

Addendum 2

LA01/2017/0689/F

Full Planning

Update

There is one further letter 1 letter of support from an MLA. The letter of support states that this proposal will bring the building back into use through retention and refurbishment, and the hotel will add to the tourism offer and benefit the local economy.

2 further objections were received to the Listed Building Consent (LBC) LA01/2018/0446/LBC which accompanies this planning application. However, the matters raised would be best placed being considered under the full application as these generally relate to planning issues.

The objectors raise concern regarding increased traffic. Consultation with DFI Roads has been carried out on these objections, and a further addendum will be prepared if necessary.

The agent argues car parking policy has not changed since the expired approval on site; however, further approvals and development within the town centre has changed. Therefore a revised car parking statement was submitted. This included a car parking survey in March 2018. This is a Town Centre site and while guidance would require 137 spaces, the TRICS database calculates a requirement of @31. While these cannot be accommodated on street, there is sufficient capacity within the town centre car parks. Dfl has accepted this methodology and raises no objection.

Appendix C of TAF Revision A (16/4/18), provides a commentary on servicing. Dfl Roads has been consulted on this and raises no objection on these grounds.

There are 3 further hotels along Main Street; the Atlantic, the Port and the Adelphi, with none of these having a sole dedicated pick up/drop off point. Given this is within the town centre, and the 3 further hotels, it is considered pick up / drop off can be managed within the existing road

network as DfI Roads raises no objection in this regard. Officials are content with this assessment.

A Waste, Noise, Odour and Lighting plans/assessments have been carried out. Environmental Health has been consulted and raises no objection in regard to any of these. Given this is a town centre location and the existing use as a public house/nightclub, officials agree with this assessment.

There are objections from neighbouring properties with regards to impact on residential amenity and a further site visit was carried out on the 8th January 2019, specifically looking at the impacts on nos. 40-44 Mark Street, 4 Atlantic Avenue, and the Whiterocks Apartment development on Mark Street.

Criterion (h) of TSM 7 in PPS 16 states that proposal should not harm the amenities of nearby residents. During the site visit the amenity of nearby residents was considered. The proposal is likely to have an impact on the early morning sun. Having regard to the existing layout of buildings and development, and their general arrangement, including rear returns of existing properties, it is not considered that this is so significant to warrant refusal solely on this matter.

There are also 36 windows proposed on the 5 storey rear elevation. The further distance these are from any nearby property is just over 20 metres (to no. 44 Mark Street). While the first floor windows will have limited, if any overlooking, the second to fifth floors will (27 windows) with the top 3 floors having greatest impact. While there will only be a number of windows (most likely 4) directly aligning with any existing residents windows, there will be overlooking created from this proposal impacting on 4 properties on Mark Street and a lesser impact on the Whiterock Apartment development, given this is apartments with already shared overlooking into the rear space.

The proposal is also 5 storeys, approximately 5 metres from a 2 storey dwelling on Atlantic Avenue. The scale and bulk of a 5 storey development within proximity to the 4 residential dwellings on Atlantic Avenue and Mark Street will dominate the sky and be dominant on these properties.

Having regard to all these matters combined, on balance, it is considered that the amenities of these neighbouring properties will be harmed. It was also noted that the current development being constructed on Main Street/Atlantic Avenue drops down from Main Street as the development steps back towards Mark Street Lane, taking

cognisance of the smaller scaled development on Atlantic Avenue. Having regard to this it is considered that the proposal is contrary to criterion (h) of TSM 7.

Refusal Reason 2 set out in Section 10 should therefore be amended from the following wording:

2. The proposal is contrary to criterion (b), (g) and (i), of Policy TSM 7 of Planning Policy Statement 16 due to the partial loss of a listed building, and the design and scale of proposed extension, and its detrimental impact on the surrounding buildings and built heritage.

It should now read as follows, to include reference to criterion (h):

2. The proposal is contrary to criterion (b), (g), (h) and (i), of Policy TSM 7 of Planning Policy Statement 16 due to the partial loss of a listed building, and the design and scale of proposed extension, and its detrimental impact on the surrounding buildings and built heritage, and the unacceptable impact on the amenities of nearby residents..

Recommendation

That the Committee note the contents of this Addendum and agree with the recommendation to refuse, as set out in paragraph 9.1 of the Planning Committee Report and the amended refusal reason 2.