

# **Addendum 3**

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

### **Full Planning**

#### **Update**

#### **Objections**

1.1 1 further objection was 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 do not specifically relate to issues regarding the listed building.

1.2 1 further objection was also received to this application.

1.3 The matters raised in both objections mainly relate to the loss of an historical music venue and building, and that there are other derelict areas that require investment.

1.4 Planning has a statutory duty to consider the planning merits of each individual application. The loss of a music venue in this circumstance is a matter that carries little weight and whether investment is forthcoming in other areas is not a matter for this planning application.

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

2.1 Turleys, on behalf of the applicant, has resubmitted a document titled "Main Street & Atlantic Avenue, Portrush" dated December 2018. This document was also submitted to Members in December 2018 and is considered within the first Addendum (Paras 3.1-3.5).

#### **Dfl Roads Consultation response**

3.1 Dfl Roads was re-consulted on 2 objection letters. Within the 2<sup>nd</sup> Addendum it was explained that consultation with DFI Roads has been carried out on these objections, and a further addendum will be prepared if necessary.

3.2 In its response, Dfl Roads outline that issues raised in relation to parking are amenity issues, and it is a matter for Council to consider these. These issues have previously been considered by Officials and, again having regard to the Dfl Roads commentary, remain of the view

that amenity issues, such as parking on kerbs or taxi pick ups/drop offs are matters that are inherent within any town centre, and it is considered that Portrush is no different. Therefore, it is considered, on balance, that these amenity issues created by this proposal would not be so significant as to warrant the withholding of planning permission.

3.3 Within the consultation response, DfI Roads advises that:

- The development's proposed usage is similar to its previous use which had no provision of in-curtilage parking. Similar hotel developments in close proximity have no in-curtilage parking provision.
- The site is in a town centre location where it is highly accessible on foot and well served by public transport being close to bus stops and the train station.
- The Developer's Agent has provided evidence of capacity within town centre car parks to accommodate the developments parking requirement.
- Servicing of the site will be managed and controlled to the rear of the development via Mark Street Lane. It is considered that these proposals will not significantly inconvenience the flow of traffic.
- There are a number of other hotels along Main Street which do not have dedicated pick up/drop off points. As it is within a town centre it is considered that pickup/drop off can be managed within the existing road network.

3.4 Officials would be in agreement with DfI Roads that the proposal complies with the policy requirements of PPS 3.

## **Recommendation**

4.1 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.