Appeal Decision

Corrected Decision

Park House
87/91 Great Victoria Street
BELFAST
BT2 7AG
T: 028 9024 4710
F: 028 9031 2536
E: info@pacni.gov.uk

Appeal Reference:	2016/A0044
Appeal by:	Car Park Services Ltd & Slaney Ltd.
Appeal against:	The refusal of planning permission
Proposed Development:	Demolition of existing warehouse and construction of Managed Purpose Built Student Accommodation comprising: 79 apartments containing 365 en–suite bedrooms with shared living rooms and kitchens; 8 studio apartments containing 28 self-contained studios, on ninth and tenth floor; a landscaped central courtyard atrium amenity space; a management reception office at ground floor level; a basement level containing 21 car parking spaces, 111 cycle spaces, 7 motor cycle spaces, changing area and showers, gymnasium, games room, TV room and laundry for exclusive use of residents; ancillary plant rooms and storage including bin storage and a car lift accessed from Kent Street.
Location:	Land bounded by Library Street, Stephen Street and Kent Street, Belfast.
Planning Authority:	Belfast City Council.
Application Reference:	LA04/2015/0676/F
Procedure:	Informal hearing on 2nd November 2016.
Decision by:	Commissioner Mandy Jones, dated 27th February 2017.

Decision

The appeal is allowed and full planning permission is granted subject to the conditions set out below.

Preliminary Matter

1. Within their statement of case the appellant requested that the Commission consider a suite of up dated drawings which they stated incorporated amendments which reduces the alleged impact on the residential properties along Stephen Street. This suite of drawings was also submitted to the Council for consideration, but did not form part of the refusal package. The amendments included the following :

- Reduction of the elevation to Stephen Street – facade is set back by 7 - 8m from floors 3 to 10 (the extent of the lower floors remains unchanged),
- Set back of floor 11,
- Reduction in the number of beds from 444 to 393,
- Reduction in the number of apartments from 88 to 79,
- Reduction in car parking spaces to 21 spaces (reduction of 1 space) Increase in cycle spaces to 111 (addition of 7)
- Addition of 7 motor cycle spaces.

2. The original description of the proposal was:

   Demolition of existing warehouse and construction of managed purpose built student accommodation comprising: 78 apartments containing 408 en–suite bedrooms with shared living rooms and kitchens and 10 studio apartments containing 36 self-contained studios on ground and 10 upper-storeys, a landscaped central courtyard atrium amenity space and a management reception office at ground level; a basement level containing 22 car parking spaces, 104 cycle spaces, changing area and showers, gymnasium, games room, TV room and laundry for exclusive use of the residents; ancillary plant rooms and storage including bin storage and a car lift accessed from Kent Street.

3. The description is amended to: (underlining indicates amendments):

   Demolition of existing warehouse and construction of Managed Purpose Built Student Accommodation comprising: 79 apartments containing 365 en–suite bedrooms with shared living rooms and kitchens; 8 studio apartments containing 28 self-contained studios, on ninth and tenth floor; a landscaped central courtyard atrium amenity space; a management reception office at ground floor level; a basement level containing 21 car parking spaces, 111 cycle spaces, 7 motor cycle spaces, changing area and showers, gymnasium, games room, TV room and laundry for exclusive use of residents; ancillary plant rooms and storage including bin storage and a car lift accessed from Kent Street.

4. The Council stated that the revised scheme should not be accepted and referred to Section 59 of the Planning Act (Northern Ireland) 2011. It was argued by the appellant that the revised and reduced scheme (submitted on 22.01.2016) was before the Council but was not presented to the planning committee and the refusal was then issued on 22.02.2016 (and back dated to 20.1.2016). There were on-going discussions during an 11 month period where the issue of scale, massing and height was not raised. The appellant was advised on 14.1. 2016 that the application was going to the Planning Committee on the 19.1.2016 with a recommendation to refuse. At this meeting the appellant made an oral representation to reduce the scheme but the members voted to refuse.

5. Although the amended scheme was before the Council it was submitted a few days after the planning committee meeting and 2 days after the date on the refusal notice. However the appellant argues that reducing the scheme could not have been raised before this time owing to the late introduction of the refusal reason (they were not aware of these issues despite lengthy pre – application discussions) and the

unwillingness of the Council to accept any amendments prior to issuing the refusal notice. In this respect, I consider that the amendments are in accordance with Section 59 (1) (a).

6. Section 59 (2) of the Act however states that Section 59 (1) does not affect any requirement of entitlement to have regard to the provisions of the local development plan or any material consideration. The proposed amendments are material considerations as they relate directly to the reason for refusal.

7. The nature of the proposal remains unchanged for managed student accommodation across an 11-storey building with central atrium and courtyard including ancillary parking and communal facilities. The amended scheme is a reduction in the overall numbers of bedrooms and the set back of the facade to Stephen Street by 7-8m from floors 3 to 10.

8. To my mind, this does not significantly alter the nature of the proposal. The Council addressed the merits of the reduced scheme in their statement of case. The objectors also had an opportunity to comment on the reduced scheme.

9. I have examined the new suite of drawings and consider the design amendments to be relatively minor overall and to constitute a reduction of the scheme. I am satisfied that there would be no prejudice to any other party. Accordingly, I will base my considerations on the new suite of drawings submitted to the Commission within the appellant's statement of case.

Reasoning

10. The main issues in this appeal are :

- The principle of development and proposed use at this location and,
- The impact on the character of the area and on the residential amenity of adjacent residents.

11. The appeal site lies close and east of the Inner Ring Road (Carrick Hill). The surrounding area comprises an historic urban grain with dense tall red brick buildings, interspersed with mid – century to late century office and warehouse buildings and a number of vacant sites. The surrounding built fabric of the area contains some landmark buildings such as the Frames building; the Irish News HQ; the Belfast Central Library and the original Belfast Telegraph building. There are a number of land uses within the vicinity of the appeal site including ; commercial, office space, warehousing, vacant plots, car parks and residential. The appeal site consists of a surface level car park and a red brick warehouse building. Adjoining to the east of the appeal site is a 9-storey apartment development – known as Library Square Apartments. On the opposite side of Stephen Street is a row of 2½-storey terrace dwellings. The appeal site is just outside the city centre commercial core to the south and is within close proximity to the University of Ulster campus (approximately 3 minute walk).

12. The proposal is for purpose built managed student accommodation (PBMSA) to service the relocation of the University of Ulster campus. The building is arranged over 11 floors plus a basement level. The basement level has car parking, plant rooms, gym and laundry and the apartments are above. The design has active frontages on all three open elevations. The main parapet line is the same height as the adjacent Library Square Apartment building with 2 floors above (floor 10 and 11) stepped back with a slopped roof profile and finished in a different material (standing seam metal panels). There is a central private open air atrium which extends through the core of the building from a communal ground level garden. External materials are multi – red facing brick with standing seam metal spandrel panels and aluminium windows and doors.

13. Section 6 (4) of the Planning (Northern Ireland) Act 2011 states that determination under this Act must be made in accordance with the local development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The Belfast Metropolitan Area Plan 2015 (BMAP) and the Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) Subject Plan for Belfast City Council Area 2015 both operate as local development plans for the area. Within BMAP the appeal site is located within the city centre boundary of Belfast. The site is identified as whiteland and falls within designation CC010 – Scotch and Cathedral Quarter Character Area.

14. Within the HMO Subject Plan: Policy HMO 3, HMO Development Nodes states that along the frontages of designated HMO Development Nodes planning permission for HMOs will be granted. The justification and amplification text states that the policy is designed to accommodate the need and demand for HMO accommodation and direct it to areas where it can contribute to regeneration and it applies to 18 designated HMO Development Nodes within Belfast.

15. The appeal site is located within one of these nodes - HMO Development Node Designation HMO 4/17 Scotch Quarter which states that higher density residential development resulting from HMOs is encouraged within this node.

16. The subject plan recognises that there will be a growth in PBMSA development. At page 29 it states that the future development of HMOs will be curtailed in areas where there are currently significant concentrations of such accommodation, particularly in South Belfast. Opportunities to meet the ongoing requirement for HMO accommodation will be met through:

    (a) Purpose built student housing and
    (b) Designation of areas where HMO development will be permitted.

17. Policy HMO 7 relates to Large Scale Purpose Built Student Accommodation and states that planning permission will only be granted for large scale purpose built student accommodation where all of 5 criteria are met. None of these criteria relate to a need test. Rather the justification and amplification text states that Policy HMO 7 is designed to facilitate the need and demand for multiple occupation, protect the amenity of other residential areas and promote appropriate development of student accommodation. It goes on to state that currently Belfast has a lower level of purpose built student housing than most other major university cities in the UK when

the number of such units available is compared to student enrolment (12% against a national average of 25 %).

18. The Council had no objections with the principle of PBMSA on the appeal site given its city centre location within an HMO development node. Objectors accept that the principle of residential development has been established on the site however argued that a purpose built student accommodation proposal is unsuitable at this location as a 'need' has not been established. They referred to a document entitled 'Belfast: A Learning City – A framework for student housing and purpose built student accommodation March 2014' produced by Belfast City Council. The forward states that 'this framework advocates a vision and direction for student housing and PBSA in Belfast and advocates a number of key criteria to be applied to proposals..... these criteria will be used by the Council and its partners as they engage with the planning process and in the future may inform revisions of planning policies.' This strategic document provides guidance however is not planning policy.

19. Approval figures for PBMSA presented by the Council indicated that there are currently a total of 4425 bedrooms across Belfast. The appellant argued that given there are approximately 60,000 students in Belfast this represents 7.3% of the bedrooms available would be provided by PBMSA. Even if there were 7383 bedrooms (presented as number of overall applications within the planning system) this would represent an increase of 10% which still falls well short of the national average of 25 % as indicated by policy. Whilst there is no policy requirement to demonstrate need the figures presented do not suggest that there is an oversaturation of PBMSA proposals within Belfast City Centre.

20. Although there are a number of approved and proposed proposals across Belfast City Centre for PBMSA schemes neither has it been demonstrated that there is an overconcentration of student accommodation in the surrounding vicinity of the appeal site. In fact, the map submitted by the Council showing PBMSA schemes in Belfast City Centre indicates a number of refusals in the vicinity of the appeal site and no approvals in the vicinity of the appeal site.

21. Although the objectors would prefer a scheme for social housing on the appeal site, the appeal site is located within an HMO node which directs schemes for PBMSA to be within this designation. I was told that the appeal site is in private ownership and the appellant made it clear at the hearing that there are no intentions for it to be used for social housing. The objectors concerns in relation to the principle of PBMSA at this location are not sustained.

22. CC 010 Scotch and Cathedral Quarter within BMAP sets out urban design criteria within this designation. In the 'General' section it states that;

    - the density of development shall be maintained and increased, where appropriate, through high site coverage and high plot ratio (including residential),
    - Development proposals shall take account of the height of adjoining buildings.

The 'elsewhere' section states that;

- Building heights shall be a minimum of 3 storeys and a maximum of 4-storeys or 5-storeys with use of setback, articulated roof forms reinforcing traditional character.

23. With reference to the context of the appeal site, BMAP goes on to state that 'The area suffers from the dominance of the Inner Ring Road infrastructure as well as the many radial routes coming into this part of the city centre. The area is particularly weak at its western fringe (vicinity of the appeal site) with many vacant sites, a lack of building frontage and a loss of historic grain. Despite these weaknesses it remains an important resource for the expansion and consolidation of the various uses and activities of the City Centre.' The Council argue that the appeal proposal is a full 6-storeys higher than the specified height set out in the 'elsewhere' criteria.

24. Planning permission was approved for 93 apartments over 8-storeys under planning reference Z/2010/1632/O on 19 June 2012. The Council state that this was a poor decision made by the then Department of the Environment. This approval does not lapse until 2017. I was told at the hearing that if this appeal is not successful in order to protect their commercial asset the appellant intends to submit a full application and build out the extant approval for an 8-storey building – I consider that it represents a realistic fallback position for the appellant. I consider that this extant approval for an 8-storey building is a material consideration and accepts the principle of a tall building on the appeal site. It is also contrary to the urban design criteria set out in the 'elsewhere' section for CC010.

25. Directly to the north and opposite the appeal site is approval Z/2006/0655/F for a 10-storey mixed use scheme comprising 253 apartments, retail units on land bounded by Library Street, Stephen Street approved on 25.6.2009. This has lapsed. Directly abutting the appeal site is a 9-storey development which has been constructed - approved 10.11.2004. (Z/2003/3077/F).

26. The Strategic Planning Policy Statement for Northern Ireland 2015 (SPPS) is a material consideration and Planning Policy Statement 7: Quality Residential Environments which is retained under the SPPS is relevant to this proposal.

27. Policy QD 1 of PPS 7 states that planning permission will only be granted for new development where it is demonstrated that the proposal will create a quality and sustainable residential environment. The design and layout of residential development should be based on an overall design concept that draws upon the positive aspects of the character and appearance of the surrounding area. The policy lists a number of criteria that proposals should conform with. The Council and objectors argue that the proposal is contrary to criteria (a), (h) and (g).

28. Criterion (a) requires the development to respect the surrounding context and is appropriate to the character and topography of the site in terms of layout, scale, proportions, massing and appearance of buildings, structures and landscaped and

hard surfaced areas. In relation to criterion (a) the Council's main concern was that the proposal is out of context with the 2½-storey dwellings at Stephen Street.

29. In terms of the urban design the Council seem to refer to the dwellings on Stephen Street in isolation and disregard the surrounding context and approvals. The appeal proposal takes account of the adjoining Library Court development in terms of scale and massing. Within the vicinity of the appeal site from the south, the proposal would be viewed against the site immediately to the north which has an approval for 10-storey development. Although this has lapsed, it establishes the principle of a tall building on the site.

30. The row of 8 no 2½-storey dwellings on Stephen Street are an anomaly within the high rise and dense urban grain to the north, east of the appeal site and south. These residential dwellings are in sharp contrast to the surrounding scale of buildings and extant approvals. To my mind, the appeal site presents an opportunity for an architectural solution to embrace this transition in scale and massing. Although the row of dwellings are indeed part of the character of the area they do not constitute the prevailing character and should not solely dictate the massing and scale of a design proposal on the appeal site.

31. The proposed elevation onto Stephen Street at floors 1-3 addresses the edge of Stephen Street and the upper floors are stepped back by 7m. This set back provides a domestic scale which addresses the properties at Stephen Street. I consider that the massing and articulation of the Stephen Street elevation provides the transition required in terms of urban design. In contrast, the approved facade is solid on the edge of the street – and 9-storeys in height with no set back. I consider that it would have a much more dominant effect on the immediate streetscape than the appeal proposal. In my opinion, a low rise development within the site would be an incorrect contextual response to this particular site in this urban fringe location. I note that the previous approval, which was made within the context of PPS 7, endorses a higher density solution.

32. The 3-storey element will be perceived from street level, and the increase in height between the extant approval (9-storeys) and the appeal proposal (11-storeys) would be barely discernible when viewed from the street level.

33. I consider that the proposal responds to the totality of the surrounding context and is both appropriate to the scale of the terrace properties along Stephen Street and the multi storey apartments contiguous to the east and the approvals to the north of the appeal site. The proposal reflects this inner city location and responds to the objectives of the HMO designation. I consider that it also conforms with the general urban design criteria for designation CC 010 within BMAP – although not the 'elsewhere' criteria. When compared to the extant approval, in terms of the impact on the dwellings on Stephen Street, it offers a better design solution.

34. The objectors also referred to longer range views from Carrick Hill and the residential areas to the west of Carrick Hill. From the east the proposal would be seen immediately against the adjoining 9-storey Library Court apartment development.

35. Land to the north (referenced as site 6 within the objector's statement of case) is zoned for social housing under designation CC04/03 in BMAP and is under public ownership. I was told by the objectors that the Northern Ireland Housing Executive (NIHE) has developed housing proposals for the site. A site to the east (referenced as site 8) is also under public ownership and also subject to NIHE housing proposals. I was told that progress on these 2 sites has been interrupted by the abandoned Northside regeneration scheme. The objectors argued that the appeal proposal will have an adverse impact on the residents who will occupy the housing on sites 6 and 8 in terms of scale, massing and overdevelopment. However, there are no planning approvals or applications with the Council for housing developments on these sites. I was not provided with details of any potential schemes on these sites either. As such, I am unable to assess any impact on residents who may potentially occupy the housing on these sites.

36. Criterion (h) requires that the design and layout will not create conflict with adjacent land uses and there is no unacceptable adverse effect on existing or proposed properties in terms of overlooking, loss of light, overshadowing, noise or other disturbance. The Council's and objectors concerns related to the loss of light and overshadowing in the mornings which would have an unacceptable impact on the properties in Stephen Street.

37. A daylight and sunlight assessment prepared by Herrington Consulting Ltd was submitted with the application which tested the original proposals. Comments on the amended proposal (which I am considering) was submitted within the appellant's statement of case (dated 4 October 2016). This concluded that from inspection of the section drawings indicating the 2 schemes, it is evident that the amended scheme will result in a significant improvement. The measurement of the obstruction angle – from the centre point of the lowest window of the dwellings on Stephen Street to the top of the proposal, it can be seen that this angle reduces from 66 degrees (2015 scheme) to 58 degrees (amended 2016 scheme). From these two obstruction angles it is possible to derive an approximate Vertical Sky Component (VSC) which represents the amount of sky that is visible from each window of the affected building.

38. This gives a VSC value of the 2015 and 2016 schemes as 5% and 10% respectively. The amended proposal will give a doubling of the available daylight over the both the original 2015 scheme and the approved 2012 scheme. Taking into consideration the BRE Guidelines stance on adopting alternative target values for development in situations where previous schemes have already been approved this is considered to represent a significant improvement.

39. In terms of overshadowing, the BRE Guidance suggests that where new development may affect amenity areas then analysis can be undertaken to quantify the loss of sunlight from overshadowing - such amenity areas include back gardens. However, due to the orientation of the dwellings in relation to the sun path I agree with the appellant that the small rear amenity spaces of these dwellings are self-shaded from the dwellings themselves. No unacceptable overshadowing has been demonstrated. Overall, it was accepted by the Council that the amended proposal provides betterment than the approved 2012 scheme.

40. The Council also argued that there will be an unacceptable level of dominance to the properties along Stephen Street. There is no doubt that the extant permission Z/2010/1632/O on the edge of the street and 9-storeys in height with no set back would have a dominant effect on the properties along Stephen Street. The amended appeal proposal with its upper floors set back, in my opinion would have the result of significantly reducing the dominance of the building on the residential properties.

41. Objectors have fears of the area becoming like the 'Holylands' as there will be a significant influx of students into the area which will disrupt and unsettle the residential community's amenity in terms of noise, nuisance and antisocial behaviour. The proposal is for a managed scheme and can be conditioned as such. Outside the building a public order regime would apply. I note that the extant approval for apartments on the site was unmanaged and could still be fully occupied by students. A noise impact assessment was provided by the appellant and no concerns in relation to it were raised by either the Council or objectors.

42. Objectors also raised criteria (g) which requires that the design of the development draws upon the best local traditions of form, materials and detailing. I consider the external finishes to be appropriate and I do not consider the use of metal panels on the facade to be unacceptable given this inner city location.

43. In conclusion, I consider that the appeal proposal accords with BMAP and the HMO Subject Plan. I consider that it is an appropriate design to respond to its inner city location and addresses the scale of tall buildings in the area whilst being cognisant of the dwellings on Stephen Street. Given the design, previous land use and planning history I consider that the appeal proposal complies with PPS 7 policy QD1. Accordingly, the Council's reason for refusal and the objectors concerned have not been sustained.

44. The Council provided no basis for a condition for the developer to enter into a Section 76 to provide developer contributions to assist in the provision of environmental improvements within the vicinity of the site.

45. I consider that a condition requiring a Construction Management Plan - incorporating a construction noise management plan - is necessary given the inner city location of the site and the extent of demolition which is required. Given the location of the appeal site a condition requiring a noise verification report based on the submitted noise assessments is required to protect the amenity of existing and proposed residents. Separate noise conditions are required to control noise within any proposed residential unit and from building plant as these were not covered in the submitted noise assessments. A condition requiring new contamination risks identified during construction to be investigated is required given the previous land use of the site and its inner city location.

CONDITIONS

(1) If during the development works, new contamination or risks are encountered which have not previously been identified, works shall cease immediately and the Planning Authority shall be notified within one working day. This new contamination shall be

fully investigated in accordance with the Environment Agency's Model Procedures for the Management of Land Contamination (Contaminated Land Report 11). No further development works shall take place until a report detailing the findings of the investigation and any necessary remediation measures arising there from has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Planning Authority.

(2) No apartment shall be occupied until there has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Department a verification report demonstrating that the remedial measures referred to in condition 1 have been successfully completed.

(3) Prior to occupation of the proposed development, the applicant shall submit to Belfast City Council a Noise Verification Report for review and approval, which demonstrates the implementation of the mitigation measures outlined in the July 2015 and October 2015 Peter Lloyd and Associates Noise Assessments titled *' Proposed Student Housing, Kent Street/ Library Street, Belfast, Andrew Nesbitt Architects'*

(4) The Noise Verification Report (referred to in condition 2) shall also demonstrate that internal noise levels within any proposed residential unit shall:

- Not exceed 35 dB $L_{Aeq,16hrs}$ at any time between 07..00hrs and 23.00hrs within any habitable room, with the windows closed and alternative means of acoustic ventilation provided in accordance with current building control requirements;
- Not exceed 30 dB $L_{Aeq,8hr}$ at any time between the hours of 23.00hrs and 07.00hrs within any habitable room, with the windows closed and alternative means of acoustic ventilation provided in accordance with current building control requirements;
- Not exceed 45 dB L_{Amax} for any single sound event between 23.00hrs and 07.00hrs within any proposed bedrooms with the windows closed and alternative means of ventilation provided in accordance with current building regulations.

(5) Prior to commencement of development the applicant shall submit a report for the approval of Belfast City Council, identifying an appropriate target noise rating level (dBL_{Ar}) of all combined building plant services. The report must demonstrate that the proposed rating level will not exceed the background sound level (for both day time and night time).

(6) Prior to commencement of development, a construction management plan – incorporating a construction noise management plan – shall be developed and submitted for review and approval by Belfast City Council. This Plan should outline the methods to be employed to minimise any noise and vibration impact of demolition and construction operations demonstrating 'best practicable means'. The Plan should pay due regard to BS 5228:2009 *Noise and Vibration Control on Construction and Open Sites* and include a detailed programme for the demolition/ construction phase, the proposed noise and vibration monitoring methods, noise mitigation methods and evidence of neighbour liaison.

(7) No development shall take place until a determination has been made under Article 3 of the Private Streets (Northern Ireland) Order 1980.

(8) Prior to occupation a 'Purpose Built Managed Student Accommodation', Management Plan shall be submitted to Belfast City Council for approval. This should be in conformity with the Student Draft Management Plan dated June 2015 previously submitted. The PBMSA development should be operated in perpetuity in accordance with the agreed Management Plan.

(9) Prior to occupation of the proposed development, the submitted Travel Plan, by MRA Partnership dated June 2015 shall be implemented.

(10) The development shall be begun before the expiration of five years from the date of this permission.

This decision approves the following drawings:

Pac ref	**drg no.**	**Title and Date**
PAC 1	399 SL (90) 000	Site Plan (1:1250) April 2015
PAC 2	399 CL (90) 99	Site Layout Block Plan, rev A (1:400@A3) dated 29.4.2015
PAC 3	399 CL (90) 100	Basement Plan, rev C (1:150@A3) dated 18.05.2016
PAC 4	399 CL (90) 101	Ground Floor Plan, rev E (1:150 @A3) dated 16.09.2016
PAC 5	399 CL (90) 102	First Floor Plan, rev C (1:150 @A3) dated 18.05.2016
PAC 5(i)	399 CL (90) 113	Second Floor Plan, rev (1:150@A3) dated 18.05.2016
PAC 6	399 CL (90) 103	Typical Floor Plan, rev C (1:150@A3) dated 18.05.2016
PAC 6(i)	399 CL (90) 114	Eighth Floor Plan, (1:150@ A3) dated18.06.2016
PAC 7	399 CL (90) 108	Ninth Floor Plan, rev B (1:150@A3) dated 18.05.2016
PAC 8	399 CL (90) 109	Tenth Floor Plan, rev B (1:150@A3) dated 18.05.2016
PAC 9	399CL (90) 110	Proposed Section A-A, rev B (1:175@A3) dated 18.05.2016
PAC 11	399CL (90) 107	Proposed Library Street Elevation, rev B (1:150@A3) dated 18.05.2016
PAC 12	399CL (90) 105	Proposed Stephen Street Elevation, rev B (1:150@A3) dated 18.05.2016
PAC 13	399CL (90) 104	Proposed Kent Street Elevation, rev C (1:150@A3) dated 18.05.2016
PAC 14	399CL (90) 111	Proposed Rear Elevation, rev B (1:150@A3) dated 29.04.2015
PAC 15	399CL (90) 121	Basement Access & Footways Plan,

		rev B (1:200@A3) dated 25.09.2015
PAC 16	399CL (90) 122	Private Streets Determination, rev B (1:200@A2) dated 25.09.2015
PAC 17	399CL (90) 106	Contextual Elevations, rev B (1:750@A3) dated 18.05.2016
PAC 18	399CL (90) 112	Proposed Section B-B, (dated 18.05.2016)
PAC 19	399CL (90) 125	Roof Plan, rev A (1:150@ A3) dated 18.05.2016)
PAC 20	399SL (90) 01	Topographical Survey (1:200@ A3) dated 29.04.15

COMMISSIONER MANDY JONES

2016/A0044

List of Documents

Planning Authority:	'A' Statement of Case with appendices
Appellant:	'B' Statement of Case with appendices
Objectors:	'C' Statement of Case with appendices

2016/A0044

Appearances at the Hearing

Belfast City Council

Planning Authority:	Conor Campfield, Belfast City Council Chelsea Johnston, Belfast City Council
Appellant:	Stewart Beattie instructed by Tugans Solicitors Gemma Jobling, JPE Planning and Environmental Maria O'Loan, Tugans Solicitors Simon Herrington, Herrington Consulting Ltd Andrew Nesbitt, Andrew Nesbitt Architects Catherine McHugh, Car Park Services Ltd.
Objectors:	Colm Bradley, Community Places Grace Campbell, Community Places Frank Dempsey, Carrick Hill Residents Gerard Dempsey, Carrick Hill Residents