Addendum 4 LA01/2017/1599/O

1.0 Update

- 1.1 A further submission was made via e-mail to members of the Planning Committee on the 22nd November 2019 in support of the application. The same submission was submitted directly to the Planning Department on 25th November 2019. The submission dated 22nd November aims to demonstrate how the development of the gap with two dwellings would respect the pattern of development along the built up frontage.
- 1.2 The agent raised concerns that the applicant has been prejudiced because a briefing note submitted on 11th November 2019 was not circulated directly to Committee Members despite this being done for a separate application. The briefing note was uploaded onto the portal and was the subject of addendum 3 which was circulated to members with the full committee report and agenda for this meeting. The agent was advised accordingly on 11th November, 13th November and 18th November. As the briefing note is available to view by all parties on the portal no prejudice has been caused.
- 1.3 The agent argues that the separation distance between buildings should consider the development pattern of existing houses and it would be wrong to be led by an ancillary building which is secondary. An illustrative plan was provided. Within the original Planning Committee report, reference to the building referred to by the agent on the drawing as 196a was not referred to, however given the presence of three buildings either side of the application site (196, 198 and the pigeon sheds), its omission from the report is not critical in defining the presence of a substantial and continuously built up frontage. The building, for the purposes of development pattern, should form part of the consideration in respect of the overall character of the area.

- 1.4 The agent quotes Building on Tradition and that "a gap with more than twice the length of the average plot width is 'often' unsuitable for infill", which in their opinion means that there are cases when gaps could be suitable. In regards to the guidance within Building on Tradition, the wording refers to gap sites which are more than twice the length of the average plot width is 'often' unsuitable for infill with two dwellings. While the word 'often' gives some flexibility in the assessment of proposals, the application site is not considered to be acceptable. The site is open and devoid of any substantial features which would merit flexibility. The gap between buildings is 2.5 times the average plot width, and represents an important visual break to the urban form as outlined at Paragraph 8.8 of the Planning Committee Report.
- 1.5 The agent points out that appeal reference 2014/A0255 is relevant because it was issued post SPPS and shows that the leading policies of PPS21 should be given more weight than Policies CTY13 and CTY14. The agent goes on to explain that it is their opinion that the site complies with Policies CTY13 and 14 because it is not prominent and will be seen within the context of surrounding development. With respect to the comments raised under the heading Integration the agent outlines that the appeal referenced by the Planning Authority within Addendum 3 is not comparably based on the physical attributes of the site and works required to facilitate development. The Planning Authority acknowledge the differences in the physical attributes of the respective sites, however the appeal referenced by the Planning Authority (2017/A0018) clarifies that while an application site may represent a gap within a built up frontage it has to meet all other planning and environmental criteria, which includes integration. Appeal 2014/A0255 did not reference the SPPS in its consideration and is not materially comparable to this application site.

2.0 Recommendation

2.1 That the Committee note the contents of this Addendum and agree with the recommendation to **Refuse** the planning application as set out in Section 9.0 of the Planning Committee Report, with the refusal reasons which have been refined within the first addendum to the Planning Committee Report.