49 self-contained permanent apartments with associated cycle/waste storage, and provision of 49 car parking spaces with access from New South Promenade following demolition of existing buildings (Outline application for access, appearance, layout and scale). Ms S Parker, Head of Development Management, advised the Committee that this application was linked to the previous item on the agenda, application number 22/0168 and delivered a joint presentation outlined both applications.

Ms Parker outlined both applications and advised that these were outline applications for two part 4, 5 and 6 storey buildings on the Promenade following demolition of existing holiday accommodation on the site. Both sites were located within the Pleasure Beach Promenade frontage and referred to Policy CS23, in respect of the loss of sites used as holiday accommodation and the need for developments to meet high design standards and deliver clear regeneration benefits. The proposal was outlined as being 40 apartments on the south site, 49 on the north site with all 89 offering permanent residential accommodation. Ms Parker advised that given the Boulevard Hotel and the recently extended Hampton by Hilton development, the expectation for a wider mix of permanent residential and holiday usage would be satisfied on balance. Neither of the sites had been allocated for housing and the Council continued to have a comfortable housing supply of approximately 14 years.

Ms Parker advised that the apartments proposed on both sites met national space standards and that most would have outdoor amenity space provided by terraces and balconies, with an outlook over the Promenade. Since the first submission of the applications the height of the apartments had been reduced to minimise impacts of neighbours and visual impacts. It was proposed that each block would be 18 metres tall which was taller than the Hampton by Hilton development, but no taller than the Coastal Point Development and the scale was considered to be acceptable. In respect of the main elevations, these would be light brick and white stone with full height windows and decorating curtain walling and panelling which would be arranged in ordered bays.

Access to the South Site would be via Harrowside West with ground floor parking and the North Site would be accessed via the Promenade Crescent with accommodation on the ground floor and parking to the rear. Each apartment would have at least one parking space and the local Highway Authority considered this provision to be acceptable. A loading bay would be provided for each block for servicing and waste collection, with other off-site highway works securable by condition.

MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING - TUESDAY, 9 APRIL 2024

In respect of amenity, Ms Parker advised that separation distances involved would prevent undue impact. No heritage impacts had been identified for the North Site, however the South Site was within the setting of the locally-listed Solaris building, but Planning Officers considered that the scheme would improve the setting rather than harm its significance. The sites were situated within flood zones two and three, and both blocks would be constructed in accordance with the Flood Risk Assessment and no unacceptable flood risk or drainage issues had been identified.

The Committee was advised that both applications had been supported by a Habitats Regulation Assessment and that Natural England had not objected to either application, subject to the appropriate mitigation measures being implemented and on the understanding that the Habitats Regulation Assessment was adopted. In relation to biodiversity net gain, Ms Parker noted that provision of 10% provision was not a statutory requirement for either site as the applications pre-dated the legislation.

Ms Parker advised the Committee that neither site contributed the full level of required planning obligations in respect of green infrastructure, health contributions or affordable housing due to viability issues and it was the view of the Planning Officer that the wider benefit from development was sufficient to outweigh any shortfall in planning obligations.

The Committee was asked to adopt the Habitats Regulation Assessment and to support the scheme subject to entry into Section 106 agreements and the conditions listed in the Committee report. In addition, the Update Note requested that the Head of Development Management be authorised to make changes to the wording of the conditions as may be appropriate as long as the changes would not materially affect what the condition was trying to achieve or the permission overall.

Ms D Love, Agent for the applicant, spoke in favour of both this application and in favour of application number 22/0168 and advised the Committee that the development was of a high-quality and would complement the Hampton by Hilton and Coastal Point developments. The design and layouts were supported by Planning Officers, however the viability had been the cause of negotiations and delays. Ms Love advised the Committee that the provision of affordable housing would not be viable for the development but that sums of £196,000 and £136,000 had been identified as a contribution for provision at other sites. The Committee was advised that the applicants were hotel owners and local people and it was their intention to sell the site in order for a developer to fully realise both applications and to further elevate the area.

The Committee discussed the application in conjunction with application number 22/0168 and in response to questions, Ms Parker advised that it would not be feasible to provide the limited amount of affordable housing that could be funded on site as it would not be attractive to a registered provider and that contributions would be secured for off-site provision and advised that Policy CS14 allowed for contributions to be directed off-site to support regeneration objectives.

The Committee expressed its disappointment that no affordable housing would be provided within either of the application sites, however it noted the high-quality nature of the development.

MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING - TUESDAY, 9 APRIL 2024

Resolved:

1. To adopt the Habitats Regulations Assessment.
2. To resolve to support the application and delegate approval to the Head of Development Management subject to the completion of a S106 legal agreement and the conditions listed within the Committee report.
3. To authorise the Head of Development Management to make changes to the wording of the conditions as may be appropriate as long as the changes would not materially affect what the condition is trying to achieve or the permission overall.

7 BACKGROUND REPORT ON PLANNING APPLICATIONS 23/426, 23/430 AND 23/440

The Committee considered the background report that had been provided in relation to planning applications 23/0426, 23/0430 and 23/0440.

Ms S Parker, Head of Development Management, advised the Committee that this report was for noting and provided an overview of all three applications which would be discussed in the three subsequent agenda items. Ms S Parker outlined the report and noted that this was linked to the next two applications on the agenda, being 23/0430 and 23/0440). Ms Parker's presentation addressed all three of the applications.

As part of the general overview of all three applications the Committee was advised that the layby on the southern side of Harrow Place outside number 10 was proposed to be unrestricted as there was sufficient parking provision within the curtilage of this property. Ms Parker asked the Committee to note that should the demand for parking permits on the scheme be less than 100% take-up then the Council may need to re-evaluate the scheme and make spaces available for general pay and display use, however any such changes would be via the Traffic Regulation Order process and not the planning process.

Resolved:

To note the background report.

8 PLANNING APPLICATION 23/0426 - 2-4 HARROW PLACE AND 647-651 NEW SOUTH PROMENADE, BLACKPOOL, FY4 1RP

The Committee considered planning application 23/0426 for external alterations to include the front extension and whole roof lift, balconies to Harrow Place and New South Promenade elevations and use of premises as altered as 66 self-contained permanent flats with associated car parking, bin store, boundary treatment and highway works. The Committee also considered the application under Section 73 and 73A to allow the variation of condition 1 attached to planning permission 16/0421 to alter various floor layouts, relocation of gym and entrance position, removal of residents lounge in C Block, relocation of windows and amendments to highway and car parking layouts.

The Committee was advised that the application site was subject to a long and complex planning history and also referred to an application granted in July 2023 for the redevelopment of numbers 6-8 Harrow Place for 15 flats, which was subject to a condition preventing commencement until a parking scheme had been secured. The applications on the agenda for this meeting related to Coastal Point and although the scheme as a whole encompassed numbers 2-4 Harrow Place and number 647-655 New South Promenade, in planning application terms the flats at numbers 653-655 New South

MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING - TUESDAY, 9 APRIL 2024

Promenade sat outside the red edge of the current applications. These were still relevant as the original planning permission 16/0421 sought to secure parking for the whole of the Coastal Point Scheme. Ms Parker advised that the Council's original approach was innovative, as the Council was keen to facilitate development on a site with buildings in a poor state or repair, however a number of technical obstacles had become apparent which had then delayed any progress. In addition to this, the Coastal Point development under planning application 16/0421 did not progress in accordance with the original permission granted due to various reasons. At this juncture the Committee was reminded that breach of planning control was not in itself justification for formal planning action unless that breach resulted in material planning harm.

Ms Parker continued to outline the planning history and the timeline of the current applications, along with the application for 6-8 Harrow Place approved in July 2023. A new parking arrangement was devised to meet the requirements of all applications and in order to achieve this, both developers would need to enter into a Section 106 legal agreement. The Applicant for the three applications to be determined by the Committee tonight could enter into their Section 106 Agreement though those applications and the applicant for 6-8 Harrow Place had been advised to submit a discharge of condition application to enter into their Section 106 agreement. Ms Parker noted that draft legal agreements had not been issued for inclusion with the agenda but these would be issued as soon as possible.

Ms Parker continued to outline the position in respect of the Section 106 agreements and, under those agreements, both developers would be required to dedicate an area of land to deliver parking provision, with both paying a capital contribution to provision, and liable to pay for parking for a five-year period. The parking scheme for the three applications before the Committee would have 87 spaces for 88 flats which was not a 1:1 ratio, but was considered to be the best overall solution. Ms Parker summarised the process that would be followed once all Section 106 agreements had been completed and the Committee was advised that a Traffic Regulation Order would be required to enable the Council to use the highway for parking or to restrict traffic flows to one way. As Traffic Regulation Orders were subject to their own legislation, this would be an opportunity for local resident to make representations.

As outlined in the umbrella report, the Committee was reminded that the layby on the southern side of Harrow Place outside number 10 was proposed to be unrestricted as there was sufficient parking provision within the curtilage of this property. Ms Parker asked the Committee to note that should the demand for parking permits on the scheme be less than 100% take-up then the Council may need to re-evaluate the scheme and make spaces available for general pay and display use, however any such changes would be via the Traffic Regulation Order process and not the planning process.

Ms Parker then outlined specific information in respect of application number 23/0426 which was a variation of condition application under Section 73 and 73a. The internal and external alterations proposed were considered to be acceptable and had been assessed within the Committee report. In respect of viability and planning obligations, Ms Parker advised that the applicant had sufficiently demonstrated that it was not viable to provide any such obligations, other than those required to deliver the parking scheme. As such it was the view of the officers that the importance of delivery the parking scheme meant that the scheme could be supported, despite the lack of full planning obligations.

MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING - TUESDAY, 9 APRIL 2024

In conclusion for planning application 23/0426, Ms Parker asked the Committee to resolve to support the proposal and to delegate approval to the Head of Development Management subject to signature of a Section 106 Agreement, the conditions listed in the Committee Report and the conditions listed in the Update Note.

Mr D Storton spoke in objection to the application and had also registered to speak on application numbers 23/0430 and 23/0440. As these applications were linked to each other, the Chair allowed Mr Storton to speak on each application concurrently, using all of his allocated time during this item. Mr Storton referred to an email sent to Councillors and Officers and provided the Committee with verbatim extracts of the email. Mr Storton advised the Committee that he had lived in his property for 23 years and that he had raised concerns in respect of parking arrangements within the development with the Council and the Member of Parliament. In relation to parking, Mr Storton outlined the contact had with various officers and previous on-site meetings and Planning Committee meetings. In relation to parking matters, Mr Storton advised the Committee that unrestricted access to the parking layby would resolve parking issues.

Mr K Allen, Traffic and Highways Officer, provided the Committee with clarification on the Traffic Regulation Order process in relation to parking and the layby highlighted by Mr Storton and emphasised that this was a separate process to the Planning process.

Ms J Fox, Agent for the Applicant spoke on application number 23/0426 and also provided the Committee with her client's views on the umbrella report at Item 7 of the agenda that had been previously noted. She advised the Committee that the application site was within the red edge on the plans provided and that parking issues and the layby previously mentioned was not within the red edge, was subject to a separate process and was not, in her view, relevant to the Committee's deliberations. Ms Fox provided the Committee with an overview of the planning history on the site and the time that it had taken to determine previous applications and to bring the three applications related to Harrow Place to the Committee and asked that the Committee resolved to support the application as outlined in the Committee Report and Update Note.

Ms Fox also spoke on applications 23/0426 and 23/0440 and her submission in respect of those applications is contained within the minutes for each of those items.

The Committee discussed application number 23/0426 at length in conjunction with planning applications 23/0426 and 23/0430 and noted the submissions from Mr Storton and Ms Fox along with the complex planning history of the site. The Committee noted that the Traffic Regulation Process was separate to the Planning process.

Resolved:

1. To support the application and delegate approval to the Head of Development Management, subject to the signing of a S106 agreement to secure the parking scheme necessary to make the development acceptable and the conditions listed in the Committee Report and Update Note.
2. To authorise the Head of Development Management to make changes to the wording of the conditions as may be appropriate as long as the changes would not materially affect what the condition is trying to achieve or the permission overall.

MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING - TUESDAY, 9 APRIL 2024

9 PLANNING APPLICATION 23/0430 - FLAT 25, COASTAL POINT, 647-651 NEW SOUTH PROMENADE, BLACKPOOL

The Committee considered planning application 23/0430 Conversion of previously approved single flat to two self contained permanent flats in respect of Flat, 25, Coastal Point.

The Committee was advised that the application site was subject to a long and complex planning history and also referred to an application granted in July 2023 for the redevelopment of numbers 6-8 Harrow Place for 15 flats, which was subject to a condition preventing commencement until a parking scheme had been secured. The applications on the agenda for this meeting related to Coastal Point and although the scheme as a whole encompassed numbers 2-4 Harrow Place and number 647-655 New South Promenade, in planning application terms the flats at numbers 653-655 New South Promenade sat outside the red edge of the current applications. These were still relevant as the original planning permission 16/0421 sought to secure parking for the whole of the Coastal Point Scheme. Ms Parker advised that the Council's original approach was innovative as the Council was keen to facilitate development on a site with buildings in a poor state or repair, however a number of technical obstacles had become apparent which had then delayed any progress. In addition to this, the Coastal Point development under planning application 16/0421 did not progress in accordance with the original permission granted due to various reasons. At this juncture the Committee was reminded that breach of planning control was not in itself justification for formal planning action unless that breach resulted in material planning harm.

Ms Parker continued to outline the planning history and the timeline of the current applications, along with the application for 6-8 Harrow Place approved in July 2023. A new parking arrangement was devised to meet the requirements of all applications and in order to achieve this, both developers would need to enter into a Section 106 legal agreement. The Applicant for the three applications to be determined by the Committee tonight could enter into their Section 106 Agreement though those applications and the applicant for 6-8 Harrow Place had been advised to submit a discharge of condition application to enter into their Section 106 agreement. Ms Parker noted that draft legal agreements had not been issued for inclusion with the agenda but these would be issued as soon as possible.

Ms Parker continued to outline the position in respect of the Section 106 agreements and under those agreements, both developers would be required to dedicate an area of land to deliver parking provision, with both paying a capital contribution to provision, and liable to pay for parking for a five-year period. The parking scheme for the three applications before the Committee would have 87 spaces for 88 flats which was not a 1:1 ratio, but was considered to be the best overall solution. Ms Parker summarised the process that would be followed once all Section 106 agreements had been completed and the Committee was advised that a Traffic Regulation Order would be required to enable the Council to use the highway for parking or to restrict traffic flows to one way. As Traffic Regulation Orders were subject to their own legislation, this would be an opportunity for local resident to make representations.

As outlined in the umbrella report, the Committee was reminded that the layby on the southern side of Harrow Place outside number 10 was proposed to be unrestricted as

MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING - TUESDAY, 9 APRIL 2024

there was sufficient parking provision within the curtilage of this property. Ms Parker asked the Committee to note that should the demand for parking permits on the scheme be less than 100% take-up then the Council may need to re-evaluate the scheme, and make spaces available for general pay and display use, however any such changes would be via the Traffic Regulation Order process and not the planning process.

Ms Parker then outlined specific information in respect of application number 23/0430 which sought permission to sub-divide the existing flat number 25 into two separate units which would still result in both flats meeting minimum floor space standards, whilst not compromising the overall housing mix.

In terms of impact, Ms Parker advised that there was no other impact envisaged for this application, other than the impact upon parking. In respect of parking, the Committee was advised that the Applicant objected to condition 7 which would prevent occupation of the flats until the parking scheme was available. Ms Parker advised the Committee that Planning Officers were of the view that the historic agreement of a 1:1 parking ratio should be maintained and as such, condition 7 was appropriate.

In conclusion for planning application 23/0430, Ms Parker asked the Committee to resolve to support the proposal and to delegate approval to the Head of Development Management subject to signature of a Section 106 Agreement, the conditions listed in the Committee Report and the correction to condition 7 as listed in the Update Note.

Mr D Storton spoke in objection to the application and had also registered to speak on application numbers 23/0126 and 23/0440. As these applications were linked to each other, the Chair allowed Mr Storton to speak on each application concurrently, using all of his allocated time during this item. Mr Storton referred to an email sent to Councillors and Officers and provided the Committee with verbatim extracts of the email. Mr Storton advised the Committee that he had lived in his property for 23 years and that he had raised concerns in respect of parking arrangements within the development with the Council and the Member of Parliament. In relation to parking, Mr Storton outlined the contact had with various officers and previous on-site meetings and Planning Committee meetings. In relation to parking matters, Mr Storton advised the Committee that unrestricted access to the parking layby would resolve parking issues.

Ms J Fox, Agent for the Applicant spoke on application number 23/0430 and advised the Committee that flat number 25 was the only three –bed apartment within the scheme and that all penthouse apartments had parking provision within the courtyard area. In respect of condition 7, Ms Fox advised the Committee that, in her view, it was not lawful to require a third party to take action in order to discharge a planning condition and asked that this condition be removed from the application, should the Committee resolve to support the application.

Ms Fox also spoke on applications 23/0426 and 23/0440 and her submission in respect of those applications is contained within the minutes for each of those items.

Mr I Curtis, Legal Adviser, advised that, in his view condition 7 was not inherently unlawful, however should the Committee prefer to obtain a full legal opinion on this matter, then deferral of the item should be considered.

MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING - TUESDAY, 9 APRIL 2024

Ms S Parker, Head of Development Management, provided the Committee with a further overview of the proposed parking and noted that the proposed new scheme sought to divide one flat into two flats and, in the view of Planning Officers, the same ratio of 1:1 parking should apply.

The Committee discussed application number 23/0430 at length in conjunction with planning applications 23/0426 and 23/0440 and noted the submissions from Mr Storton and Ms Fox along with the complex planning history of the site. In discussions on this item, the Committee noted the Applicant's request to remove condition 7 and the importance of encouraging development on this site.

Resolved:

1. To support the application and delegate approval to the Head of Development Management subject to the conditions outlined in the Committee Report and Update Note.
2. To remove condition 7 and to note that the removal of conditions 7 would remove the need for a Section 106 Agreement to secure the necessary parking scheme.
3. To authorise the Head of Development Management to make changes to the wording of the conditions as may be appropriate as long as the changes would not materially affect what the condition is trying to achieve or the permission overall.

10 PLANNING APPLICATION 23/0440 - 2-4 HARROW PLACE, BLACKPOOL, FY4 1RP

The Committee considered planning application 23/0440 for the use of part of ground floor as two self-contained permanent flats.

The Committee was advised that the application site was subject to a long and complex planning history and also referred to an application granted in July 2023 for the redevelopment of numbers 6-8 Harrow Place for 15 flats, which was subject to a condition preventing commencement until a parking scheme had been secured. The applications on the agenda for this meeting related to Coastal Point and although the scheme as a whole encompassed numbers 2-4 Harrow Place and number 647-655 New South Promenade, in planning application terms the flats at numbers 653-655 New South Promenade sat outside the red edge of the current applications. These were still relevant as the original planning permission 16/0421 sought to secure parking for the whole of the Coastal Point Scheme. Ms Parker advised that the Council's original approach was innovative as the Council was keen to facilitate development on a site with buildings in a poor state or repair, however a number of technical obstacles had become apparent which had then delayed any progress. In addition to this, the Coastal Point development under planning application 16/0421 did not progress in accordance with the original permission granted due to various reasons. At this juncture the Committee was reminded that breach of planning control was not in itself justification for formal planning action unless that breach resulted in material planning harm.

Ms Parker continued to outline the planning history and the timeline of the current applications, along with the application for 6-8 Harrow Place approved in July 2023. A new parking arrangement was devised to meet the requirements of all applications and in order to achieve this, both developers would need to enter into a Section 106 legal agreement. The Applicant for the three applications to be determined by the Committee tonight could enter into their Section 106 Agreement through those applications and the

MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING - TUESDAY, 9 APRIL 2024

applicant for 6-8 Harrow Place had been advised to submit a discharge of condition application to enter into their Section 106 agreement. Ms Parker noted that draft legal agreements had not been issued for inclusion with the agenda but these would be issued as soon as possible.

Ms Parker continued to outline the position in respect of the Section 106 agreements and under those agreements, both developers would be required to dedicate an area of land to deliver parking provision, with both paying a capital contribution to provision, and liable to pay for parking for a five-year period. The parking scheme for the three applications before the Committee would have 87 spaces for 88 flats which was not a 1:1 ratio, but was considered to be the best overall solution. Ms Parker summarised the process that would be followed once all Section 106 agreements had been completed and the Committee was advised that a Traffic Regulation Order would be required to enable the Council to use the highway for parking or to restrict traffic flows to one way. As Traffic Regulation Orders were subject to their own legislation, this would be an opportunity for local resident to make representations.

As outlined in the umbrella report, the Committee was reminded that the layby on the southern side of Harrow Place outside number 10 was proposed to be unrestricted as there was sufficient parking provision within the curtilage of this property. Ms Parker asked the Committee to note that should the demand for parking permits on the scheme be less than 100% take-up then the Council may need to re-evaluate the scheme and make spaces available for general pay and display use, however any such changes would be via the Traffic Regulation Order process and not the planning process.

Ms Parker then outlined specific information in respect of application number 23/0440 which sought permission for use of part of ground floor as 2 self-contained permanent flats and noted that these flats would meet needs for housing mix and the minimum floor space standards. In relation to lighting, the Committee Report highlighted that one of the bedrooms would only be able to access natural light via a light well, however this had been approved elsewhere within the Costal Point scheme and adjacent proposals at Harrow Place. A similar situation existed in relation to the high level of a window in the second bedroom of the other apartment which was considered by Planning Officers to be the most acceptable solution, although not ideal.

The Committee was advised that no impacts were anticipated to be caused by the proposed scheme other than the impact on parking and that Planning Officers proposed that a condition be imposed in order to prevent occupation until provision of the parking scheme. The Committee was asked to support the proposal and to defer approval to the Head of Development Management subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement and the recommendation as outlined in the Update Note.

Mr D Storton spoke in objection to the application and had also registered to speak on application numbers 23/0126 and 23/0440. As these applications were linked to each other, the Chair allowed Mr Storton to speak on each application concurrently, using all of his allocated time during this item. Mr Storton referred to an email sent to Councillors and Officers and provided the Committee with verbatim extracts of the email. Mr Storton advised the Committee that he had lived in his property for 23 years and that he had raised concerns in respect of parking arrangements within the development with the Council and the Member of Parliament. In relation to parking, Mr Storton outlined the

MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING - TUESDAY, 9 APRIL 2024

contact had with various officers and previous on-site meetings and Planning Committee meetings. In relation to parking matters, Mr Storton advised the Committee that unrestricted access to the parking layby would resolve parking issues.

Ms J Fox, Agent for the Applicant spoke on application number 23/0440 and reiterated the Applicant's position in relation to car parking and imposition of conditions that were, in her opinion, inherently unlawful.

Ms Fox also spoke on applications 23/0426 and 23/0430 and her submission in respect of those applications is contained within the minutes for each of those items.

The Committee discussed application number 23/0440 at length in conjunction with planning applications 23/0426 and 23/0430 and noted the submissions from Mr Storton and Ms Fox along with the complex planning history of the site. The Committee noted that as it had removed condition 7 from the previous application then consideration should be given to removal of the equivalent condition from this application and also noted Mr I Curtis', (Legal Advisor) view that the wording of this condition was, in his view, lawful as drafted.

The Committee noted the issues that had been raised by the objector and the Applicant's Agent on all of the applications that had been discussed.

Resolved:

1. To support the application and delegate approval to the Head of Development Management subject to the signing of a S106 agreement to secure the parking scheme necessary to make the development acceptable and the following conditions as listed in the Committee Report and Update Note.
2. To take advice on the wording of condition 6 in relation to parking and to consult with the Chair of the Planning Committee prior to changing the wording of the condition.
3. To authorise the Head of Development Management to make changes to the wording of the conditions as may be appropriate as long as the changes would not materially affect what the condition is trying to achieve or the permission overall.

[At this juncture in the meeting, the Chair called a short break in proceedings].

11 PLANNING APPLICATION 23/0830 - LAND BOUNDED BY COOKSON STREET, MILBOURNE STREET, GROSVENOR STREET AND GEORGE STREET, BLACKPOOL

The Committee considered planning application 23/0830 which was a Hybrid application comprising of Full planning permission for the demolition of existing buildings and structures and Outline planning permission for the erection of buildings for use as an education-led mixed use development comprising a new education campus building (Use Class F1(a)) and further education floor space (Use Class F1(a)) and/or office floor space (Class E(g)), creation of new public realm with associated landscaping, car parking and associated works.

Ms S Parker, Head of Development Management, outlined the report and provided the Committee with an overview of the application which was to enable the new education campus to be occupied by Blackpool and the Fylde College and would be known as the

MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING - TUESDAY, 9 APRIL 2024

“Multiversity”. The application proposed the clearance of land between George Street to the north, Milbourne Street to the south, Cookson Street to the west and Grosvenor Street to the east.

The Committee was advised that it was proposed for the development to be phased with Phase 1 being for education use with Phase 2 offering flexibility for the provision of additional educational floor space if required. Alternatively the space could be used for new office accommodation to in the Talbot Gateway area.

Ms Parker advised the Committee that the application was for full permission for demolition, and outline permission for the new floor space. Whilst all matters were reserved, the information submitted indicated a pedestrianised plaza to be created along with a modern building with glazing. The lighting suggested would provide animation in the evening and the building would facilitate renewable energy generation and have a green roof area. The Committee was advised that the location was visually sensitive due to the proximity to the Town Centre Conservation Area, its prominent position and the proximity to statutorily and locally listed buildings, including Blackpool Tower. As such, this development required an Environmental Impact Assessment. Ms Parker noted that the Environmental Statement had been submitted but not fully agreed by both parties and work was continuing on this.

The Committee’s attention was drawn to the Update Note and the clarification of recommendations which would preclude the grant of planning permission until the Environmental Statement had been fully agreed, until Active Travel England had confirmed that it had no objection and also until the Secretary of State had confirmed that the application would not be called in. In respect of Active Travel England, Ms Parker informed the Committee that an objection had been received in relation to a lack of cycling infrastructure and its response was awaited to a revised Transport Assessment. Additional representations had been received as detailed in the Update Note and the Committee was reminded that that the application had been publicised in full accordance with all statutory requirements.

In terms of regeneration the Multiversity would accommodate more than 3,600 learners, would generate 190 new jobs and support local shops and services. In addition, it would provide important regeneration in one of Blackpool’s most deprived areas and the Talbot Gateway business hub. Ms Parker advised that the 10% biodiversity net gain requirement did not apply to the application but that the scheme would meet or exceed BREEAM ‘very good’ standards. In addition, no significant issues in relation to drainage or ecology had been identified.

In respect of highways matters, it was proposed to close George Street and further modelling work would be required and the best approach could be secured via condition. No substantive parking provision was proposed on site, however the location was easily accessible and close to public car parks. The Council’s Highways Team, therefore, had no objection to the application subject to further works and the appropriate conditions being secured.

Ms Parker advised the Committee that the scheme was considered to be acceptable in principle and that there was no requirement for the applicant to demonstrate a need for the facility or comply with the sequential test. In relation to planning obligations, full

MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING - TUESDAY, 9 APRIL 2024

obligations would not be delivered in relation to trees, however this would be mitigated by the provision of green roofing and external landscaping.

The visual impact of the proposed Multiversity was outlined and Ms Parker acknowledged that this would be sizeable, but that the benefits of the scheme outweighed the impact of the building. In relation to Blackpool Tower, the development would impact on the setting, however no strategic views would be affected.

Ms Parker asked the Committee to support to support the application and delegate approval to the Head of Development Management subject to either Active Travel England withdrawing their objection to the scheme or the Secretary of State confirming that he does not wish to call the application in for his own determination, to support subject to confirmation that the Environmental Statement submitted in support of the application was acceptable and subject to the conditions as outlined in the Committee Report and the Update Report and to authorise the Head of Development Management to make changes to the wording of the conditions as may be appropriate as long as the changes would not materially affect what the condition was trying to achieve or the permission overall.

Mr G Whyte spoke in objection to the scheme and raised concerns regarding the compulsory purchase of residential properties, the consultation process and also the suitability of the site for educational purposes. Mr Whyte raised the issue of the lack of parking for staff and pupils and his view that other sites would be more suitable.

Ms Parker advised the Committee that the application had been publicised as an educational facility and in accordance with statutory requirement and noted that the planning application process was a separate process to Compulsory Purchase Order processes.

Mr E Harvey, Agent for the Applicant, spoke in favour of the application and advised the Committee that the development was an important step in continuing works for the Talbot Gateway area and would increase footfall and regeneration in that area. Provision of the Multiversity would expand the student cohort and provide more educational opportunities and employment within the Blackpool area. Mr Harvey outlined the benefits of the scheme and asked the Committee to support the application.

The Committee discussed the application and representations received.

Resolved:

1. To support the application and delegate approval to the Head of Development Management subject to:
 - Either Active Travel England withdrawing their objection to the scheme or the Secretary of State confirming that he does not wish to call the application in for his own determination.
 - Confirmation that the Environmental Statement submitted in support of the application is acceptable.
2. To support the application subject to the conditions as set out in the Committee Report and revised conditions in the Update Note.
3. To authorise the Head of Development Management, in consultation with the Chair of the Planning Committee, to make changes to the wording of the conditions as

MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING - TUESDAY, 9 APRIL 2024

may be appropriate as long as the changes would not materially affect what the condition is trying to achieve or the permission overall.

12 PLANNING APPLICATION 23/0848 - SITE BOUNDED BY PROMENADE, ST CHADS ROAD, WOODFIELD ROAD AND BOLTON STREET, BLACKPOOL, FY1 6BN

(Councillor Baker having declared a prejudicial interest left the room during consideration of this item and took no part in the discussion or voting thereon).

The Committee considered planning application 23/0848 for the Erection of a part 5, part 6 storey hotel with 143 bedrooms and ancillary facilities, with car parking to rear accessed from Woodfield Road and landscaped external seating area to front.

Ms S Parker, Head of Development Management, outlined the report and provided the Committee with an overview of the site which had previously accommodated the four storey St Chad's Terrace, Lyric Hotel and Regency Holiday Flats. The site was situated within the Resort Core, Defined Inner Area and the South Beach Promenade frontage. The Committee was advised that future growth and regeneration in Blackpool was focussed on the Inner Area and the Resort Core, as set out in Policies CS1 and CS21 and therefore the development was welcomed in this location.

Ms Parker outlined the proposed building which would be taller than the surrounding buildings, however the scale was considered to be appropriate and would provide a high quality, visually engaging building. Public art would be provided within the fabric of the building and this would accord with Policy DM25. No adverse amenity impacts had been identified. Some representations had been received in relation to the application and these had been addressed in the Committee Report.

In terms of planning obligations, the Committee was advised that tree planting would apply to the application and this would be addressed by onsite planting and innovative greening measures.

In respect of highways, Ms Parker noted that 28 spaces would be provided to the rear of the site which was a lesser provision than previous uses of the site, however the proposed provision was considered to be more suitable and safer in terms of highway safety. Car parking would be managed by the hotel and the site was accessible by public transport.

The Committee was advised that 10% biodiversity net gain was not a requirement for the scheme and that no unacceptable impacts on environmental quality were anticipated. The building would aim to achieve a BREEAM rating of 'very good' in order to accord with Policy CS10.

Ms Parker advised the Committee that the scheme was considered to be of high quality and would improve the appearance of the Promenade, supporting the Council's regeneration strategy and vision. The Committee was asked to support the application subject to the conditions listed in the Committee Report.

Mr S Norris spoke in objection to the application and advised that he was generally supportive of the application, however he raised concerns in respect of parking on

MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING - TUESDAY, 9 APRIL 2024

Woodfield Road. In addition Mr Norris informed the Committee that the demolition works had been carried out without adequate consultation with local businesses and residents.

Mr I White spoke in objection to the application and indicated that he too was broadly supportive of the proposals. He thanked the applicant for consulting with businesses and residents to address concerns in relation to parking and the impact of the building and asked that they continued to consult with those affected.

Mr K Allen, Traffic and Highways Officer, advised the Committee that he was aware of the issues around demolition works and that a Construction Management Plan would be in place.

Mr A Shepherd, Agent for the Applicant, spoke in favour of the application and outlined the hotels in Blackpool that were currently under the umbrella of the applicant, Fragrance UK. The proposal would deliver a high quality hotel and would enhance public realm to improve the image of the Promenade for visitors and guests. The development would provide employment in the form of 40 jobs and an additional 20/30 seasonal jobs. Mr Shepherd outlined the consultation that had taken place and that feedback had been listened to and acted upon. The Committee was asked to approve the application.

The Committee discussed the application and commended the applicant for the level of consultation that had been carried out and acted upon. The provision of glazing to obscure part of the full length windows was noted and welcomed.

Resolved:

To grant the application subject to the conditions as outlined in the Committee Report.

13 PLANNING APPLICATION 23/0824- BLACKPOOL YOUTH CENTRE (BOYS AND GIRLS CLUB) VICTORY ROAD, BLACKPOOL, FY1 3HP

(Councillor Baker having declared a prejudicial interest and having left the room for Item 12, returned to the meeting at this point).

The Committee considered planning application 23/0824 for the erection of a single storey building for use as a community centre with associated soft landscaping and boundary treatment following demolition of existing building.

Ms S Parker, Head of Development Management, outlined the application and advised that the building would accommodate the Blackpool Youth and Community Centre, known as the 'Boys and Girls Club'. The site was within the Talbot and Brunswick Integrated Neighbourhood Improvement Area, bound by Victory Road, Gorton Street, George Street and Counce Street.

The Committee was advised that the building would be constructed of brick with timber cladding and the provision of green walls and artwork and that the existing prefabricated building would likely be relocated for use elsewhere. In terms of site designation, the proposed site was Open Space, however the development was considered to be acceptable as it would be a replacement facility of equivalent or better provision. The proposed new space would provide community facilities to include an activity hall,

MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING - TUESDAY, 9 APRIL 2024

activity rooms and a canteen and would be funded by the Youth Investment Fund.

The proposed scheme was considered to be acceptable in principle, no green infrastructure would be lost and four trees would be provided in accordance with the Greening Blackpool Supplementary Planning Document. The site was adjacent to a multi-use games area and children's play area and would serve the local walk-in catchment. No issues had been identified in relation to highways safety or parking, nor for drainage, flood risk, ecology nor environmental quality.

Ms Parker addressed matters of security and noted that solid roller shutters were proposed, however these would be sensitively incorporated into the fabric of the building and artwork would be included to soften the appearance of the shutters. In respect of fencing, although tall fencing was not ideal, this was considered to be acceptable for the application due to antisocial behaviour within the area.

Ms Parker drew the Committee's attention to an anonymous representation that had been received in relation to the application that related to design and security.

The application was considered to be acceptable and the Committee was asked to approve the application subject to the conditions listed in the Committee Report.

The Committee discussed the application and noted that the application had been amended and improved and was a much needed facility in that area of Blackpool.

Resolved:

To approve the application subject to the conditions listed in the Committee Report.

14 PLANNING APPLICATION 24/0029- 24 STANLEY PARK CLOSE

The Committee considered application number 24/0029 for the creation of a 2.9 metre wide vehicle access and installation of gates to East Park Drive elevation.

Ms S Parker, Head of Development Management, outlined the report and noted that this was a householder application for a house accessed off Stanley Park Close via a private driveway. The previous planning history for the site was outlined and the Committee was advised that a previous application had been refused in 1990, however the dwellings that would have been affected by that application were now demolished.

The Committee was advised that the access would create a private drive and sole access to the property due to long-standing issues in relation to obstruction, though this was not a material consideration. Ms Parker advised that the key consideration for the Committee was the impact on highway safety and also the impact on the Stanley Park Conservation Area.

Ms Parker drew the Committee's attention to two representations that had been received, with one in support and which outlined the difficulties that the applicant had encountered when accessing their property. The other representation was in partial support but did raise highways concerns. Ms Parker assured the Committee that all relevant matters had been considered as part of the highways assessment of the application and that the local Highway Authority had no objections to the proposals. The

MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING - TUESDAY, 9 APRIL 2024

Applicant had also provided further representation as included within the Update Note.

The scheme was not considered to have an impact on residential amenity and the design was also considered acceptable, with no harm to the character or heritage value of the Stanley Park Conservation Area. The Committee was advised that an existing tree would be safeguarded by condition and that replacement hedgerow planting would also be secured.

Ms Parker asked the Committee to approve the application subject to the conditions outlined in the Committee Report.

The Committee discussed the application and the Chair of the Committee noted that she had requested that the application come before the Committee due to concerns in relation to proximity to Stanley Park and the impact on East Park Drive.

In response to questions from the Committee, Ms Parker advised that there no particular concerns in relation to precedent and was expected to be an isolated application. Mr K Allen, Highways Officer, advised that in his opinion there were no grounds for refusal and it was likely that an appeal against refusal would succeed.

Resolved:

To grant the application subject to the conditions set out in the Committee Report.

15 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The Committee was advised that the date of the next meeting was subject to approval of the 2024/2025 Committee Meeting Schedule at Annual Council in May 2024.

Chairman

(The meeting ended at 9.18 pm)

Any queries regarding these minutes, please contact:

Jenni Cook Democratic Governance Senior Adviser

Tel: (01253) 477212

E-mail: jennifer.cook@blackpool.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank