

Planning Application Objection

Riverside Quay 20/00187/FUL

Application under Section 42 of the Town and Country Planning (Scotland) Act to:

1. vary Condition 1 of planning permission 15/00790/FUL, and

2. authorise use of existing student accommodation as short term holiday lets between:

1 June and 31 August, annually at:

Riverside Quay, 1 Forthside Way, Stirling, FK8 1HZ, for UK PBSA (Forthside Way, Stirling) Limited 20/00187/FUL

1. Riverside Community Council objects to this development due to the impact it will have on car parking in the area. There is not the available car private parking on site to accommodate a change of use to short term holiday lets which should be one car parking space per bedroom. Why should this be any different from the requirements of nearby Premier Inn or Travel Lodge who are serving the same customer base ie short term holiday lets ? This area is not within a Controlled Parking Zone and should provide one parking space per bedroom and one parking space per 3 staff. (SG14). If this accommodation is serving a different customer base then the current parking conditions need to change to suit the change of use, so that the new customer profile parking needs are met in terms of planning requirements.

2) Riverside Community wishes to have a hearing with the planning panel so that we can object publicly regarding the impact it will have on parking in our community and with regard to the impact it will have on the surrounding area. This in turn affects the amenity in the surrounding areas and has a direct effect on the residents of Riverside who wish to voice their objection at a Hearing at the Planning Panel.

First the objection that it will affect traffic, parking, access in the site and surrounding area and the design of the development and its relationship / impact it has on its surroundings. It needs to be highlighted that there is evidence to suggest there appears to be no enforcement of the agreed condition “not to include car owning households” tenancy agreement under section 10 of the Reporters decision of the Appeals Decision Notice 26/10/16 .

This evidence is based directly on the number of cars parked each evening in the access road immediately next to the gates to Riverside Quay each evening (see photo 1).

It should be noted in the Reporters decision notice 26/10/16 “in response to the council’s concerns, and those of the community council, the appellant argues firstly that the proposed development will not include car owning households; occupiers of the development will confirm such by signing their tenancy agreements, secondly that the council’s parking standards should not be applied to the appeal proposals, as it does not believe that the development will lead to or exacerbate on- street parking difficulties in the area and, thirdly, that the appeal proposals are consistent with SG14, in particular the mode hierarchy described at paragraphs 2.9 to 2.11, by placing the travel needs of pedestrians first, cyclists, second, public transport users third, before those who use of motor vehicles”.

Traffic Parking and access impact on the surrounding community. This can only be confirmed by reality of the regular parking of cars outside the closed gates of Riverside quay at night in the access road to the site and lack of evidence of the cycle parking being used. (see photo 2). Also food deliveries in the evening are frequently parked on the double yellow lines and pavement outside RQ as there is no parking available for deliveries on site . (photo 3). This causes problems with cars coming from Forth Street wishing to turn right.

Since RQ opened there has been an ongoing issue with car parking on the double yellow lines on Shore Road. (we have received numerous complaints regarding this. It is a new problem that has coincided with Riverside Quay opening). All of this may well be a result of displacement parking.

The figure of 2% car ownership as given by the developers at RQ. It has to be questioned this may be severely flawed given the amount of car parking in the access road immediately next to RQ and the site of the impending new housing development. This would far exceeds 2% and indicates a need to question whether the clause in the tenancy agreement is being implemented as per section 10 of the decision notice. It must be questioned how this can be enforced. There appears to be empty cycle parking and much car parking immediately adjacent to RQ.

Parking will only increase with short term lets with a more varied client base and every evening the access road is full of parked cars. This will have a detrimental impact on the surrounding areas parking and amenity. Currently car owners parking in the access road outnumber bike parking on site which regularly remains empty. (see photos).

With the availability of 209 beds this could lead to a dramatic rise in car parking as there is no way to enforce parking restrictions / car ownership to these short term lets.

If RQ was to be class 7 for its use then one parking space would be required per room and one parking space per 3 staff and an increase in disabled parking.

There is clearly no room on site for this to happen. Therefore the impact of change of use can only have a detrimental affect on both parking and amenity to existing residents of Riverside.

There is concern that the use may then change to long term non student lets as demand for expensive student accommodation is not met in the current climate. This is already evident in student cities in England and Wales due to lack of demand for purpose built student accommodation.