COMMITTEE ITEM	3.6 – ADDENDUM
APPLICATION NO	LA03/2021/1029/F
DEA	GLENGORMLEY URBAN
COMMITTEE INTEREST	ADDENDUM TO COMMITTEE REPORT
RECOMMENDATION	REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION
PROPOSAL	Retrospective change of use from shop unit to 2 no. ground
	floor flats (1 No 1P/1B unit and 1 no. 2P/1B unit) to include
	internal alterations to existing building
SITE/LOCATION	4 Hightown Road, Glengormley, Co Antrim, BT36 7UA
APPLICANT	Mr Thomas Donaghy
AGENT	HR JESS
LAST SITE VISIT	14 th December 2021
CASE OFFICER	Alicia Leathem
	Tel: 028 903 40416
	Email: alicia.leathem@antrimandnewtownabbey.gov.uk

Full details of this application, including the application forms, relevant drawings, consultation responses and any representations received are available to view at the Planning Portal www.planningni.gov.uk

ASSESSMENT OF PLANNING ISSUES/MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Since the preparation and publication of the Committee Report additional information in support of the application has been submitted by the agent for the application, HR JESS Architecture. The supporting information (Drawing No. 02/1 and Document 01 date stamped 13th January 2022) is available for Members to view online at the Planning Portal (www.planningni.gov.uk).

The amended plans received show the removal of two car parking spaces located directly in front of the adjacent residential property No. 2 Hightown Road. The car parking spaces are replaced with a cycle stand located to the front of the subject property. It is accepted that the removal of the car parking spaces located directly in front of the adjacent residential property will lessen the impact on the amenity of the adjacent property in relation to light nuisance, noise and general disturbance, however, no information has been provided regarding where the necessary 2 No. car parking spaces for the flats is to be provided. While it is accepted that the site has a previous use as a beauty salon, the removal of parking from the proposal is a significant change. The agent has not provided any information to demonstrate whether the current proposal is less intensive in terms of parking provision or not. There is an acceptance that commercial type activities can rely on public parking in a retailing area, however, it is rare for private residential properties to rely on public parking with the exception of on-street parking. As the application site fronts onto the Hightown Road and lies close to its junction with the Antrim Road, it is difficult to ascertain where any on-street parking would be available in close proximity to the site which would not result in impeding the flow of traffic.

The supporting statement (Document 01) contends that within town centres particularly on brownfield sites a reduced level of amenity space is acceptable. The amenity space provision on the amended block plan (Drawing 02/1 date stamped 13th January 2022) reflects that submitted originally, which provides 10sqm of amenity space per apartment. As indicated within the Committee Report one of the areas of

amenity space provided sits directly to the rear of the adjacent residential property at No.2 Hightown Road and directly below its bathroom window. It is considered that the lack of a suitable form of private amenity space will have a detrimental impact on the amenity of No. 2 Hightown Road and demonstrates the restricted and cramped nature of the site the development giving rise to overdevelopment.

Within the additional information provided (Document 01) the agent stipulates that the previous use as a beauty salon included a large number of waste water outlets and contends that the change of use to a residential use would be less intensive. The applicant raises concerns as to the need for a Waste Water Impact Assessment (WWIA) as requested by NIW and goes on to state that NIW can consider proposals in one of three instances; like for like development; extant previously approved development and where the development offers a reduced loading on the sewer network. The applicant has requested that the submitted information is forwarded to NIW seeking a rationale for requesting a WWIA. This information relates to the number of showers, baths and foot spas which were currently in use, however, there is no verifiable information to support this assertion, nor are there any calculations to demonstrate the waste water load that was in use by the former business use. The procedure in relation to solutions for waste water capacity pressures is currently dealt with through the submission of a WWIA to NIW. This has not been submitted by the applicant nor has it been requested as the principle of development has not been established and it is felt that requesting such information would lead to unnecessary costs to the applicant.

As a result of the changes made, the recommendation to refuse planning permission remains the same, however, the part of the reason for refusal which relates to nuisance from the parked cars to the front of No. 2 has been deleted.

CONCLUSION

The following is a summary of the main reasons for the recommendation:

- An appropriate level of private amenity space has not been provided;
- The development will have an adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring residents;
- There is no suitable means for sewage disposal from this site.

RECOMMENDATION: | REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION

PROPOSED REASONS FOR REFUSAL

- 1. The proposal is contrary to the policy provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policy QD1 of Planning Policy Statement 7 'Quality Residential Environments' in that the proposed development represents an overdevelopment of the site as there is inadequate provision of private amenity space and the proposal will have an adverse impact on the amenity of proposed residents in terms of the overlooking, noise nuisance and general disturbance.
- 2. The proposal is contrary to the policy provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and would, if permitted, cause harm to an interest of acknowledged importance, namely sewage disposal, as it has not been demonstrated there is a satisfactory means of dealing with sewage associated with the development.

3. The proposal is contrary to the policy provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policy AMP 7 Planning Policy Statement 3, Access, Movement and Parking in that the development does not provide any incurtilage parking spaces and does not provide any detail on how the parking requirements for the development can be met.