

Addendum

LA01/2018/0556/F

Update

Further information was submitted by the agent in support of the planning application.

The submission outlines a number of headlines in terms of background to the proposal and a set of photomontages which were submitted as part of the planning application. Summary of points made:

- The proposal seeks to use an opportunity presented by a shop flat roof to use as a balcony for the adjacent residential property. The shop, formerly known as The Beach Ball, was used for renting seaside/recreational equipment.

Full description of the proposal is given in paragraph 4.1 of the Committee Report.

- The site is located next to the seaside shorefront in an area with a mixture of housing/commercial/recreational uses i.e. Arcadia playpark and 55 degrees north.

Contextual description of the site is given in Part 2 of the Committee Report.

- Listed Buildings Craig Vara House and Arcadia are located near the application site.

Issues relating to the impact on these Listed Buildings is considered in paragraphs 8.9 to 8.11 of the Committee Report.

- This is the third application for a balcony. The previous proposals considered by then DOE/PAC while refused, issues relating to design, impact on character of area and amenity of adjoining residents were not upheld.

A full planning history for the site is outline in Part 3 of the Committee Report. Issues relating to design and residential amenity are considered in paragraphs 8.3 to 8.8 of the Committee

Report. The reason for refusal based on impact on the nearby Listed Buildings reflects previous DOE/PAC recommendations.

- The current planning application addresses concerns of the previous 2015 application by further recessing the terrace by 1.1 metres with screening provided by parapet walls. The proposal proposes to have fixed furniture to remove opportunity for the presence of alleged paraphernalia.

This issue is considered in paragraph 8.11 of the Committee Report. It is not considered that the further recessing of the roof will prevent the potential paraphernalia on the terrace, the coming and going of people and the adverse impact and degrading this will have on views of the Listed Buildings.

- HED did not review the plans in detail but rather adopted the same position of the 2015 appeal and did not account for concessions made by applicant.

Although HED have come to the same recommendation as in the previous 2015 application it is following consideration of the current submitted plans and is not based on previous applications.

The submission also included a number of photomontage images which were submitted as part of the planning application and will also form part of the presentation to the Planning Committee.

2 further objections have been submitted including 1 from No. 1 Strandmore received 19.09.2018 and 1 objection from the Residents of Craigvara House received 23.09.18.

The following points were raised in the objection from no. 1 Strandmore Portrush;

- That the Council to support the recommendation for refusal;
- Numerous sets of plans have been submitted over the last 10 years and discusses the extensive planning and appeal history on the site.
- This is a premier tourist area with East Strand Promenade, water sports centre, Arcadia Play Area, Arcadia Café and the art gallery. It is vital that it is not compromised in by such a dominant feature.
- There are inaccuracies and inconsistencies in the proposed plans.

The following points were raised in the objection from the Residents of Craigvara House;

- The application should be refused on the grounds that it is detrimental to our Grade 2 listed building and on the Arcadia.
- This is an ongoing issue since 2008 and the applicant continues to apply despite continued refusals.
- Craigvara House would be undermined by such an extension.
- Privacy of those on the promenade and children in the playpark would be undermined.
- The previous walkway on the site attracted unsocial behaviour.

These points have been raised by previous objections and are considered within the Planning Committee Report.

Recommendation

That the Committee notes the contents of the Addendum and agrees with the recommendation to refuse, as set out in paragraph 10.1 of the Planning Committee Report.