

Erratum

LA01/2024/0137/F

1.0 Update

1.1 Replace paragraphs 8.32, 8.38 and 8.39 with the following revised paragraphs below:

8.32 No in-curtilage parking will be provided for the caretakers dwelling or associated Men's Shed facility. It is proposed that parking for the ancillary accommodation and Men's Shed will be provided using the country park's existing parking facilities. As per Parking Standards, the caretaker's dwelling requires 1.5 in-curtilage parking spaces. The associated Men's Shed facility is anticipated to generate 10 vehicles per day. Given the nearest existing car park is 385m from the site via narrow lanes, the potential for conflict between pedestrians and users of the Men's Shed and ancillary accommodation is high. The access route is insufficient to safely accommodate both vehicles and pedestrians. A key aspect of the country park is that it is a normally vehicle-free environment where users are able to explore the riverside environment unincumbered by concerns regarding their safety due to potential vehicle conflict.

8.38 Policy AMP7 of PPS3 outlines that development proposals are required to provide adequate provision for car parking and appropriate servicing arrangements. It goes onto state that a reduced level of carparking may be acceptable in certain circumstances:

- Where through a Transport Assessment it forms part of a package of measures to provide alternative transport modes.
- The site is in a highly accessible location well served by public transport.
- The development would benefit from spare capacity in nearby public car parks or adjacent on street parking.
- Where shared parking is a viable option.
- Where an exercise in flexibility would assist in conservation of the built or natural heritage, would aid rural regeneration, facilitate a better quality of development or the beneficial reuse of an existing building.

8.39 In this case no parking within the curtilage of the facility or ancillary caretaker's dwelling is proposed. The site layout states that parking is to be provided using the Country Park's existing parking facilities. It goes on to state that this is to minimise parking demand and that alternative arrangements to site/ car park include cycling. Given that the nearest Country Park parking spaces are approximately 385m via paths/ narrow laneway to the site, and that access to the car park in question is limited and controlled entirely by NIEA, the proposed parking arrangement is inadequate. The proposal is contrary to Policy AMP 7 as no viable parking solution is proposed or demonstrated via Transport Assessment.