

5th March
2019

Planning Application Reports – Update Note

Listed below are changes to the planning reports made as a result of additional information received since the publication of the agenda for this meeting.

| Case: | Address: | Update: |
|---------|--|--|
| 19/0083 | SANDS VENUE,PALATINE BUILDINGS, PROMENADE | <p>Members will be aware from the officer report that this application is recommended for deferral for two reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The consultation and publication period does not expire in time for a decision to be made at the Committee meeting; 2) At the time of writing the officer report, information to address the refusal of previous application ref. 18/0818 were expected but had not been received. <p>In respect of the first reason for deferral, it is stated in the officer report that the earliest date for decision is 11 March 2019. As a result of the date on which some consultation requests were issued, the earliest date for a decision is now 18 March 2019.</p> <p>In respect of the second reason for deferral, some of the information expected has not been provided. The applicant has submitted some elevation drawings dated April 2018 that include annotations that detail the proposed materials. An updated Design and Access Statement has also been provided along with a sample panel of the fascia material. A deliveries and services statement has also been submitted.</p> <p>No samples of the vertical supports or cross-bars have been provided but it has been verbally confirmed that they would match the appearance of the fascia sample. No sample of the glazing has been provided. The statement justifying the material colours that was submitted with the last application has not been updated.</p> |

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>The outstanding information has been requested. No response has been received in time for inclusion in this update note in relation to the outstanding materials justification statement. The applicant has confirmed that a sample of glazing will be delivered to the Council offices at 9am on Tuesday 5 March 2019.</p> <p>Officers are concerned that the sample panel received does not address the issues raised by the Committee at its meeting on 5 February 2019. However, in the interests of fairness and as some of the necessary information continues to be outstanding, the recommendation remains one of deferral at the present time.</p> <p>Once the glazing sample is received on 5 March 2019, officers will form a professional view based on the information available and will provide a substantive recommendation to the Committee through an updated update note to be circulated at the Committee meeting.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, the following consultee responses have been received since the officer report was written:</p> <p>Historic England – on the basis of the information provided, Historic England does not wish to offer any comments. The views of the Council’s specialist conservation and archaeological advisers should be sought.</p> <p>Built Heritage Manager - the proposed colour palette fails completely to take into account the hotel’s contextual relationship with the Tower and its immediate neighbour the former Woolworth’s building. I am not aware of any other example of this colour palette anywhere within the Town Centre Conservation Area, and its introduction would be an unwelcome intrusion into the townscape of the Promenade causing substantial harm to the setting of the Tower. The bronze, cream and green colour scheme initially proposed was carefully chosen to mitigate any potential harm caused by a modern hotel design in a largely Victorian and Edwardian built environment, and would also have enhanced the setting for the Conservation Area, the boundary of which is immediately to the north of the site. There appears to be no justification for this colour palette, and no assessment of its harm on the setting of the Tower, Woolworth’s building or the Conservation Area. As such I would recommend refusal of this application.</p> |
|--|--|---|

| | | |
|--|--|---|
| | | <p>Head of Transportation – the delivery and servicing statement submitted is fairly simple and lacking in detail but is acceptable for the present purposes. The applicant intends to have maintenance staff on-site and this would reduce the number visiting tradesman, adequately reducing one concern. Parking was a second, albeit minor concern. Basement parking has been replaced with valet parking. It has been made clear that there is no provision around the building for casual parking and they have arrangements in progress for this. The third issue was servicing. It has been argued that the existing service area has served a multi-use building on the site for many years. It is agreed that a management strategy will be produced and agreed. For example, visiting museum exhibitions that require more space than is available in the servicing area would have to arrive and depart outside of standard operational hours. It is agreed that the drop-off area needs to be of limited width to prevent excessive intrusion into the pedestrian route and flow diversion into the hotel entrance area. Any works outwith the building involving the highway would require a S278 Agreement and this is agreed, as is the need for Traffic Regulation Orders. As such, no highway objection is raised.</p> |
|--|--|---|