

Planning Statement

Address:

20/00605

Waterfall Hotel, Glen Maye, Kirk Patrick



1.0 The Application Site

1.1 The application site is positioned centrally to the public car park on Shore Road, Glen Maye. The exact construction date of the Waterfall Hotel is unknown but it is of traditional stone wall construction and deeds of purchase found run back to August 1944 with discussions made dating back to 1907. It is two storeys in height (7.6m approx to top of ridge) with an additional attic area used for storage.

1.2 The site back in 1944 totalled 16.5 acres and included the National Glen and a large portion of land running down both sides and including Shore Road. Large portions of this land have obviously been sold off over the years and numerous property developments undertaken. *It should be noted that the proposed site is not located within a Conservation Area. Nor is Glen Maye as a whole.*

1.3 The site is approximately 787sq metres in total. The adjacent car park and beer garden which the applicant owns totals an additional 1,580sq metres.

1.4 The building is currently vacant and was last used as a business over three years ago. This was along with multiple previous attempts that ended unsuccessfully.

1.5 To the South side of the site is located the public car park and access into Glen Maye National Glen. To the North is Glen Close Cul De Sac which mainly houses one storey bungalows. To the

• East is the entrance into Glen Close and the vehicular entrance into the car park and Shore Road from the A27 running through Glen Maye. To the West is Waterfall House set over two stories and Shore Rd continues to run down to the National Glen, with properties being located up to 0.5km down.

1.6 The building is finished in painted render to all elevations. The roof is dark slate or cement tiles. The front elevation is traditional in style but has white uPVC casement windows, two modern rooflights and only two chimneys which makes the overall appearance less traditional and asymmetrical.

1.7 The rear elevation from inspection seems to have been extended multiple times in the past it would seem and has no aesthetic positives. The garden area to the rear at most is 20m long and is split levelled and runs right up to the boundary with Glen Close. This is overgrown and laid to both paving and grass.

1.8 Existing parking is via the public car park. There are approximately 45-50 vehicular spaces. The owners of the Waterfall Hotel own the car park. Within the 1960 deeds there is an agreement with the Forestry Board. This allows visitors to the National Glen to use the car park along with the patrons to the Waterfall Hotel.

1.9 Extract from 'www.isleofman.com' Glen Maye Glens description:

The glen was purchased by the Forestry Board in 1960 from the proprietor of the Waterfall Hotel, Agnes Welstead, who had previously acquired it from two men who owned the separate areas of the glen, Richard Edward Hughes in 1950 and Thomas Samuel Caleb Sidney Counsell (who owned the lower section) in early 1960. The trees in the glen were valued for the Forestry Board at £124.6s.6d, firewood value only, due to the difficulty in extracting it.

2.0 Proposal

2.1 This application is being submitted as a follow on to Planning Application 17/01189/B. This application was refused at the Appeal stage in October 2018.

2.2 Full Planning Approval is sought for the demolition of the existing Waterfall Hotel and erection of 4 terrace dwellings in it's place.

2.3 The existing is in a poor state of decay and has been vacant for over 5 years. The proposed replacement dwellings respect the traditional style of the existing hotel and immediate surroundings. The materials used will match in with the local vernacular.

2.4 The proposed terrace dwelling would be set mainly over two floor levels but with an extra room within the roof space. There will be a minimal height increase of 800mm.

2.5 Each dwelling would house 3/4 bedrooms, living space be approx 122m² internally each.

2.6 Each dwelling would have it's own garden to the rear with the minimum size being 76m². Each dwelling would have a small garden space to the front of approximately 16m².

Key Policies for the Proposal

Below are the key Strategic Planning Policies that have been reviewed and taken into consideration during the creation of this proposal.

The application site is within an area recognised as being an area

- of "Residential/Woodland" under the Isle of Man Development Plan Order 1982. The site is not within a Conservation Area; nor within an area zoned as High Landscape or Coastal Value and Scenic Significance.

General Policy 2

General Policy 2 contains some useful wording: "Development which is in accordance with the land-use zoning and proposals in the appropriate Area Plan and with other policies of this Strategic Plan will normally be permitted, provided that the development:

- (b) respects the site and surroundings in terms of the siting, layout, scale, form, design and landscaping of buildings and the spaces around them;

- (c) does not affect adversely the character of the surrounding landscape or townscape;

- (g) does not affect adversely the amenity of local residents or the character of the locality;

- (h) provides satisfactory amenity standards in itself, including where appropriate safe and convenient access for all highway users, together with adequate parking, servicing and manoeuvring space;

- (i) does not have an unacceptable effect on road safety or traffic flows on the local highways".

Strategic Policy 1

Strategic Policy 1: "Development should make the best use of resources by:

- (a) optimising the use of previously developed land, redundant buildings, unused and under-used land and buildings, and re-using scarce indigenous building materials;

- (b) ensuring efficient use of sites, taking into account the needs for access, landscaping, open space and amenity standards; and

- (c) being located so as to utilise existing and planned

· infrastructure, facilities and services."

Strategic Policy 2

Strategic Policy 2: "New development will be located primarily within our existing towns and villages, or, where appropriate, in sustainable urban extensions of these towns and villages. Development will be permitted in the countryside only in the exceptional circumstances identified in paragraph 6.3."

Strategic Policy 3

Strategic Policy 3: "Proposals for development must ensure that the individual character of our towns and villages is protected or enhanced by:

(a) Avoiding coalescence and maintaining adequate physical separation between settlements; and

(b) having regard in the design of new new development to the use of local materials and character."

Strategic Policy 10

New development to be located and designed to promote a more integrated transport network with aims to minimise journeys, especially by car, make best use of public transport, preserve highways safety and encourage pedestrian movement.

Housing Policy 14

Housing Policy 14: " Where a replacement dwelling is permitted, it must not be substantially different to the existing in terms of siting and size, unless changes of siting or size would result in an overall environmental improvement; the new building should

- therefore generally be sited on the "footprint" of the existing, and should have a floor area, which is not more than 50% greater than that of the original building (floor areas should be measured externally and should not include attic space and outbuildings)".

Community Policy 4

Community Policy 4 - " Development (including the change of use of existing premises) which involves the loss of local shops and local public houses, will only be permitted if it can be demonstrated that the use is no longer commercially viable, or cannot be made commercially viable.

3.0 Why can't business continue?

3.1 Multiple attempts have been made over recent years to make the business work but have been unsuccessful. These have been at a considerable cost to the applicant.

3.2 The catering industry be it food, drink or both has taken a different route over the last 10 years, especially after the last recession. On top of this awareness has been given in a very positive way to the risk of drink driving.

3.3 The public are not going out as much now for the sake of it to eat and drink due to the above reasons. Rising costs are meaning people stay at home more and if they do go out it is to one of the main hubs for ease of getting home. Peel is the closest location for this and as can be seen, public houses and restaurants are flourishing there due to the ease of access. Unfortunately people are not going to commute out to Glen Maye when there are closer locations. It could be said the industry is over populated.

3.4 The Waterfall Hotel used to flourish due to the greater flexibility there used to be in the past. Competition from premises in Peel has been deemed impractical to keep up with.

3.5 The community of Glen Maye would probably argue the above and will state that a community facility is being removed. However it is deemed that only a small percentage of local residents would utilise the Waterfall Hotel as was the case with the previous attempts to run and would also not allow for a successful business to be run given the small population of the area. This in conjunction with point 3.3 creates the unfeasible situation. The village of Glen Maye is not of a sufficient size to sustain a public bar in high or low season 7 days a week and is not on a well used thoroughfare so as to generate passing trade.

3.6 Surrounding businesses have closed through the years for similar reasons. These include the old cafe, the shop which has been given permission to change to tourist accommodation, and the old post office.

3.7 Just recently the Liverpool Arms has closed it's doors to the public which is very similar to the Waterfall Hotel. Not a local position but with surrounding dwellings. However it shows a sign of the times and how public houses/hotels are not being utilised enough to continue business. The same can be said for the Ballacallin Hotel in Dalby.

3.8 Some public comments were made to the past application stating that the applicant was a typical Isle of Man based property developer and only out to make a quick buck. This is not the case at all. The applicant has multiple high profile trading companies employing circa 60 people on the island. A lot of these companies are in the hospitality sector and has been a backbone of business for the applicant for many years.

3.9 The applicant also owns a portfolio of properties leased to trading companies, all of which generate jobs on the island.

3.10 The applicant has tried very hard to make the Waterfall Hotel

• work and currently has a large sum of money invested in the site, some £200,000 being from trading losses over the years. The applicant has not just bought the site and instantly proposing to develop. Many years have been attempted to run it as a successful business but unfortunately as the above sum shows, it has not been successful. As stated above, this isn't the first hospitality venture by the applicant and it has been unsuccessful even with multiple years experience in the industry. Business accounts as per the last application have been provided.

3.11 The aim from gaining planning permission is to recover the cost the applicant has within the site to enable them to expand other existing operations on the Isle of Man which will increase jobs and overall island economy.

3.12 To confirm a point made in the previous application, The Waterfall Hotel was opened and supported the Glen Maye Duck Race in May 2015. However this was only temporary. The proposed new tenant brought in to run the Hotel did not come through and yet again the Applicant was left having to foot the bill.

4.0 Why can't existing hotel be renovated and converted?

4.1 The existing hotel has been empty and vacant for over five years. This follows multiple attempts to run the business successfully.

4.2 This has led to the building slowly creeping into a bad state of decay. It is of original construction with stone external walls, render finish and slate roof. Given time on their own these buildings start to feel the severe effects of damp. It would require a considerable financial investment to do this.

4.3 The existing building would have to be carefully stripped right back to the bare external walls. From brief inspection, at least the internal walls, floors and roof construction are not up

• to current Building Regulation Standards if converted.

4.4 The existing would need considerable investment to get up to standards, especially from a thermally efficient perspective. Upgrading the insulation to the building would generally involve constructing secondary stud walls internally which would encroach on the existing floor area and take away from the usable floor space.

4.5 Conversion to one dwelling is not feasible due to the investment already put into the site and the additional investment needed to renovate. A single property would not be valued high enough to cover this.

4.6 Due to the current layout it would be required to construct a new extension onto the rear of the existing that brought it up to two storey's in height to create sufficient floor space to convert into dwellings. From reviewing, any extension to the rear would have to be similar to the proposed. However the work involved would be considerably more to tie in with the existing, create more disruption to the surroundings and also create something that was not as efficient and had a limited lifespan.

4.7 The existing whilst in a prime position at the start of Shore Rd, has minimal architectural value. Asymmetrical chimneys, uPVC windows and rooflights. The rear as stated is an amalgamation of bad design and does not have any intrinsic value.

4.8 The proposal would create dwellings that far exceeded the U-value requirements set out in the Building Standards. They would be thermally efficient and work alongside modern energy systems to completely minimise energy consumption both electrical and heating.

This would not be achievable with a conversion of the existing.

4.9 Cost involved to convert or build new would be very similar.

- Buyers of course would have to undertake regular maintenance on the converted option.

4.10 Through the above thought processes it is deemed that demolition and construction of new would be the most practical, feasible and efficient for both applicant, surroundings and potential purchasers.

4.11 The owner/applicant has struggled greatly to get public liability insurance for the building given its condition. It was only renewed during the previous application at the last minute after finding an off island insurance broker. No insurance company on the island would insure the building including Kestrel Insurance who the applicant has a long running relationship with. The applicant has managed to renew this insurance but was notified that given the condition of the building the option to renew may not be achievable for much longer and as such this is a great factor in the proposal as the current building is close to not being insurable and thus becoming a safety issue.

5.0 Visual impact upon character of the village and the street scene

5.1 The proposal would result in a two storey building located within a prominent position within Glen Maye Village. When travelling through the village, along the A27 road, the majority of properties are characterised as traditional in appearance, ranging from single storey Manx cottages to two storey properties. There are also more modern properties in the village, including single storey bungalows, a row of two storey terraced properties (commissioners houses) and estates (Glen Maye Park). These are located throughout and including directly behind the proposed site forming Glen Close. The proposal would be apparent from a number of public viewpoints in relation to the street scene (access to car park from A27 road, within the car park, along Shore Road) and with this in mind the applicant has wanted to create a proposal

that completely respects the surroundings whilst being aesthetically pleasing to the eye in comparison to some of the surrounding properties.

5.2 In terms of planning policy General Policy 2 paragraph b and c are relevant to consider. Paragraph b indicates that development will only be permitted if the proposal respects the site and surroundings in terms of the siting, layout, scale, form, design and landscaping of buildings and the spaces around them. Paragraph c states that any development should not affect adversely the character of the surrounding landscape or townscape.

5.3 As described in full in part 8.0 of this statement, the proposal has been designed in a manner that respects the traditional character and appearance of Glen Maye. Being on an existing site and being only 800mm higher at most to the existing hotel, it would not represent a detrimental feature to the amenities of the locality and the village of Glen Maye. Materials and proportion have been carefully considered throughout the design stage.

6.0 Parking

6.1 Each of the 4 dwellings will have 2 parking spaces within the existing car park that the applicant owns.

6.2 The car park has approximately 45-47 parking spaces. Covered by deeds, this car park is solely for use by the patrons of the Waterfall Hotel and visitors to the Glen Maye National Glen. A large sign is present within the car park that states this.

6.3 The applicant proposes to look at refurbishing in the future along with landscaping to make more aesthetically pleasing.

6.4 Considering the main use for the car park would be removed, namely the Waterfall Hotel and the proposed dwellings would have

• their own parking spaces, parking will not be an issue.

6.5 The deed covenant would still be in place for visitors to the National Glen to have use of the car park.

7.0 Part B of General Policy 2 - siting, layout, scale, form, design and landscaping of buildings and the spaces around them

7.1 The siting of the proposed terrace dwellings has been carefully considered to respect the current set up of the Waterfall Hotel which is to be demolished. The existing building line will be repeated.

7.2 The area of the proposed dwellings is nearly identical to the existing. The overall external ground area of the proposed building is 220sq metres. The current Waterfall Hotel is 231sq metres.

7.3 The layout of the dwellings is mainly set over two floors. Kitchen, dining, living, WC, utility to ground floor. 3 bedrooms are created (2x double, 1 x single) to first floor alongwith one en suite and bathroom. The internal area totals 122sq metres.

7.4 The scale of the proposal does increase the height upon the existing but only marginally to allow the creation of the roof in the roof. It was imperative from the clients perspective to limit the impact this would have on the surroundings. The front eaves level has been slightly reduced by 350mm. The rear eaves height is approximately 2.7 metres higher due to the existing reducing down to one level at the rear. The ridge has increased by 800mm metres. This reduces any potential impact down to a bare minimum. It should be noted that whilst increasing in height, there would be no overbearing problems due to the surrounding Glen Close properties being higher than the proposed due to their increased ground level.

7.5 The form of the terrace of dwellings will be completely respect the traditional nature of Glen Maye and the surroundings. The pitched roof will be finished in a dark slate. The main walls will be of painted render finish. Chimneys and gable copings will be fitted also. Windows to the front elevation will be sliding sash. It will create a Manx Cottage feel.

7.6 Stone cladding is to be utilised to the front bays.

7.7 It should be noted that the surrounding properties are mainly more modern in design with a mix of bungalows and detached dwellings. The roof finish of Waterfall House next door has it would seem replaced the slate roof with concrete tiles which are not in keeping with tradition. This is the same for the bungalows.

7.8 As above precedent is in place for design flexibility. The proposal is felt to respect the locality and tradition of Glen Maye more than the current surrounding properties.

8.0 Amenity

8.1 Refuse storage would be placed within the existing storage building between the Waterfall Hotel and Waterfall House. This will allow ease for both residents and also refuse collectors.

8.2 The rear gardens are large. Between 76-102sq metres in size they average over 50% of the floor area of the dwelling. Working on a basis of 3 persons to a dwelling this equates to 25-34sq metres per person of amenity space on the private land.

8.3 Even with the large gardens proposed it is felt with the National Glen on the doorstep, there should be some flexibility in amenity requirement.

8.4 The existing Waterfall Hotel has a beer garden located at the pedestrian entrance to the National Glen. This is approximately

. 570sq metres in size. This can be utilised by the owners of the dwellings and the visitors to the National Glen.

9.0 Outlook

9.1 The front elevation will have a pleasing view looking out onto the upper trees of the national glen and also landscape further afield heading up to Dalby. The car park would not be the most aesthetically pleasing view but would be no worse than that of the surrounding properties. As stated in the parking part of this statement, the applicant will look at refurbishing the car park and landscape parts in the future which would improve this aspect.

9.2 The rear elevation would have a nice outlook out onto the gardens. At between 13-20 metres long they allow for a nice environment to be enjoyed.

9.3 The upper rooms would have an outlook to Glen Close. The rooms to the rear are purely bedrooms and as such the outlook is not as important.

9.4 Windows proposed within the dwellings will maximise natural light penetration within the rooms. The proposed respects the original theme of sash windows.

10.0 Overlooking

10.1 There will be no overlooking to the front elevations of the dwellings. The car park, beer garden to the existing Waterfall Hotel and trees to the National Glen are present.

10.2 No windows have been placed to the end terrace gables to eliminate any overlooking to neighbours on both Shore Road and the A27.

10.3 Whilst dwellings are located to Glen Close behind the site,

overlooking will not be an issue. The Glen Close dwellings are mainly bungalows and with their higher ground level (3.5 metres approx) could not be overlooked. Vice Versa the Glen Close dwellings could not create any overlooking issues to the new dwellings due to the distance. The Gables and Vale View which are directly behind the dwellings are approximately 26 metres away from the rear of the proposed.

11.0 Drainage

11.1 It is proposed that the foul drainage from the dwelling would run out to the front onto Shore Road and tap into the existing foul sewer running down the road.

11.2 The usage of the sewer will not be increased in comparison to what the existing building has implemented.

11.3 It is proposed that each dwelling has a new soakaway located to their rear garden/s for surface water drainage. A full percolation test would be needed but the aim will be to separate the foul from the surface drainage to reduce the inflow to the main sewer.

11.4 From research it has been found that a public sewer line runs approximately half way across the back amenity area of the site and down the West boundary next to the neighbouring property Waterfall House. This sewer run picks up the drainage from the properties to Glen Close.

11.5 All building works undertaken within 3 metres of this sewer line running through the site would be undertaken via a build over agreement with the Isle of Man Drainage Authority.

12.0 Landscaping

12.1 The front curtilage of the dwellings will have a mixture of hard and soft landscaping.

13.2 Small lawned/planted areas will be located along each boundary between dwellings. A mixture of shrubs, planting will be incorporated.

12.3 The rear gardens will be split level due to the difference in ground level.

12.4 Boundaries will be created with dwarf stone walling to the front to tie in with the local vernacular and close boarded fencing to the side and rear. The existing natural hedging and shrubs to the rear are proposed to be kept as much as is feasible. Any new to be planted will be chosen to tie in with the existing.

12.5 It is proposed that the actual material used for the paving and patios is confirmed with the Planning Department prior to ordering so agreement can be had on type used.

13.0 Previous Application Points

13.1 The previous Planning Application was 17/01189/B. This application was refused at the Appeal stage.

13.2 Main application dates:

- Planning Application submission date : 15th November 2017.
- Main updated statement and drawings for application : 2nd March 2018.
- Planning Application Decision : 12th June 2018.
- Appeal request lodged : 27th June 2018.
- Appeal Inquiry : 22nd August 2018.

- Appeal decision : 9th October 2018.

13.3 The original planning application (17/01189/B) was recommended for approval by the Planning Officer.

13.4 The application met all the main Planning Policies barring Community Policy 4.

13.5 The Committee refused the application on one point:

: It has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Planning Committee, that the premises are not commercially viable or could not be made so: the proposal is therefore in conflict of Community Policy 4.

13.6 The Chief Minister following the Appeal process agreed with the above and stated:

: It has not been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Planning Committee, that the premises are not commercially viable or could not be made so: the proposal is therefore in conflict of Community Policy 4 of the Isle of Man Strategic Plan 2016.

13.7 The applicant whilst feeling that this Policy had been covered, has taken it on board and over the past year has had The Waterfall Public House and site in its entirety for sale on the World Wide Web on both local Estate Agents website and the overseas property site Zoopla. We can confirm that there has been minimal interest in the property, only two viewings and absolutely no offers for purchase.

13.8 We attach to this application, a letter date 27th January 2020, from the Estate Agents advertising the property that confirms the above and notes that the site is a high risk venture for any potential purchaser leading to

13.9 It should also be noted that the building has remained empty.

Conclusion

It should be considered that the proposal can be viewed favourably when assessed against each of the key criteria including Community Policy 4. Provisions have been made from the Development Plan with strong regard for Strategic Plan Policies:

- General Policy 2
- Housing Policy 14
- Strategic Plan 1
- Strategic Plan 2
- Strategic Plan 3
- Strategic Plan 10
- Community Policy 4

As described in this Planning Statement, it is felt that the proposal complies with all the Policies outlined above.