



**PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD
WEDNESDAY 28 JANUARY 2026**

Table of Key Adoptions

No.	Item	Summary of Decisions
1.	Apologies	<i>Alderman Callan, Scott, Councillors Anderson, Nicholl</i>
2.	Declarations of Interest	<i>Alderman Coyle, Councillors Kane, McQuillan</i>
3.	Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held Wednesday 26 November	<i>Confirmed as a correct record</i>
4.	Order of Items and Confirmation of Registered Speakers	
4.1	LA01/2023/1142/F, Objection, 42 Dhu Varren, Portrush	<i>That the Planning Committee defer application LA01/2023/1142/F, Objection, 42 Dhu Varren, Portrush to allow for the re- notification of neighbours.</i>
5.	Confidential Items	
5.1	Retail & Leisure Capacity Study-Nexus Presentation	<i>That the Planning Committee accept the attached Retail & Commercial Leisure Capacity Study and Policy Briefing Note to inform both the preparation of the LDP</i>

		and decision-making on related planning applications in the Borough.
6.	Schedule of applications:	
6.1	LA01/2022/1529/F (Council), Site 10m North of 34 Strand Park, Cloughmills	<i>Deferred for further information</i>
6.2	LA01/2025/0670/F (Council), Lands between 13 and 39 Quay Road, Ballycastle	<i>Agree and Approved</i>
6.3	LA01/2024/0223/F (Objection), Playing field / public open space area adjacent/east of 55 Garvagh Road, Dungiven	<i>That Planning Committee defer application LA01/2024/0223/F for a site visit to see what space there is and consider car parking options.</i>
6.4	LA01/2021/0777/O (Referral), Land immediately adjacent to 124B Dunlade Road, Greysteel	<i>Agree and Refused</i>
6.5	LA01/2024/0061/F (Referral), Agricultural Lands 12 metres North West of No. 18 Harbour Road, Ballintoy	<i>Disagree and Approve</i>
6.6	LA01/2024/1283/O (Referral), Lands between No.'s 30 and 36 Dunboe Road, Castlerock	<i>Disagree and Approve</i>
7.	Correspondence	
7.1	DfI – Chief Planner’s Update	<i>Noted</i>
7.2	DfI – Policy Revision to the SPPS – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy	<i>Noted</i>
7.3	Farmers for Action – New Bridge, Kilrea	<i>That Planning officials inform Farmers for Action on the outcome of the Notice of Motion brought before the Council Meeting held on 6th January 2026 regarding a new bridge over the River Bann in Kilrea</i>
7.4	DfE – Consultation on Changes to Accommodation Regulation – Council’s Response 05.01.26	<i>Noted</i>

7.5	NILGA – Planning Learning and Engagement Programme	<i>That nominations be agreed via group leads or by email from the Director of Corporate Services to Elected Members</i>
7.6	Confirmation of Listings – BT Kiosks x 5	<i>Noted</i>
7.7	Proposed variation (No 1) to the County Donegal Development Plan 2024-2030	<i>Noted</i>
8.	Reports for Decision	
8.1	TPO Confirmation – 23 Mountsandel Road, Coleraine	<i>That Planning Committee agree Option 1: Resolve to confirm the TPO, with modifications, as detailed above at Items 8.1 – 8.6</i>
8.2	TPO Confirmation – Ballyarton House, Cloyfin Road, Coleraine	
8.3	TPO Confirmation – Cranagh View, Coleraine	
8.4	TPO Confirmation – Glenfield House, 12 & 14 Atlantic Road, Coleraine	
8.5	TPO Confirmation – Main Street, Ballykelly	
8.6	TPO Confirmation – Lands at Strangemore & adjoining land, 2 Main Street, Dungiven	
9.	Reports for Noting	
9.1	Finance Report Period 1-7 2025_26	<i>Noted</i>
9.2	Finance Report Period 1-8 2025_26	<i>Noted</i>
9.3	Second Quarterly Report on Planning Performance	<i>Noted</i>
9.4	Local Development Plan - 6 Month Work Programme	<i>Noted</i>
10.	Confidential Items	
10.1	Legal Update	<i>Noted</i>
11.	Any Other Relevant Business (in accordance with Standing Order 12 (o))	<i>None</i>

**MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING
COMMITTEE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CIVIC HEADQUARTERS AND
VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE
ON WEDNESDAY 28 JANUARY 2026 AT 10.30AM**

Chair: Councillor Kane (C)

Committee Members: Alderman Coyle (C), Hunter (R), S McKillop (C),
Councillors, C Archibald (C), Kennedy (C), McGurk (R),
McMullan (C), McQuillan (R), Storey (C), Watton (C)

Officers Present: M Quinn, Director of Corporate Services (C)
M Jones, Council Solicitor, Corporate and Regulatory (R)
J Lundy, Development Management (local applications)
Manager (C)
S Mathers, Development Management Manager (C)
S Mulhern, Development Plan Manager (C/R)
E Hudson, Senior Planning Officer (C)
J McMath, Senior Planning Officer (C)
M McErlain, Senior Planning Officer (C)
S McKinley, Planning Officer (R)
I Owens, Committee & Member Services Officer (R/C)
J Keen, Committee & Member Services Officer (C/R)

In Attendance: A Lennox, ICT Operations Manager (Interim) (C/R)
G Lidster, HED (R)

Press 1 no. (R)
Public 15 no. including Speakers

Key: R = Remote in attendance C= Chamber in attendance

Registered Speakers

Item No	Name
LA01/2024/0223/F	Raymond Brady
LA01/2021/0777/O	Mark Cairns
LA01/2024/0061/F	Conor McGarry
LA01/2024/1283/O	Matt Kennedy Maurice Bradley

The Director of Corporate Services undertook a roll call.

The Chair reminded Planning Committee of their obligations under the Local Government Code of Conduct and Remote Meetings Protocol.

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were recorded for Alderman Callan, Scott, Councillors Anderson and Nicholl.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Declarations of interest were recorded for:

Alderman Coyle in Item 5.3 LA01/2022/1529/F, Objection, Playing field / public open space area adjacent/east of 55 Garvagh Road, Dungiven. Alderman Coyle left the Chamber during consideration of this item and did not vote.

Councillor Kane in Item 5.1 LA01/2022/1529/F (Council), Site 10m North of 34 Strand Park, Cloughmills. Councillor Kane left the Chamber during consideration of this item and did not vote.

Councillor McQuillan in Item 5.1 LA01/2022/1529/F (Council), Site 10m North of 34 Strand Park, Cloughmills. Councillor McQuillan left the Chamber during consideration of this item and did not vote.

3. MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD WEDNESDAY 26 NOVEMBER 2025

Copy, previously circulated.

Proposed by Councillor Watton

Seconded by Councillor Kennedy

– That the Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held Wednesday 26 November 2025 are signed as a correct record.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

11 Members voted For; 0 Members voted Against, 0 Member Abstained.

The Chair declared the motion carried.

RESOLVED - That the Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held Wednesday 26 November are signed as a correct record.

4. ORDER OF ITEMS AND CONFIRMATION OF REGISTERED SPEAKERS

4.1 LA01/2023/1142/F, Objection, 42 Dhu Varren, Portrush

Development Management (local applications) Manager provided the following information:

Correspondence was received from the neighbouring property at No. 44 Dhu Varren in relation to amended plans which were published to the portal on the 20 January 2026.

The amended plans provided clarification across drawings to ensure that the elevations and floor plans aligned. Levels were added to plans for further clarification however, as these were already provided on the existing site plan, no further notification was required on this point.

The garage plans include the detail of a section running through the site. The elevation of the proposed dwelling on the section showed a different window arrangement on the ground floor to the arrangement shown on the most recent elevation plan (Drawing No. 05 REV 3). An updated garage plan was requested to align with the Elevation Plan. As this includes a larger window on the elevation depicted on the garage plan section it is considered that further neighbour notification on this point is required.

The recommendation is to defer the application to allow for the re-notification of neighbours.

Proposed by Alderman Coyle

Seconded by Councillor Watton

- That the Planning Committee defer application LA01/2023/1142/F, Objection, 42 Dhu Varren, Portrush to allow for the re-notification of neighbours.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

11 Members voted For; 0 Members voted Against, 0 Member Abstained.

The Chair declared the motion carried and application deferred.

RESOLVED - That the Planning Committee defer application LA01/2023/1142/F, Objection, 42 Dhu Varren, Portrush to allow for the re-notification of neighbours.

CHANGE IN ORDER OF BUSINESS

The Chair advised that Agenda Item 9.1 Retail & Leisure Capacity Study-Nexus Presentation will be considered as the next Item in the meeting.

MOTION TO PROCEED *'IN COMMITTEE'*

Proposed by Councillor McMullan
Seconded by Councillor C Archibald and

AGREED – That Planning Committee move *'In Committee'*.

* **Members of the Press and Public left the meeting at 10:43am**

5. CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS

5.1 Retail & Leisure Capacity Study-Nexus Presentation

Confidential report, by virtue of paragraph(s) 6b of Part 1 of Schedule 6 of the Local Government Act (Northern Ireland) 2014 was presented by Development Plan Manager.

Purpose of Report

To present the Causeway Coast and Glens Retail and Commercial Leisure Capacity Study (2025). This includes a presentation from NEXUS Retail's Planning Consultant, Rob Pearson, who carried out the Study.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Planning Committee accept the attached Retail & Commercial Leisure Capacity Study and Policy Briefing Note to inform both the preparation of the LDP and decision-making on related planning applications in the Borough.

The Chair invited R Pearson and J Batrouney to present.

R Pearson presented via Power Point presentation to provide an overview of the study.

J Batrouney presented via Power Point presentation to provide an overview of the findings from the towns considered in the study.

R Pearson provided information regarding population and expenditure forecasts, market share changes and comparison floor space capacity. R Pearson also outlined recommendations from the study.

In response to questions the Development Plan Manager outlined SPPS policy and provided examples to illustrate how the policy applies in practice including how it applies to rural development. The Development Plan Manager advised that concerns raised regarding rural development and sustainability can be addressed in the draft Plan Strategy. In response to comments regarding business rates the Development Plan Manager advised that this not a Planning matter, but rather a wider Council matter.

In response to questions. R Pearsons stated that shopping patterns have changed and Council have an opportunity to consider how town centre spaces are used.

In response to questions J Batrouney concurred with comments from R Pearson and stated that town centres can adapt to changes in shopping patterns.

The Development Plan Manager read the recommendation.

Proposed by Councillor Storey

Seconded by Councillor Kennedy

- that the Planning Committee accept the attached Retail & Commercial Leisure Capacity Study and Policy Briefing Note to inform both the preparation of the LDP and decision-making on related planning applications in the Borough.

The Chair put the motion to the vote

11 Members voted For, 0 Members voted Against, 0 Members Abstained

The Chair declared the motion carried

RESOLVED - that the Planning Committee accept the attached Retail & Commercial Leisure Capacity Study and Policy Briefing Note to inform both the preparation of the LDP and decision-making on related planning applications in the Borough.

MOTION TO PROCEED ‘IN PUBLIC’

Proposed by Councillor Watton

Seconded by Alderman S McKillop and

AGREED – That Planning Committee move ‘*In Public*’.

* **The Press and Public were readmitted to the meeting at 11:48am**

The Chair declared a recess at 11:48am

- * **The meeting reconvened at 12:02pm**
- * **Having declared an interest, the Councillor Kane vacated the Chair and did not rejoin the meeting.**
- * **Alderman Coyle, Vice Chair, assumed the Chair.**

6. SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS

6.1 LA01/2022/1529/F (Council), Site 10m North of 34 Strand Park, Cloughmills

Report, site visit report and presentation were previously circulated and presented by Senior Planning Officer, E Hudson.

Council Application to be determined by Planning Committee

App No: LA01/2022/1529/F

App Type: Full

Proposal: Proposed development of four No town houses and four pair of semi-detached dwellings - 12 No units in total and associated parking (Amended plans)

Recommendation

That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to REFUSE planning permission as set out in section 10.

Addendum Recommendation

That the Committee note the contents of this Addendum, has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to REFUSE planning permission as set out in section 10.

Senior Planning Officer presented via power point as follows:

- Planning Application LA01/2022/1529/F. This is a full application for 4 town houses and four pair of semi detached dwellings – 12 in total. 10 m north of 34 Strand Park, Cloughmills.
- Site visit took place Monday. Addendum to Committee report
- This is the red line boundary of the site. The site is located in the SDL of Cloughmills which is a large village as designated in the NAP. The site

currently comprises a disused playpark and all weather pitch with residual grass areas surrounding it.

- Aerial overview of the park – one part equipped play park and the other an all weather pitch. Planning histories would indicate that the play park dates back to the late 1970's. The site is surrounded by residential development and is accessed off Strand Park it is easily accessible from surrounding residential development and catered for wide age range including g younger and older children.
- This is an extract from the NAP. The land is zoned as a Major area of existing open space. As such Policy OS 1 of PPS 8 applies. Policy states that development which would result in the loss of open space will not be permitted. The only exceptions to this are:
 - Where re-development would bring substantial community benefits that decisively outweigh the loss of open space; or
 - Where it is demonstrated that the loss of open space will have no significant detrimental impact on the amenity, character, biodiversity of an area and where:
 - In cases of an area of open space of 2 hectares or less alternative provision is made by the developer which is at least as accessible to current users and at least equivalent in terms of size, usefulness, attractiveness, safety and quality;
- The Proposal does not meet any of these exceptions and the principle of development is contrary to OS 1 of PPS 8.
- Supporting information was submitted outlining:
That policy does not have to be slavishly applied, adequate open space in the village and that the Council has identified the land as surplus to requirements.
- The supporting info also referred to a planning application for social housing approved on an area of open space and that this would set a precedent. This relates to planning permission granted for 8 social housing units by Triangle Housing in 2010.
- Annex C of PPS 8 states that in relation to Housing Executive land within existing older estates there can often be substantial community benefit in permitting the appropriate redevelopment of part of open space provision. In this case the development for social housing was considered to meet the exception. This application is for a private developer. In addition, the previous approval retained a percentage of the site for public open space.

Also, this area of open space was not an equipped children's play area as the application is rather an incidental area of open space common in housing developments which provide visual relief and informal play areas.

- Supporting info also refers to the biodiversity park located in the village which incorporates community buildings, riverside walkway allotments and play area. Applying the National Playing fields association minimum standard as set out in PPS 8 generates a demand for 1.05 ha of children's play area – this includes equipped play areas as well as casual and informal play areas. The level of public open space in Cloughmills has diminished since the publication of the NAP. The only play area available is the biodiversity park which lies in the southern portion of the village not easily accessible for the northern portion of the village. At 0.065 hectares it is substantially below the minimum standard of the NPFA guidance and also only 20% of the size of the play area on the application site.
- There are a number of areas zoned for housing in the NAP which are not developed and which have no planning permissions – including zoning csh 3, 5, 6, 7. As such, there are a number of sites where housing could be brought forward which would be in accordance with the development plan.
- Google street view images. Policy OS 1 of PPS 8 is clear that there is a presumption against the loss of open space irrespective of its physical condition and appearance. It would appear that the park has not been maintained over the years which has led to the deterioration of the park. This is not a reason in itself to permit redevelopment to an alternative use.
- Layout of proposed housing development. Notwithstanding the principle of development is considered unacceptable. The layout is considered to meet the requirements of the relevant policy namely PPS 7, Addendum to PPS 7, Creating places and DCAN 8. The detail of this consideration is outlined in the committee report. There is adequate amenity space provided, density is in keeping with surrounding development, adequate separation to protect privacy and adequate parking provision. No concerns in relation to compliance with PPS 7, Creating Places.
- 6 Letter of objection received 5 of which are from the same address. Issues raised include:
 - Overlooking, loss of light, impact on biodiversity, flooding, loss of open space/play park and impact on water/sewage.
 - No consultees issues.
- Refusal is recommended as outlined in Part 10 of your committee report.

Councillor Kennedy expressed concern regarding the antisocial behaviour in the area and stated it is not an option for Council to do nothing. Councillor Kennedy proposed that the application is deferred for one month for the Leisure and Development Directorate to consider how the site can be used.

In response to Councillor Kennedy's comments the Senior Planning Officer stated this application was considered under planning policy, that there is a need for open space and the developer has not put forward an alternative for providing the open space.

Councillor McMullan seconded the proposal to defer the application to consider alternative options.

Councillor Watton referred to the deteriorated condition of the site, referred to the Biodiversity Garden in Cloughmills as being an accessible open space and stated that the reasons for refusal are sparse.

In response to Councillor Watton's comments the Senior Planning Officer stated that the policy states open space is required irrespective of appearance or condition. The Senior Planning Officer stated that the policy is clear, deterioration is not justification for loss of open space.

Councillor Storey considered that this is a classic example of collective failure within the Council. Councillor Storey referred to the policy of development that is in place and questioned how it would impact on those affected by antisocial behaviour. Councillor Storey agreed with the proposal to defer with the view of Council Officers giving consideration to what the best options for the site are.

Alderman S McKillop concurred with previous speakers stating that the antisocial behaviour needs to be addressed and supported the proposal to defer.

In response to questions from Councillor McMullan, Councillor Storey stated that the land is for sale subject to planning permission, that Council has a chance to rectify allowing the site getting into such a deteriorated condition and this opportunity should be taken.

Proposed by Councillor Kennedy

Seconded by Alderman S McKillop

- That the Planning Committee defer application LA01/2022/1529/F for one month for the Leisure and Development Directorate to explore alternatives for the site.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.
9 Members voted For; 0 Members voted Against, 0 Member Abstained.
The Chair declared the motion carried and application deferred.

RESOLVED - That the Planning Committee defer application LA01/2022/1529/F for one month for the Leisure and Development Directorate to consider how the site can be used.

- * **Alderman Coyle, Vice Chair, vacated the Chair at 12:30pm.**
- * **Councillor Kane returned to the Chamber and assumed the Chair at 12:30pm.**

6.2 LA01/2025/0670/F (Council), Lands between 13 and 39 Quay Road, Ballycastle

Report and presentation were previously circulated and presented by Senior Planning Officer, J McMath.

Council Application to be determined by Planning Committee

No: LA01/2025/0670/F

App Type: Full

Proposal: Proposed 8m high by 30m long ball stop net to car park end of football pitch.

Recommendation

That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to APPROVE planning permission subject to the conditions set out in section 10.

Senior Planning Officer presented via power point as follows:

- This is a local application with no representations and is presented today as a council interest application.
- The proposal is for the erection of an 8m x 30m long ball stop net to the car park end of the existing football pitch at the Quay Road playing pitches situated at Quay Road, Ballycastle.
- The site is located within the following designations as provided for by the NAP

- the Settlement Development Limit (SDL) of Ballycastle,
 - within a major area of existing open space
 - the Tow Valley Local Landscape Policy Area (LLPA)
 - Ballycastle conservation area
 - an area of archaeology potential
 - Antrim coast and glens Area of Natural Beauty (AONB)
- The site and immediate area has been long established as playing pitches with pitches granted permission in 2004 and the new leisure facilities, which are currently under construction, approved in 2023. The existing car park will be replaced by an accessible play area as approved by the 2023 approval.
 - The proposed ball stop will be made from galvanised and power coated posts coloured green and mid posts with black PVC covered line wire and with 120mm black mesh netting.
 - The ball stop net is complementary to the existing long established land use of playing pitches and will not result in the loss of open space. As the net is ancillary to the playing pitches the scale, design and finish will not impact on townscape, the conservation area or the AONB given the siting within the playing pitches site.
 - The site is located within the Tow Valley LLPA, the features of which are the wooded slopes, the open recreational grounds and the wooded Dunamallaght motte. The ball stop net does not impact on the motte feature of the LLPA and during the processing of this application, the ball stop net was repositioned to be an acceptable distance away from the crown spread of retained trees with confirmation provided that no works are required to trim back any of the trees for clearance. As such, the proposed ball stop net will not impact on protected trees and will not harm the features of the LLPA.
 - A Preliminary Ecological Assessment was submitted and concluded that the proposed works do not require the removal of any trees, scrubs or hedges or have direct works on the pavilion there will be limited impact on protected species.
 - A Habitats Regulations Assessment checklist has been completed and the development will not have a significant impact on designated sites. Historic Environment Division have confirmed that there will be no impact on archaeology.

- The recommendation is to approve as the proposal complies with the Northern Area Plan and policies contained in SPPS, PPS2, PPS6, PPS8 and the Planning Strategy for Rural Northern Ireland.

There were no questions or comments from Committee members.

There were no registered speakers.

Proposed by Councillor McMullan

Seconded by Councillor Kennedy

- That the Planning Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to APPROVE planning permission subject to the conditions set out in section 10.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

10 Members voted For; 0 Members voted Against, 0 Members Abstained.

The Chair declared the motion carried and application approved.

RESOLVED - That the Planning Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to APPROVE planning permission subject to the conditions set out in section 10.

6.3 LA01/2024/0223/F (Objection), Playing field / public open space area adjacent/east of 55 Garvagh Road, Dungiven

Report, Speaking Rights Template Raymond Brady, Objection Raymond Brady on behalf of Ranyglass Residents, Objection Raymond Brady and presentation were previously circulated and presented by Development Management (local applications) Manager, J Lundy.

Objection Application to be determined by Planning Committee

App No: LA01/2024/0223/F

App Type: Full

Proposal: Playing field / public open space area adjacent/east of 55 Garvagh Road, Dungiven

Recommendation

That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for recommendation set out in Section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to **APPROVE** planning permission subject to the conditions set out in section 10.

Development Management (local applications) Manager presented via power point presentation as follows:

- Playing field / public open space area adjacent/east of 55 Garvagh Road, Dungiven. The proposal is for a new terrace, associated fence and path for Dungiven GAC
- It is an objection item with 14 objections from 6 different addresses.
- A summary of the objection points are set out in para 5.2 of the PCR.
- I will provide a verbal update for 2 further objections received this week that have been circulated. They also attach the objections previously received during the processing of the application that have been considered in the PCR.
- The emails advise they have serious concerns relating to traffic parking and health and safety implications, arising from the application. The email refers to paragraphs 8.11 to 8.14 of the PCR relating to PPS 3 Access, movement and parking.
- The objector states that this assessment is misleading and has not taken account of the capacity of the site to accommodate 598 spectators.
- The email refers to a Gaelic match held on Monday 15th September 2025 that demonstrated the:
 - Indiscriminate Parking –Blocked Pedestrian Footpaths –
 - Critically Reduced Road Width
 - Visibility Splays at Junctions Completely Obstructed
 - Pedestrian Crossing Points Blocked
 - Parking Directly Opposite Residential Driveways
- This was evident in the photos of streets with cars parked on roads and pavements.
- A letter from NIHE dated 30/9/24 to St Canice's GAC that they have cancelled the application to purchase land at playing field adjacent to 55 Garvagh road.
- Also attached to the emails is an initial roads consultation to a previous application that was subsequently approved following amendments.
- I will address the points of objection throughout the presentation.

- As stated, the application is for a terrace at an existing pitch. The site location shows the pitch in the blue lands which includes existing changing rooms and car park. The existing facilities were approved under the planning histories as set out in section 3 of the PCR.
- The aerial photograph showing the context of the site. To the north the site is bounded by residential development and to the south housing abounds the SE side of the pitch and open space associated with Rannylglass to the remainder of the south boundary. The Garvagh road to the west and open countryside to the east. There is a change in levels from the open space with the pitch being at a lower level.
- The proposal is for a new terrace, associated fence and new path to be located within the red line.
- The proposal is to provide a path exiting the grounds at the changing room to take spectators to a terrace, the path proposed in grasscrete will go behind the existing vegetation which is to be reinforced with new hedgerow planting and 10 trees related from the location of the terrace. Access to the terrace will be through a turnstile gate and will consist of 2 steps. A 2.4m weld mesh fence will be related to the rear to the terrace
- The terrace proposed is 25.6m along the back to the steps and 26.5m along the front. The first step is 15 cm higher than the pitch level. There are no barriers between it and the pitch. The dashed line you can see faintly on the plans is the existing retaining wall and 2.4m fence to be relocated. The 10 trees and hedgerow are also shown on the plans that are to be removed and located further south as shown on the previous slide. Compensatory planting cannot be done to the rear of the proposed terrace and fence due to watermain infrastructure.
- A section of the terrace, the lower section shows the level of cut as shown on the dark dashed line. The terrace is 1.6m deep, from the front of the first step to the back. The open space to the housing development shown rising slightly up from the proposed pitch.
- The existing pitch and boundary.
- Photos showing the location of the grasscrete path, the existing fence is to be retained along with the hedgerow and trees. This area is also to be planted with 10 trees and further hedging.

- The trees and hedging to be removed to facilitate the terrace. An application for a TPO has been made to protect these trees. The TPO officer has advised that they do not meet the requirements for protection. A biodiversity checklist was also submitted and an ecology statement carried out by an ecologist confirmed no impact on protected species or habitats. NED were consulted and are content that the proposal is unlikely to significantly impact on protected species or habitats.
- The open space and adjacent housing
- The existing pitch and car park.
- The view of the pitch from the Garvagh Road.
- In relation to the points raised in the objections NIHE, as the owner of the land was notified of the application and also consulted on 2 occasions. They advise correctly that planning permission does not confer title and it is the responsibility of the developer to ensure they control all the lands to carry out the development.
- In response to capacity the agent has advised that the Club confirmed that there will be no increase to numbers. The agent submitted further supporting info 10.7.2025. it advises that the pitch has been used as a training facility for many years, the main pitch is located at the top of the Garvagh Road with Main Street. It is used for youth development, training sessions and occasional small-scale youth primarily and senior games. The proposed terrace does not seek to change or intensify this use. It offers a safe, improved viewing area for those who already attend the area. They rebut the use of the SGSA Green guide for density and that the suggestion the terrace could accommodate nearly 600 spectators is a misapplication of the green guide which is intended for large, regulated sports grounds / stadia.
- In relation to Traffic and Parking the agent advised: the proposal will not increase user numbers or event frequency, there will be no additional demand for parking. The existing informal arrangements remain sufficient for the current low-level use. The terrace will improve safety by encouraging spectators to stand off the pitch rather than on grass banks or near vehicles. Dungiven GAC are a very community-focused club and very open to meeting objectors to discuss their concerns in order to improve existing parking behaviour at any of the existing events, but it's the club's position that this new terrace will not exacerbate existing parking or amenity conditions.
- In the Departments assessment as set out in the PCR:

There is extant permission for a smaller terrace which is 13 m in length that can be constructed without further planning permission.

This proposal is to increase the size to establish a safe standing space for spectators. As you could see from the photographs the available standing space is around the edge of the pitch and on a steep bank and elevated car park. The objectors also submitted photos of spectators standing on the access to the changing rooms.

The objectors have referred to the Guide to Safety at Sports Grounds (Green guide). The SGSA is the UK Government's advisor on safety at sports grounds as stated on their website it is used around the world by architects and designers as a best practice guide for the development and refurbishment of stadiums.

The Department of communities has endorsed the latest SGSA Guide. In its circular the key consideration is that the guidance provides for a proportionate approach to safety and recognises the variances that exist across the sports grounds that will use the guidance. In terms of the built environment, the guidance is not being applied retrospectively.

The guide starts as standard capacity of 4.7m persons per metre and then you look at other factors (p) physical condition, is there barriers in place, has it shelter condition of the structure and (s) views of play, the quality of the safety management in each area. It sets standards for areas of standing terraces with barriers.

It does not include paths, access points etc, these cannot be used for viewing, they should be kept clear of entry, exit, emergency exit, for wheelchairs etc

It states that to Factor in physical condition and safety management. Calculation must be made by a competent person – someone with sufficient training and experience to conduct the assessment according to the green guide.

We have assessed the information and provided by the objections and the agent.

- The grasscrete path is discounted as a viewing area, it is to the rear of existing trees and hedging and a fence and this area is also to be augmented with additional trees and vegetation removing any potential views of the pitch. The proposed terrace is an increase to the previously

approved terrace and is to provide an appropriate space for current attendees to have a safe standing space and on this basis we have recommended approval. The parking standards for pitches requires no parking for spectators and that 1 space per 3 players is provided, which can be provided in the current car park. It is only stadia where spectator parking is required and stadia is defined as large scale venues with tiered seating.

- The images submitted by the objectors of the cars parked on pavements and roads is a matter for the PSNI and the Club. The Club have indicated that they are happy to meet with the objectors on this matter. This is outside of the application process and relates to ongoing historic issues. We have balanced the approved terrace and the increased length in this application, that people already attend the pitch which is outside of our control and that as advised by the agent this is for current attendees to provide a safe standing area.

Approval has been recommended.

In response to questions the Development Management (local applications) Manager advised that there is an approved terrace accessed alongside the pitch which has been extended from 17 metres to 27 metres. The Development Management (local applications) Manager advised that land ownership is not a Planning matter, the requirement is that the owners are notified.

The Chair invited R Brady to speak in objection to the planning application.

R Brady stated that the residents are not opposed to development, they are concerned about access and parking. R Brady referred to a study completed in 2015 containing photographic evidence which shows indiscriminate carparking which causes hazards, junction splays being obstructed, cars parked on the grass amenities site beside the playpark. R Brady stated children have been knocked down on this road. R Brady stated that there is a safety concern, that the traffic test has not been met. R Brady referred to a previous planning application which the Department for Infrastructure raised objections. R Brady stated that an increase in 20 spectators shows intensive use, that capacity had been understated by the GAA Club and that the GAA Club has not reached out to local residents. R Brady stated that the GAA Club host Championship matches which increases attendance at the grounds, this is 3 times the current capacity and an increase in traffic. R Brady stated that the Northern Ireland Housing Executive have confirmed that they have not sold their land to the Club. R Brady stated that a foreseeable and avoidable accident can be prevented.

In response to questions R Brady confirmed that historically traffic accidents have been known to occur on this road. In response to further questions R Brady stated that during training sessions and on match days the carpark is full. R Brady stated that on the day of the survey there was over 100 cars which is typical on match days.

Councillor Watton considered it appropriate to hold a site visit to see what room there is and consider the carparking options.

Councillor McGurk requested that the Department of Infrastructure are present at the next Planning meeting.

Proposed by Councillor Watton

Seconded by Councillor Storey

- That Planning Committee defer application LA01/2024/0223/F for a site visit to see what space there is and consider car parking options.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

10 Members voted For; 0 Members voted Against, 0 Members Abstained.

The Chair declared the motion carried and application deferred for a site visit.

RESOLVED - That Planning Committee defer application LA01/2024/0223/F for a site visit to see what space there is and consider car parking options.

The Chair declared a recess at 1.05pm until 1:45pm.

J Keen, Committee and Member Services Officer left The Chamber at 1.15 pm

I Owens, Committee and Member Services Officer arrived in The Chamber 1.45 pm

The meeting resumed at 1.45 pm.

The Director of Corporate Services undertook a roll call.

6.4 LA01/2021/0777/O (Referral), Land immediately adjacent to 124B Dunlade Road, Greysteel

Report, Site Visit report, Speaking Rights Template Mark Cairns, and presentation were previously circulated and presented by Senior Planning Officer M McErlain

Referral Application to be determined by Planning Committee

App No: LA01/2021/0777/O

App Type: Outline

Proposal: Proposals relate to outline permission for a new detached bungalow adjacent to 2 no. existing dwellings under the ownership of the applicant. Access will be provided via existing private lane under the ownership of the applicant.

Recommendation

That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for recommendation set out in Section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to **REFUSE** planning permission subject to the reasons set out in section 10.

Erratum Recommendation

That the Committee note the contents of this Erratum and agree with the recommendation to refuse the application in accordance with Paragraph 1.1 of the Planning Committee report.

Addendum Recommendation

That the Committee note the contents of this Addendum, has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to REFUSE planning permission as set out in section 10.

The Senior Planning Officer, M McErlain advised of an error in the Planning report citing Alderman Fielding as the referring Elected Member. The report should have cited Councillor Nicholl.

Senior Planning Officer presented via power point presentation as follows:

- LA01/2021/0777/O is an Outline application for a new detached bungalow adjacent to 2 no. existing dwellings under the ownership of the applicant. Access will be provided via existing private lane under the ownership of the applicant at Land immediately adjacent to 124B Dunlade Road, Greysteel.
- This is a local application and is presented to the Planning Committee as a referred item following a recommendation to refuse planning Permission.
- The site is located in the rural area as defined in NAP2016 - The site is not located within any environmental designations.
- Five objections have been received in relation to this application from two separate addresses as well as one neutral representation.
- The application site comprises a triangular parcel of land which rises towards the south-east from Dunlade Road. The site is currently bound by vegetation to the rear (south-western) boundary, with remaining boundaries undefined. The application site boundary includes two

dwellings and associated outbuildings at Nos. 124 and 124b with the proposed siting on the portion of land to the NW of no. 124b.

- Previous planning history on the site relate to the existing dwellings at Nos. 124 and 124b.
- This application has been submitted as an infill dwelling located at an existing cluster. The principle of development therefore falls to be determined under paragraph 6.73 of the SPPS and Policies CTY2a and CTY 8 of PPS 21.
- Policy CTY 2a advises that planning permission will be granted for a dwelling at an existing cluster of development provided all six criteria are met.
- The proposed site is within a group of buildings which appear as a visual entity on the landscape, including 10 dwellings which are outside of a farm. Officials are satisfied that the proposal meets the first two requirements of CTY2a
- The third criteria of Policy CTY2a requires that the cluster is associated with a focal point such as a social / community building/facility or is located at a cross-roads. The agent highlighted a water pumping station and public house which sit some 370m and 470m respectively from the site, neither of which are physically or visually associated with the application site and surrounding group of buildings. The agent has also highlighted the windmills on the hills to the south of the application site. Likewise, the windfarm is not physically or visually associated with the group of buildings and are not considered a focal point. (1.5km south of site).
- In support of the application the agent provided a selection of planning applications and appeals which granted planning permission for proposals where the proposals did not meet with this requirement of the Policy. However, Planning Appeals 2021/A0119 (Appendix 1, previously circulated) and 2024/A0021 (Appendix 2, previously circulated) identify that while all the criteria in CTY2a are to be met, the first three criteria give an indication of the intended meaning of a cluster, and in these cases, the lack of established focal point or crossroads was a critical factor in the determination of the appeals which were subsequently dismissed. These appeal decisions post-date the applications and appeals referenced by the agent and represent the settled position of the Planning Department on this matter and is consistent with the Appeals Commissions position on what defines a cluster.
- It is also notable that none of the planning decisions referred to were taken by this council.
- The application site and surrounding buildings are not located at or associated with a focal point such as social/community buildings or facilities and is not located at a crossroads and consequently the proposal fails the third criteria of the policy.

- Officials are content that the remaining criteria within Policy CTY2a would be satisfied met.
- Policy CTY8 allows for the development of a small gap site sufficient only to accommodate up to a maximum of two houses within an otherwise substantial and continuously built-up frontage provided these respects the existing development pattern along the frontage in terms of size, scale, siting and plot size and meets other planning and environmental requirements.
- For the purpose of this policy the definition of a substantial and built-up frontage includes a line of three or more buildings along a road frontage without accompanying development to the rear.
- Nos. 124B, 124, 124C and 124A to the SE of the site all front onto the laneway however, there is no development to the northern end of the application site which fronts onto the laneway. No. 126 fronts onto Dunlade Road. Due to the application site extending to the public road No. 126 does not have frontage onto the laneway and consequently cannot form part of a substantial and continuously built-up frontage along the laneway for the purposes of infilling. Consequently, the application site does not represent a gap site within a built-up frontage.
- The agent makes reference to Paragraph 5.33 of PPS21 in their justification of the proposal under Policy CTY8 with specific emphasis placed on the sentence which reads “Buildings sited back, staggered or at angles and with gaps between them can still represent ribbon development, if they have a common frontage or they are visually linked”.
- The agent asserts that given the visual connection between the dwelling at No. 126 and the development along the laneway the application site reads a suitable infill gap.
- It is noted that paragraph 5.33 of PPS21 refers to what constitutes ribbon development - not what constitutes a substantial and continuously built-up frontage. Ribbon development is detrimental to rural character and development which contributes to the creation or addition of ribbon development should be resisted unless exceptionally permitted under CTY8.
- What constitutes a substantial and continuously built-up frontage is a matter of fact as observed on the ground. As No. 126 does not have a frontage onto the laneway it cannot be considered as part of a built-up frontage along the laneway.
- Additionally, as there is no gap at the application site the proposal would extend the linear pattern of development along the laneway adding to the existing ribbon of development, thereby contrary to CTY8 and CTY 14 of PPS21.
- Given the topography, existing development and boundary treatment, a modest sized dwelling at the proposed site would not be considered a

prominent feature in the landscape, and a suitable degree of enclosure is available at the site to allow satisfactorily integration in line with CTY13 of PPS21.

- In term of rural character and in addition to adding to ribbon development as outlined, the proposed dwelling would, when read with existing development in the location, further add to the built-up character of the area and would further erode the rural character through contributing to suburban style build-up, contrary to CTY14, criteria (b).
- The main issues raised within the objection letters relating to road safety and control of lands for access have been addressed during the processing of the application. DFI Roads have no objection to the proposed access arrangements and issues in relation to ownership of the laneway/right of way is a civil matter. Concerns in relation to loss of privacy can be designed out at reserved matters stage if outline permission is granted by limiting the size of any dwelling on the site to minimise potential overlooking.
- Concerns in relation to excess surface water entering the property due to land raising and piping of a stream have been identified. The Department has not been able to determine if and when such works occurred and note the presence of a bank along the common boundary of the site and No. 126 on the submitted drawing which the agent advises was based on a land survey carried out in 2014. Any works carried out on site would appear to have been carried independently of this application. It has not been fully demonstrated to the council that works carried out within the application site has resulted in additional surface water entering the site. If permission were to be granted it should be conditional that levels within the site are not further raised and that appropriate drainage infrastructure be installed to deal with surface water run-off from the site.
- Consultation was carried out with DFI Roads, Environmental Health, NI Water, DAERA Water Management Unit and Shared Environmental Service who have no objection.
- In Conclusion the proposal is contrary to Paragraphs 6.70 and 6.73 of the SPPS and Policies CTY2a, CTY8 and CTY14 of PPS21.
- In addition, no overriding reasons have been forthcoming as to why the development is essential, therefore the proposal is contrary to CTY1.
- Refusal is recommended.

The Chair invited questions from Elected Members for the Senior Planning Officer. There were none put.

The Chair invited M Cairns to speak in support of the application.

M Cairns stated he acknowledged the five objections which included multiple objections from the same address with the remaining objections related to a substantial back up of water which is not the case as a large bank does not enable water to travel. NI Water subsequently reported that they had no objection following initial objections in this regard. CTY2A in relation to cluster development, application has been in the system for 5 years. Slides did not include the gable at 126 Dunlade Road and there is a clearly defined gap site within this existing ribbon. There are five examples provided of successful appeals on this merit. There were discussions with Planners on 1st December 2021 where a diagram was shown of the area. What constitutes the front of a laneway? The applicant at 124C constructed their own laneway. Where there is a visual link there is a ribbon.

The Chair invited questions from Elected Members for the Speaker.

Councillor Kennedy said that it was arguable that this was a gap site. The Senior Planning Officer re-showed slides showing the layout of the buildings.

The Speaker advised that since the photographs were submitted a clear up had been undertaken which had included the removal of vegetation.

At the request of Councillor Watton the Speaker advised that the applicant was in ownership of all of the lands associated with the laneway.

At the request of the Chair the Senior Planning Officer confirmed that a laneway had been established without Planning Permission which had been subsequently approved and that the two laneways associated with the application were parallel and were separated by a small ditch.

Proposed by Alderman Hunter
Seconded by Alderman Coyle

-That Planning Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for recommendation set out in Section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to **REFUSE** planning permission subject to the reasons set out in section 10.

Councillor Kane requested a recorded vote.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.
3 Members voted For; 2 Members voted Against, 6 Members Abstained.
The Chair declared the motion carried and application refused.

Recorded Vote Table

For (3)	Alderman Coyle, Hunter Councillor Kane
Against (2)	Councillor Storey, Watton
Abstain (6)	Archibald, Kennedy, McGurk, McKillop, McMullan, McQuillan

RESOLVED - That Planning Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for recommendation set out in Section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to **REFUSE** planning permission subject to the reasons set out in section 10.

CHANGE IN ORDER OF BUSINESS

The Chair advised that application LA01/2024/0061/F would be considered next on the Agenda.

6.5 LA01/2024/0061/F (Referral), Agricultural Lands 12 metres North West of No. 18 Harbour Road, Ballintoy

Report, Site Visit report, Addendum 2, Speaking Rights Template Conor McGarry and presentation were previously circulated and presented by Senior Planning Officer E Hudson

Referral Application to be determined by Planning Committee

App No: LA01/2024/0061/F

App Type: Full

Proposal: Three proposed glamping pods as part of a Farm Diversification Scheme

Recommendation

That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to **REFUSE** planning permission for the reasons set out in section 10.

Addendum Recommendation

That the Committee note the contents of this Addendum, has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to REFUSE planning permission as set out in section 10.

Addendum 2 Recommendation

That the Committee note the contents of this Addendum, has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to REFUSE planning permission as set out in section 10.

Senior Planning Officer presented via power point as follows:

- (Slide) Planning Application LA01/2024/0061 is a full application for Three proposed glamping pods as part of a Farm Diversification Scheme on Agricultural Lands 12 metres North West of No. 18 Harbour Road, Ballintoy.
- Site visit took place Monday. There is an addendum to the committee report.
- (Slide) The site is located in the countryside. It is located in the Ballintoy Harbour LLPA and the Causeway Coast AONB as designated in the NAP. The features of this LLPA include the setting of the dramatically located Ballintoy Church and the cluster along Harbour Road. It goes onto say that it is visually important that this cluster remains compact in this exceptional coastal landscape.
- The proposal would introduce new development into this important visual gap creating a linear form of development along the laneway which would compromise the compactness of the cluster and encroach development into the wider landscape setting of the Church to the detriment of the wider LLPA landscape. It is considered the proposal is contrary to Policy ENV 1 and designation BAL 01 of the NAP.
- (Slide) The proposal is for 3 glamping pods which has been submitted as part of a farm diversification proposal. As such the policy has been considered under CTY 11 of PPS 21. The farm business is active and established however concern relates to the proposal in terms of impact on the character of the area in relation to its location within the highly scenic area and the LLPA. The proposed siting is also not grouped with existing farm buildings. HED also have concern in relation to the impact on listed buildings in particular 130 White park Road.
- (Slide) Elevations and sections. The glamping pods measure 7.5m x 4m and an overall height of 3m from ground level. The site sits at a lower level than the laneway and requires cutting in and levelling.

- (Slide) Aerial overview showing the site and the listed buildings in the vicinity of the site.
- (Slide) A view of the site from the laneway which will provide access to the site
- (Slide) A view along the front looking towards the cluster of development and Ballintoy church in the background.
- (Slide) A view from White park Road towards the site. This is an approach to the Ballintoy village which lies on the Causeway Coastal Route an important tourist route linking important visitor attractions. The elevated nature of White park Road on this approach shows the extent of the visual gap. Development along this part of the laneway could lead to future development further eroding the visual gap. The principle of glamping pods isn't unacceptable, under a farm diversification proposal, and a site clustering better with the groups of buildings would be more acceptable, would maintain the visual gap and could be less harmful in terms of impact on the llpa.
- This was suggested at an office meeting however the agent believes this to be a better site as it is at a lower level.
- (Slide) Another view further along Whitepark Road. Views towards the church are achieved at this location with the application site forming part of the agricultural foreground setting to the church which contributes to its unique landscape character.
- (Slide) View from the listed building at 130 Whitepark Road. HED have concerns in relation to the views from the listed building which is elevated above the Whitepark Road. The view is currently framed by the 2 existing groups of structures to the east and west. HED consider that any proposed structures should integrate with the existing structural groupings, avoid projecting beyond the existing 2 storey dwelling at 18 Harbour Road, to avoid impacting the historic setting of the listed building. Dermot Madden is available online if there are any questions in relation to HED comments.
- (Slide) View across from the graveyard at Ballintoy Church.
- (Slide) This is an image taken from further along the White park Road. You can clearly see the 2 clusters of development on approach and the Ballintoy Church in the background. An extension to McShane Glens self catering complex, on the left was granted in 2022. Originally they wanted to extend in a linear fashion along the laneway however due to concerns with regards to the impact on the LLPA this was rejected and a layout which consolidated the extension around the existing grounds was granted which ensured the maintenance of this visual gap.
- The proposal is contrary to the NAP, SPPS, PPS 6 in relation to impact on listed buildings, PPS 2 in relation to impact on the AONB, PPS 16 and PPS 21 in relation to the impact on built and natural environment.

The Senior Planning Officer advised that representative from HED was online to answer questions from Elected Members.

The Chair invited questions from Elected Members for the Officer.

Following lengthy discussion the Senior Planning Officer provided the following clarity to Elected Members:-

Concern relates to the elevated position looking towards Ballintoy Parish Church and visible from Whitepark Road;

Development is visible between the gaps of the clusters;

Along with the pods are the associated development namely the car park, levelling off, lighting and creation of new boundaries;

If moved towards the right would require new planning permission and consideration from HED;

Under CTY11 criteria A has been met in respect of the farm being active and established;

However Criteria B - design and scale appropriate to location and criteria C - not adversely impacting on natural and built heritage has not been met.

The Chair invited G Lidster from HED to address the Committee.

G Lidster advised that there were concerns regarding the views from the elevated listed building which looked towards the site and the fact that this is agricultural land and the proposal sits between two clusters which would result in adverse impact. The application is supported in principle.

Further information had been requested to show context, by way of drawings which had not been made available.

The Chair invited questions from Elected Members HED.

At the request of Councillor Watton, G Lidster advised that the relevant listed building was the former school now known as Ballintoy Orange Hall; Further advised that Agent had not provided satisfactory evidence of context and said the proposal could be seen from the listed building with the occupancy, lighting and activities resulting in the removal of the agricultural aspect.

Alderman Coyle referred to the tourism element of the proposal and wondered if the applicant had given consideration to relocation within their land ownership.

The Chair invited C McGarry to speak in support of the application.

C McGarry stated that this is a farm diversity scheme 45 metres from holding with a flat roof with reduced scale and mass and limited light. Cannot be seen from Ballintoy Parish Church and if relocated would be more visible than the proposal. An access lane has been created, integrates successfully to land, sustains the character, causes little disruption and it is the aim to ensure a balance.

The Chair invited questions from Elected Members for the Speaker.

At the request of Councillor McGurk what options were explored with the applicant, HED advised of inability of the applicant to show context.

C McGarry advised the Committee that he had provided pictures showing that the proposal would not be visible from the doors of the Orange Hall, including mock ups and spoke of adaptations to the roof design. C McGarry offered to share images with the Committee which he had submitted as part of the application process.

Councillor McGurk said that HED should have sought clarification from the Planning Department regarding context as it was clear that the agent had provided details of what the proposal would look like in the landscape.

At the request of the Chair C, McGarry advised that the proposal included a pvc green roof, there was no lighting and there was sufficient landscaping for 4 car parks.

At the request of the Chair, the Senior Planning Officer cited 8.18 of the Planning report in reference to clusters.

Councillor Watton proposed but later withdrew a proposal to defer for one month to eradicate some of the concerns raised. The Chair concurred with Councillor Watton saying this was not 'cut and dry' and there was a reliance on interpretation.

Councillor Kennedy said he did not see the value in deferring stating that he could not see any further information becoming available.

* **Councillor Storey left the Chamber at 3.20 pm and did not return.**

Proposed by Councillor McMullan
Seconded by Councillor McGurk

-That the Committee has taken into consideration and disagrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in

sections 7 and 8 and resolves to **APPROVE** planning permission for the following reasons:-

The agent and applicant have gone the extra mile to meet with requirements;
Integration evident;
Not visible from the road and will not be visible from Ballintoy Parish Church;
Good clear case made by agent;
Application duly and diligently dealt with;
Most of the proposal sits in landscape;
Important picture not included in Officers presentation which was remis;
HED logic not evidenced that proposal would detract from countryside;
Strong application has been made by applicant;
Not detrimental to environment;
Sits neatly;
Lots of thought resulted in sensitive positioning

Alderman Hunter requested a Recorded Vote

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.
5 Members voted For; 2 Members voted Against, 3 Members Abstained.
The Chair declared the motion carried and application approved.

RESOLVED - That the Committee has taken into consideration and disagrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to **APPROVE** planning permission for the following reasons:-

The agent and applicant have gone the extra mile to meet with requirements;
Integration evident;
Not visible from the road and will not be visible from Ballintoy Parish Church;
Good clear case made by agent;
Application duly and diligently dealt with;
Most of the proposal sits in landscape;
Important picture not included in Officers presentation which was remis;
HED logic not evidenced that proposal would detract from countryside;
Strong application has been made by applicant;
Not detrimental to environment ;
Sits neatly;
Lots of thought resulted in sensitive positioning.

Recorded Vote Table

For (5)	Councillors Archibald, Kennedy, McGurk, McMullan, McQuillan
Against (2)	Alderman Coyle, Hunter
Abstain (3)	Councillor Kane, McKillop, Watton

RESOLVED – That Conditions and Informatives are delegated to Officers.

The Chair declared a recess at 3.30 pm

The meeting resumed at 3.40 pm

***Councillor Archibald did not return to the Chamber after the recess.**

6.6 LA01/2024/1283/O (Referral), Lands between No.'s 30 and 36 Dunboe Road, Castlerock

Report, Site Visit report, Addendum 2, Speaking Rights Template Maurice Bradley, Speaking Rights Template Matt Kennedy, Letters of Support Claire Sugden and Cara Hunter and presentation were previously circulated and presented by Senior Planning Officer M McErlain in addition to verbal addendum update.

Referral Application to be determined by Planning Committee

App No: LA01/2024/1283/O

App Type: Outline

Proposal: Proposed site for 2 no. infill dwellings

Recommendation

That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for recommendation set out in Section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to **REFUSE** planning permission subject to the conditions set out in section 10.

Addendum Recommendation

That the Committee note the contents of this Addendum, has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to **REFUSE** planning permission as set out in section 10.

Addendum 2 Recommendation

That the Committee notes the contents of this Addendum and agree with the recommendation to refuse the application in accordance with Paragraph 1.1 of the Planning Committee report.

Senior Planning Officer presented via power point as follows:

- LA01/2023/1283/O is an Outline application for the provision of 2no. Infill dwellings at Lands between No.'s 30 and 36 Dunboe Road, Castlerock.
- This is a local application and is presented to the Planning Committee as a referred item following a recommendation to refuse planning Permission
- The site is located in the rural area as defined in NAP2016 - The site is not located within any environmental designations.
- No objections have been received in relation to this application.
- 2 letters of support have were received 26.01.2026. I will now outline the main points raised by way of a verbal addendum.
- The letters of support outline that the proposal should be considered as an infill opportunity. Additionally, the proposal would contribute towards addressing housing needs within the local area and would allow the applicant to build a home on family land close to existing family and to remain part of the local community.
- The application site as defined by the red line boundary comprises an irregular shaped roadside plot which includes a portion of two agricultural fields/paddocks. The application site boundaries are largely undefined or defined only with post and wire fencing.
- An existing boundary hedgerow separates both proposed plots while the southern plot contains a small copse of trees at the roadside which are proposed to be retained.
- There is no previous planning history on the site. Planning history on the adjacent lands to the east of the application site is set out in Section 3 of the Planning Committee Report.
- As this application has been submitted as an infill dwelling it falls to be determined under paragraph 6.73 of the SPPS and Policy CTY 8 of PPS 2.
- Policy CTY8 allows for the development of a small gap site sufficient only to accommodate up to a maximum of two houses within an otherwise substantial and continuously built-up frontage provided these respects the existing development pattern along the frontage in terms of size, scale, siting and plot size and meets other planning and environmental requirements.
- For the purpose of this policy the definition of a substantial and built-up frontage includes a line of three or more buildings along a road frontage without accompanying development to the rear.

- The Agent contends that there are a number of buildings along this existing section of Dunboe Road which are both visually linked and contribute to the formation of a substantial and built-up frontage.
- These include:-
 - The dwelling and garage/shed at No 30 Dunboe Road
 - The dwelling and garage/shed at No 36 Dunboe Road
 - The Equestrian Facility to the east of No. 36 Dunboe Road
- Planning Approval LA01/2023/1176/RM to the south of No. 36 Dunboe Rd
- To the north of the application site is a recently constructed replacement dwelling at No. 30 Dunboe Rd, with a garage/shed sited to the rear of the dwelling. To the south of the application site is the dwelling at No. 36 also with a garage sited to the rear of the dwelling.
- While officials accept that dwellings at Nos. 30 and 36 have direct frontage onto Dunboe Road, the garages/sheds associated with these dwellings are located behind and to the rear of the respective dwellings and therefore do not have direct frontage to the road.
- It is noted that the position of the dwelling at No. 30 does not accurately reflect the position of the dwelling currently on the ground today. The dwelling shown on the site location plan submitted has been replaced by a new dwelling which sits largely in front of the adjacent shed, thereby preventing it from having direct frontage to the road.
- Consequently, these buildings cannot be included for the purposes of contributing to the formation of a substantial and continuously built-up frontage. This assessment is consistent with the Planning Appeals Commission's findings within Appeal 2024/A0097 (Appendix A of Committee report) whereby a garage to the rear of dwelling was determined to not represent a building with frontage.
- The agent highlights 2 appeals within their speaking notes in support of the application regarding the use of ancillary buildings as qualifying buildings and their siting within the established frontage.
- Planning Appeal 2017/A0109 confirms at Paragraph 6 that "there is no distinction within policy between main or subordinate buildings"
- Likewise within Planning Appeal 2019/A0093 the commission clarified that nothing within Policy CTY8 distinguishes between curtilage buildings such as garages and individual road frontage buildings on separate plots.
- This assessment is consistent with the Planning Department's application of Policy CTY8 in regard to qualifying buildings.
- The key difference between the current application and Appeal 2019/A0093 is the location of the garage relative to the common frontage within the appeal proposal. Within the appeal the built-up frontage comprised a laneway with a dwelling and garage within one plot forming one side of the gap. When viewed from the frontage the dwelling and garage are sited side by side and both have direct frontage to the laneway

- In the case of the application before us, the common frontage is Dunboe Rd and within the properties at Nos. 30 and 36 the garages are sited behind the respective dwellings and do not have frontage to the road, again consistent with planning appeals decisions including 2024/A0097.
- The approved permission (LA01/2023/1176/RM) has not yet been built and as such does not represent a building for the purposes of the policy. Consequently, the approved dwelling cannot be included as part of any built-up frontage.
- This assessment is consistent with the Planning Appeals Commissions assessment on the matter and has been clarified within various appeals such as Appeals 2015/A0249 & 2015/A0250 at Cloghs Rd, Cushendall which concluded that Foundations of a dwelling are building works but do not constitute a building for the purposes of the policy.
- The existing Equestrian facility, which includes a stable block & paddock is sited to the rear of the approved site (LA01/2023/1176/RM). However, it is located within a plot which does not have a frontage onto Dunboe Road. Planning Appeal 2022/A0189 (Appendix B) clarifies that “a building’s frontage ‘must extend to the edge of the public road or private laneway and not be separated from it by land or development outside of its curtilage’, Consequently, as the plot on which the equestrian centre/stable block is sited does not extend to the road it cannot be included as part of a built-up frontage.
- Consequently, as there are currently only two qualifying buildings along this road frontage there is no substantial and continuously built-up frontage at this location and therefore the proposal does not represent a gap site within a built-up frontage. Additionally, the proposal would result in the establishment of a linear pattern of development resulting in the creation of ribbon development, contrary to Paragraphs 6.70 and 6.73 of the SPPS and Policies CTY8 and CTY 14 of PPS21.
- As this is an outline application no detailed plans have been submitted regarding the design of the proposed dwellings. The existing development to the north and south of the application coupled with the retention of the area of woodland to the front of the southern plot will screen potential views of the application site on both approach along Dunboe Rd.
- It is considered that 2 appropriately designed dwellings on this site would satisfactorily integrate into the surrounding landscape.
- Consultation was carried out with DFI Roads, Environmental Health, NI Water, DAERA Water Management Unit, who have raised no concerns.
- In Conclusion the proposal is contrary to Paragraphs 6.70 and 6.73 of the SPPS and Policies CTY8 and CTY14 of PPS21 in that there is no substantial and continuously built-up frontage at this location and would result in the creation of ribbon of development along Dunboe Road.
- In addition, no overriding reasons have been forthcoming as to why the development is essential, therefore the proposal is contrary to CTY1.
- Refusal is recommended.

The Chair invited questions from Elected Members for the Senior Planning Officer. There were none put.

The Chair invited M Kennedy to speak in support of the application.

M Kennedy stated as follows:-

Ribboning is not being created as it already exists and a site visit had been requested for the following refusal reasons:-

- Refusal 1 – reason is a catch all refusal reason and if the application is considered to comply with planning policy and in particular Policy CTY8 then this refusal reason must fall.
- Refusal 3 – reason is a catch all refusal as if the proposal is considered to be appropriate gap site for two infill dwellings in accordance with Policy CTY8 then again this refusal reason also must fall;
- Refusal 2 – it is clear that this is a substantive refusal reason in this planning application. A substantial and built-up frontage is defined by Policy CTY8 as a line of 3 or more buildings along a road frontage. It is clear from the photo montage submitted along Dunboe Road that both the existing two storey house and the substantial garage building to the side of No 30 both have frontage onto Dunlade Road.

50% of the shed has frontage as does No 36. The stables/store has its own vehicular frontage. This is clearly the fifth building making up the frontage and complies with CTY8. There is also a house approved in the front field so this existing substantial built up frontage will be further extended when building constructed.

The Chair invited M Bradley to speak in support of the application.

M Bradley stated as follows:-

I wish to express my support for planning application LA01/2024/1283/O relating to the proposed infill development on Dunboe Road, Castlerock. This application presents a logical and appropriate infill opportunity within an existing built-up frontage with no objections from statutory bodies or neighbouring residents. The proposal would allow the applicants' family – long-standing and active members of the local community – to build an established family land, supporting generational continuity and contribution positively to the local housing supply during a period of significant housing pressure along the North Coast. Based on the site context and the absence of any adverse impacts. I believe this is a case where the committee could reasonably overturn the recommendation for refusal and grant approval. No objections from statutory bodies namely DfI Roads, Environmental Services, Northern Ireland Water, Northern Ireland Environmental

Agency and habitat legislation. Proposed site lies between two buildings and does not represent sprawl. Reads as a small cluster, integrates and is not widely prominent. If CTY8 compliant, CTY1 then falls away.

The Chair invited questions from Elected Members for the Speakers.

At the request of the Chair the Senior Planning Officer confirmed that consideration of frontage in the round demonstrated that No 30 was acceptable, No 36 was acceptable, No 30 garage and shed was not acceptable, No 26 garage and shed was not acceptable; the shed is on a lane wat and the curtilage of the site does not extend to road, garage and ancillary buildings.

At the request of Alderman Coyle the Senior Planning Officer explained the definition of frontage ie three in a row.

At the request of Alderman McKillop the Senior Planning Officer clarified that all buildings with direct frontage are taken into consideration. Alderman McKillop said it was down to perception and opinion and was debatable.

* **Councillor McMullan rejoined the meeting in the Chamber at 4.20 pm**

Alderman Hunter requested a Recorded Vote.

Proposed by Councillor Watton
Seconded by Alderman McKillop

- That the Committee has taken into consideration and disagrees with the reasons for recommendation set out in Section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to **APPROVE** planning permission

For the following reasons:

Obvious infill site;
No 38 equestrian centre should be considered – there is a 14 metre frontage not included;
It is a material fact that the bungalow although not erected will be in due course;
No objections from statutory bodies;
Reference catch all policy;
Does not add to ribbon development;
No landscaping required;
No 36 has garage behind;
No 38 is clearly considerable;
CTY8 fully met;
Garage at no 30 should be considered;

There is a row of 3 buildings

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

3 Members voted For; 2 Members voted Against, 3 Members Abstained.

The Chair declared the motion carried and application approved.

RESOLVED - That the Committee has taken into consideration and disagrees with the reasons for recommendation set out in Section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to **APPROVE** planning permission

For the following reasons:

Obvious infill site;

No 38 equestrian centre should be considered – there is a 14 metre frontage not included;

It is a material fact that the bungalow although not erected will be in due course;

No objections from statutory bodies;

Reference catch all policy;

Does not add to ribbon development;

No landscaping required;

No 36 has garage behind;

No 38 is clearly considerable;

CTY8 fully met;

Garage at no 30 should be considered;

There is a row of 3 buildings

Recorded Vote Table

For (3)	Alderman McKillop, Councillor Kennedy, Watton
Against (2)	Alderman Hunter, Councillor Kane
Abstain (3)	Alderman Coyle, Councillor McGurk, McQuillan

RESOLVED – That Conditions and Informatives are delegated to Officers.

* **Councillor Storey and Councillor Watton left the meeting in the Chamber at 4.30 pm**

7. CORRESPONDENCE

The Chair presented Items 7.1 – 7.7 inclusive as read.

7.1 Dfl – Chief Planner’s Update

Copy, previously circulated was presented as read.

Correspondence re: Chief Planner Update December 2025.

Planning Committee NOTED the correspondence.

7.2 Dfl – Policy Revision to the SPPS – Renewable and Low Carbon Energy

Copy, previously circulated, presented as read.

Correspondence re: Publication of a Policy Revision to the Strategic Planning Policy Statement on the Subject of Renewable and Low Carbon Energy

Planning Committee NOTED the correspondence.

7.3 Farmers for Action – New Bridge, Kilrea

Copy, previously circulated, presented as read.

Correspondence re: Farmers for Action

Proposed by Councillor Kane
Seconded by Alderman Hunter and

RESOLVED – That Planning officials inform Farmers for Action on the outcome of the Notice of Motion brought before the Council Meeting held on 6th January 2026 regarding a new bridge over the River Bann in Kilrea

Planning Committee NOTED the correspondence.

7.4 DfE – Consultation on Changes to Accommodation Regulation – Council’s Response 05.01.26

Copy, previously circulated, presented as read.

Correspondence re: Consultation on policy: The Statutory Regulation of Tourist Accommodation

Planning Committee NOTED the correspondence.

***Councillor Watton rejoined the meeting in the Chamber at 4.35 pm**

7.5 NILGA – Planning Learning and Engagement Programme

Copy, previously circulated, presented as read.

Correspondence re: Planning Learning and Engagement Programme – Request for Nominations

The Development Plan Manager advised that two nominations are required by 28th February 2026.

Councillor McGurk
Seconded by Councillor Kane and

RESOLVED - That nominations be agreed via group leads or by email from the Director of Corporate Services to Elected Members, before the February Planning Committee Meeting.

Planning Committee NOTED the correspondence.

7.6 Confirmation of Listings – BT Kiosks x5

Copy, previously circulated, presented as read.

Correspondence re: Eighty-Fifth Addition to the List of Buildings of Special Architectural or Historic Interest in the Causeway Coast And Glens Borough Council.

Alderman McKillop welcomed the update in relation to BT Kiosks status.

Planning Committee NOTED the correspondence.

7.7 Proposed variation (No 1) to the County Donegal Development Plan 2024-2030

Copy, previously circulated, presented as read.

Correspondence re: Proposed Variation (No. 1) to the County Donegal Development Plan 2024-2030 and associated Environmental Report, Natura Impact Report and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Report

Planning Committee NOTED the correspondence.

8. REPORTS FOR DECISION

8.1 TPO Confirmation – 23 Mountsandel Road, Coleraine

Report, previously circulated, was presented by the Development Plan Manager.

Purpose of Report

To present the TPO Confirmation, with modification, for Lands at & Adjacent to No. 23 Mountsandel Road and No's. 1-4 Mount Pleasant Close, Coleraine.

Further information was provided in the report under the following headings

- Background
- Site Context
- Financial Implications

Options

Option 1: Resolve to confirm the TPO, with modification, as detailed above.

Option 2: Resolve not to confirm the TPO.

Recommendation

It is recommended that Members agree to either Option 1 or 2 above.

8.2 TPO Confirmation – Ballyarton House, Cloyfin Road, Coleraine

Report, previously circulated, was presented by the Development Plan Manager.

Purpose of Report

To present the TPO Confirmation, with modification, for Lands at Ballyarton House, Cloyfin Road/Ring Road, Coleraine.

Further information was provided in the report under the following headings

- Background
- Site Context
- Financial Implications

Options

Option 1: Resolve to confirm the TPO, with modifications, as detailed above.

Option 2: Resolve not to confirm the TPO.

Recommendation

It is recommended that Members agree to either Option 1 or 2 above.

8.3 TPO Confirmation – Cranagh View, Coleraine

Report, previously circulated, was presented by the Development Plan Manager.

Purpose of Report

To present the TPO Confirmation, with no modification, for Lands Adjacent to No's. 1,3,5,7,9,11, & 34 Cranagh View, Coleraine.

Further information was provided in the report under the following headings

- Background
- Site Context
- Financial Implications

Options

Option 1: Resolve to confirm the TPO with no modifications as detailed above.

Option 2: Resolve not to confirm the TPO.

Recommendation

It is recommended that Members agree to either Option 1 or 2 above.

8.4 TPO Confirmation – Glenfield House, 12 & 14 Atlantic Road, Coleraine

Report, previously circulated, was presented by the Development Plan Manager.

Purpose of Report

To present the TPO confirmation, with modification, for Glenfield House and associated lands, 12 & 14 Atlantic Road, Coleraine.

Further information was provided in the report under the following headings

- Background
- Site Context
- Financial Implications

Recommendation

It is recommended that Members note the content of the report and agree to either Option 1 or 2 above.

8.5 TPO Confirmation – Main Street, Ballykelly

Report, previously circulated, was presented by the Development Plan Manager.

Purpose of Report

To present the TPO confirmation, with modification, for Lands at and adjacent to 56 Main Street, Ballykelly.

Further information was provided in the report under the following headings

- Background
- Site Context
- Financial Implications

Options

Option 1: Resolve to confirm the TPO with modifications as detailed above.

Option 2: Resolve not to confirm the TPO.

Recommendation

It is recommended that Members note the content of the report and agree to either Option 1 or 2 above.

8.6 TPO Confirmation – Lands at Strangemore & adjoining land, 2 Main Street, Dungiven

Report, previously circulated, was presented by the Development Plan Manager.

Purpose of Report

To present the TPO Confirmation, with Modification, for Lands at Strangemore and Adjoining Lands, 2 Main Street, Dungiven.

Further information was provided in the report under the following headings

- Background
- Site Context
- Financial Implications

Options

Option 1: Resolve to confirm the TPO, with modifications, as detailed above.

Option 2: Resolve not to confirm the TPO.

Recommendation

It is recommended that Members agree to either Option 1 or 2 above.

Proposed by Councillor McMullan

Seconded by Councillor Kennedy and

RESOLVED – That Planning Committee agree Option 1: Resolve to confirm the TPOs, as detailed above at Items 8.1 – 8.6.

9. REPORTS FOR NOTING

9.1 Finance Report Period 1-7 2025_26

Report, previously circulated was presented as read by the Chair.

Purpose

This Report is to provide Members with an update on the financial position of the Planning Department for the Period 1-7 of 2025/26 business year.

Details

Planning is showing a variance of over £206k favourable position at end of Period 7 based on draft Management Accounts.

The favourable position at the end of Period 7 is due to favourable position in relation to income from planning application fees and property certificate income of over £163K.

This favourable position in relation to application fee and property certificate income is supported by a favourable position of over £13K in salaries and wages and a favourable position in advertisement costs of over £8K.

There are no other areas of concern at this time in relation to other expenditure codes.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Planning Committee considers and notes the content of this report for the Period 1-7 of 2025/26 financial year.

Planning Committee NOTED the report.

9.2 Finance Report Period 1-8 2025_26

Report, previously circulated, was presented as read by the Chair.

Purpose

This Report is to provide Members with an update on the financial position of the Planning Department for the Period 1-8 of 2025/26 business year.

Details

Planning is showing a variance of just over £263k favourable position at end of Period 8 based on draft Management Accounts.

The favourable position at the end of Period 8 is due to favourable position in relation to income from planning application fees and property certificate income of over £220k.

This favourable position in relation to application fee and property certificate income is supported by a favourable position of over £14k in salaries and wages and a favourable position in advertisement costs of over £8k.

There are no other areas of concern at this time in relation to other expenditure codes.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Planning Committee considers the content of this report for the Period 1-8 of 2025/26 financial year.

9.3 Second Quarterly Report on Planning Performance

Report, previously circulated, was presented by the Development Management (Enforcement and Majors) Manager.

Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to provide a quarterly update on Planning performance against the Planning Department Business Plan 2025/26.

Background

Schedule 4 of The Local Government (Performance Indicators and Standards) Order (Northern Ireland) 2015 sets out the statutory performance targets for the Planning Department for major development applications, local development applications and enforcement cases. The Planning Department Business Plan 2025-26 sets out the key performance indicators to progress towards improving Planning performance against these targets.

The statutory targets are:

- Major applications processed from date valid to decision or withdrawal within an average of 30 weeks
- Local applications processed from date valid to decision or withdrawal within an average of 15 weeks
- 70% of all enforcement cases progressed to target conclusion within 39 weeks of receipt of complaint.

The Northern Ireland Planning Statistics is an official statistics publication issued by Analysis, Statistics & Research Team within Department for Infrastructure. It provides the official statistics for each Council on each of the statutory targets and is published quarterly and on an annual basis. The First Quarter 2025/26 Statistical Bulletin was published on 25 September 2024 providing provisional planning statistics for this period.

Details

Website link 1 <https://www.infrastructure-ni.gov.uk/publications/northern-ireland-planning-statistics-july-september-2025> provides the link to the published bulletin.

Further narrative on performance in relation to the business plan objectives was contained within the report.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Planning Committee note the Planning Department's Quarterly Report.

The Development Management Manager provided commentary on the report highlighting key figures and statistics for the Second Quarterly Report on Planning Performance

The Chair said it was evident hard work had been undertaken by Officers and commended the progress detailed within the report.

Planning Committee NOTED the report.

9.4 Local Development Plan - 6 Month Work Programme

Report, previously circulated, was presented as read by the Chair

Purpose of Report

To present, in line with the Council's current published Local Development Plan (LDP) Timetable, the 6-month indicative LDP Work Programme (see Appendix 1

circulated) which outlines the range of work to be carried out by the Council's Development Plan team within this programme (Jan-Jun 2026).

Background

Members will be aware of the suite of LDP Workshops, Steering Group and Project Management Team meetings that brought us to the stage of presenting a draft Plan Strategy (dPS) at the 24th August 2022 Planning Committee, at which members resolved to take the dPS forward to Full Council for ratification.

At its 1st November 2022 Full Council Meeting the Council resolved to defer the dPS for further consideration. Discussions on this remain ongoing (see Table 1 at Appendix 2, circulated).

Independent Housing Research Study

Ulster University, at the request of members, carried out an independent housing research study to inform the preparation of the LDP. UU presented the Interim Findings Report to members at the LDP Steering Group Workshop held on 28th August 2025 and the Final Report to members at the 17th November 2025 LDP Steering Group Workshop.

Following a Notice of Motion brought before the January 2026 Full Council Meeting it was resolved to request that UU present the Housing Study at a Deputation Workshop to be held on 3rd February 2026.

LDP Project Management Team & LDP Steering Group

Consultation with the LDP Project Management Team (key consultees and stakeholders) on our draft policy approach closed with the presentation of the dPS to the 1st November 2022 Full Council Meeting. However, given the deferral of the dPS for further consideration and ongoing discussions, this consultation process may need to be reopened.

The LDP Steering Group (Planning Committee) continues to be updated on Plan-making progress via:

- Quarterly updates;
- 6-month indicative work programmes; and
- Annual Monitoring Reports.

Working Groups/Collaborative Working

The Development Plan Working Group will continue throughout this programme. Collaborative work will also be undertaken on the following, as and when required:

- NI Coastal/Marine Group;
- Cross-Border Development Plan Group;

- Cross-Boundary Group (adjoining councils); and
- Sperrin AONB Group.

Sustainability Appraisal

A Sustainability Appraisal incorporating Strategic Environmental Assessment (SA/SEA) of the LDP is an iterative process, continuing throughout the entire Plan-making programme. The Council employed SES to carry out the LDP SA/SEA on its behalf. Any update to the dPS throughout this work programme will require an updated SA/SEA Report, Scoping Report and HRA.

Annual Monitors

Work will continue on the Council's annual retail, employment and housing monitors within this work programme.

Building Preservation Notices (BPNs)

Ad hoc requests for BPNs will be processed throughout the work programme, as and when required.

Trees

Officers will continue processing TPO and Works to Trees requests. As well as working through the key recommendations arising from the NIPSO 'Strengthening Our Roots' Report.

Community Plan Strategic Partnership Board

Given the statutory link, the Head of Planning and Local Development Plan Manager attend the Council's Community Plan Strategic Partnership Board and continue to participate in the community planning process, working collaboratively with our council colleagues and other key partners.

Other work

Officers will continue to assist our development management colleagues on a range of matters including planning application, LDP and Conservation Area consultation responses.

Consultations received from other councils, central government departments, and any other ad hoc papers will be processed and/or presented as and when required throughout this programme.

Attendance at other councils' Independent Examinations (IEs) will continue in line with the Planning Appeals Commission (PAC) timetable as this is a crucial learning resource on the evolution of the Northern Ireland Plan-making process.

Evidence Base Update

Members are aware that the LDP must be prepared using robust and up to date evidence base. As such, updates may be required to some or all of the above, depending on the timeframe for bringing an updated dPS to Members.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Planning Committee note the content of this report.

Planning Committee NOTED the report.

MOTION TO PROCEED ‘IN COMMITTEE’

Proposed by Councillor McMullan

Seconded by Councillor Watton and

AGREED – That Planning Committee move ‘*In Committee*’.

* **Members of the Press and Public left the meeting at 4.45 pm**

10. CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS

11. Legal Update

Council Solicitor, Corporate and Regulatory gave legal advice to the Committee regarding two pending actions.

MOTION TO PROCEED ‘IN PUBLIC’

Proposed by Councillor McMullan

Seconded by Alderman McKillop and

AGREED – That Planning Committee move ‘*In Public*’.

11. Any Other Relevant Business (in accordance with Standing Order 12 (o))

There were no Other Relevant Business

The Chair referred to a further request to meet with agents that was previously agreed at the Committee meeting, January 2025 and that if agreed he would pursue. Agreed.

This being all the business the meeting closed at 4.50 pm.

Chair