

# **Addendum**

## **LA01/2017/0689/F**

### **Full Planning**

#### **Update**

##### **Papers Submitted**

1.1 On 16<sup>th</sup> November 2018 a document was submitted on behalf of the applicant by Dawson Stelfox from Consarc, rebutting DfC Historic Environment Division comments (HED). This document was considered as part of the Planning Committee Report, and sent to HED for information purposes. HED has prepared a response to this report and is considered within this Addendum.

1.2 Turleys, on behalf of the applicant, has submitted a document titled “Main Street & Atlantic Avenue, Portrush” dated December 2018 which is also considered within this Addendum.

##### **HED Response**

2.1 HED has considered the arguments put forward in the document dated 16<sup>th</sup> November 2018 and states that, although it is not providing comment on Historic Buildings Council section, HBC voted unanimously in favour of the listing.

2.2 HED remain of the view that the proposal is unacceptable including the demolition, change of use, extensions and alterations and the impact on the setting of the listed buildings. HED raises concern that the buildings proposed for demolition are of significance and *‘illustrate the various phases of development over time’*, and contribute to the special interest, essential character and the historical understanding of the development of the site.

2.2 Policy BH 7 has regard to listed buildings and a change of use. Paragraph 8.57 of the Planning Committee report states that:

*“Policy BH 7 of PPS 6 relates to change of uses of listed building. While the building, in its current state, does not operate as a hotel, a public bar and music venue still do. As it may be feasible to restore the internal accommodation without the need for planning permission, Policy BH7 of PPS 6 may be of limited relevance. That said, the proposal is contrary to this policy as it fails to meet the policy requirements for the reasons set out in the consideration of Policies BH 8, BH 10 & BH 11.”*

2.3 HED has since clarified that this policy does not refer to planning ‘use classes’, but rather is a policy test to consider the impact of the proposed use, on the essential character and special interest of the listed building. The proposed impact of the change of use of the listed building, to a modern hotel as presented by the current application, includes the demolition of over half of the red lined asset. Para 6.8 of the explanatory text notes ‘The conversion of a listed building to a new use will therefore normally only be acceptable to the Department, where it safeguards the future interest of the building and any alterations proposed meet the criteria set out in Policy BH 8.’ Therefore having regard to HED comments, it is considered that the required changes would, if permitted, significantly compromise the special interest of the listed building and therefore advise the proposals fail to satisfy the policy requirements of BH7 of PPS6.

2.4 On the basis of this clarification; a further refusal reason relating to the change of use is appropriate:

*“The proposal is contrary to Policy BH 07 of Planning Policy Statement 6, in that the proposed use of the listed building requires changes that, if permitted, would significantly compromise the special interest of the listed building.”*

2.5 HED also state that criterion (b) in the supporting text of BH10 that the policy notes that the application should also demonstrate that all efforts have been made to continue the present use or find alternative compatible uses. *‘This includes the offer of the unrestricted freehold of the building on the open market at a realistic price reflecting the building’s condition.’*

2.6 No evidence has been the listed building in its current condition has not been market tested and therefore consider that criteria b has not been sufficiently satisfied. This is covered in Paragraph 8.25 of the Planning Committee report.

## **Turley's submission titled: Main Street & Atlantic Avenue, Portrush**

3.1 Turley's state that this document provides a summary of the information that was submitted with the planning application. It states that there is no additional information provided within this document.

3.2 Turley's outline that Andras House (applicant) has submitted a planning application to convert the listed former Londonderry Hotel building into a new boutique hotel along with bar and restaurant which is estimated to deliver an investment of £6.6 million.

3.3 The submission indicates that the revised proposal aims to deliver a middle ground between the initial proposal for a complete redevelopment and new build hotel, and the celebration of retaining elements of the listed building identified as being of architectural and historical significance. It argues this delivers a high quality boutique hotel that is needed in Portrush, as well as supporting this Council's Tourism and Destination Management Strategy.

3.4 Page 9 of the submission sets out the monetary figures during both the construction and operational phases with 48 net additional jobs (@18 month period) being created during the construction phase and 41 net additional jobs during the operational phase.

3.4 The submission also reports on the previous approval on site, the revised proposal, rejuvenating a listed building, public engagement, how the areas of concern have been addressed, and comments of support.

3.5 While this submission underlines the tangible benefits of the proposal, these are decisively outweighed by the harm to the listed building and adjacent listed buildings. This is the position set out in the Planning Committee report.

### **Recommendation**

4.0 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 additional refusal reason set out in paragraph 2.4 of this addendum.