

Addendum

LA01/2016/0395/O

Full Planning

Update

A submission has been made by Mr Pat McCotter. This recognises deficiencies with the previous application (Ref: C/2015/0023/O), but argues that the current proposal meets policy requirements for an infill.

The submission argues that the dwellings at nos. 34 and 36 should be considered as road frontage development. However, this issue has already been addressed in the Planning Committee Report in para 8.8. The arrangement at no. 34 is most critical as it adjoins the application site. The dwelling at no. 34 does not have a road frontage as only its access abuts the road. With regard to no. 36, which is removed from the application site, only the gable of a domestic building and its access abut the road.

Appeals 2014/A0148 and 2015/A0221 endorse this view. Both state that a laneway or access to the road is insufficient to constitute a frontage onto a public road.

Therefore the proposal fails to meet the policy requirements of Policy CTY 8 in that the site is not located within a substantial and built up frontage.