

Erratum

LA01/2017/1654/F

1. Paragraph 1.1 states ‘That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to REFUSE planning permission subject to the conditions set out in section 10.’

This should read ‘That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to REFUSE planning permission for the reasons set out in section 9.’

2. Paragraph 5.4 states ‘See appendix 1 for details of consultations carried out and the responses provided. All but one of the consultees were content subject to conditions and informatives. The only objection is from Historic Environment Division (HED) who are of the opinion that the proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Policy BH11 of PPS6 and Policy RE1 of PPS18.’

This should read ‘See appendix 1 for details of consultations carried out and the responses provided. All but one of the consultees were content subject to conditions and informatives. The only objection is from Historic Environment Division (HED) who are of the opinion that the proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Policies BH1 and BH11 of PPS6 and Policy RE1 of PPS18.’

3. Paragraphs 8.10 and 8.11 refer to public safety. The content of these paragraphs indicates that a financial interest in the development negates consideration of public safety on relevant occupied properties. This contention is incorrect. These paragraphs are amended accordingly:

8.10 No. 16 Coolkeeran Road has a financial interest in the development. However, financial interest in the development does not negate consideration of public safety. This means there are 6 dwellings within the minimum 998m separation distance for safety.

8.11 The shortfall in separation distance for these dwellings varies from 35m to 375m, or 50m to 390m from the micro-siting locations. Although the shortfall of 35m to 51m would be acceptable, the larger shortfalls of 125m to 390m is considered to be an unacceptable risk to the safety of the residents of these properties as they fall well within the buffer required. There are 4 dwellings where the separation distance is considered to be unacceptable. The applicant has not submitted any persuasive evidence to show that this safety consideration should be set aside.