

Subject:		Fee Paying Park and Ride Car Park at IKEA, Sydenham				
Date: Reporting Officer: Contact Officer:		23 April 2015 C E McILWAINE				
		Is this	s report restricted?		Yes	No
Is the decision eligible fo		or Call-in?	Yes	No	x	
1.0	Purpose of Repo	ort or Summary of main Issues				
	A retrospective planning application for a fee paying park and ride car park using part of					
	the IKEA multi storey car park at Sydenham was refused in December 2013 by DOE. The					
	operator of the car park appealed the refusal decision and the planning appeal was held by the Planning Appeals Commission in January 2015. As a decision is expected shortly members attention is drawn to this matter which may attract media attention.					
	decision the Cour	t. Depending on the outcome of the Facil may have to consider taking enfor soon as possible following the annot	cement action. Mem	bers will b	е	
3.0	Main report					
	Key Issues					
	Following a plann	ing refusal (agreed by Belfast City Co	uncil in its consultativ	e role wit	h	

DOE) the applicant Mr P Boal appealed the decision to the Planning Appeals Commission.

Members may recall this matter received considerable public scrutiny and interest (with extensive local and regional media coverage).

As a decision is expected shortly on the appeal, members attention is drawn to this matter which may again command media attention.

If the refusal is upheld on appeal Belfast City Council will then have to contemplate appropriate enforcement action against IKEA in light of the PAC decision.

The Planning Issues

The planning refusal was based on PPS 3 'Access Movement and Car Parking' which requires that the development meets a need identified in a transport plan or accepted following robust analysis provided by the developer.

No need has been identified by DRD in any Transport Plan for additional parking for this area of Belfast. In addition, correspondence was received from Belfast City Airport during the processing of the planning application stating that at no time, even the July peak, were all existing spaces occupied. They also state that the airport has spare capacity of old terminal building (some 390 spaces) it can still be used if required. There was no evidence to dispute these facts.

Secondly, a robust analysis was not provided by the applicant. The applicant has provided 'a case of need' during the processing of the planning application on 21 August 2013. This information however does not meet the criteria requirement of "robust analysis". The information provided was considered to be a generalisation of a perceived demand and no evidence was provided of need, and certainly not the robust analysis as required.

Previous PAC appeals have been made on change of use applications to car parks on sites adjacent to Belfast International Airport, which were cheaper but no robust analysis had been provided. While these were on greenfield sites, with regards Policy PPS3, they were directly comparable. Appeal 2008/A0043 – Park and Ride,

4.0	Appendices – Documents Attached
	None at present
	Equality or Good Relations Implications
	None at present
	Financial & Resource Implications
	test.
	the Department through the planning application indicated demand for cheaper parking however this does not overcome the Policy test of need which is a higher
	In summary - No evidence has been providing indicting there is a need for additional parking provision for Belfast City Airport. The case of need submitted to
	a valuable and expensive resource for the benefit of the public.
	The agent stated in his supporting statement/case of need, that the proposal will financially assist IKEA in a depressed market and in a wider context better utilises
	demonstrative of the need".