

**PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD
WEDNESDAY 24 JUNE 2026**

Table of Key Adoptions

No.	Item	Summary of Decisions
1.	Apologies	<i>Alderman Boyle, Scott Councillor Anderson</i>
2.	Declarations of Interest	<i>Alderman Hunter</i>
3.	Chair's Business	<i>That the Planning Committee continues its systematic approach through engagement sessions with architects and stakeholders and special planning meetings, to ensure it meets its commitments within the Efficient Processing of the Planning Applications Protocol.</i>
4.	Minutes of Previous Planning Committee Meetings	
4.1	Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting held Wednesday 27 May 2026	<i>Confirmed as a correct record</i>
5.	Order of Items and Confirmation of Registered Speakers	
5.1	LA01/2024/0096/F (Objection) Lands immediately south of No. 5-14 Bleachgreen Apartments, off Ann Street, Ballycastle	<i>Deferred</i>
5.2	LA01/2020/1235/O (Referral) Site adjacent to No. 53 East Road, Drumsurn	<i>Deferred for a site visit</i>

6.	Schedule of applications	
6.1	LA01/2026/0411/S54 (Major) Lands at and adjacent to 34 Agherton Road, Portstewart	<i>Approved</i>
6.2	LA01/2025/0517/F (Objection) 47 Ballycairn Road, Coleraine	<i>Approved</i>
6.3	LA01/2024/0743/O (Referral) Site Adj to 57 Dunlade Road, Greysteel	<i>Refused</i>
6.4	LA01/2025/0530/F (Referral) Lands to the rear of No. 127 Glenhead Road, Limavady	<i>Approved</i>
6.5	LA01/2025/0342/O (Referral) 40m West of 18 Ballyhackett Lane, Castlerock	<i>Disagree and Approve</i>
6.6	LA01/2024/0119/O (Referral) Lands to the West of St. Patrick's Culfeightrin Church, 89 Cushendall Road, Ballyvoy	<i>Disagree and Approve</i>
6.7	LA01/2023/0755/O (Referral) 30m South East of 23 Gaults Road, Cushendall	<i>Agree and Approve</i>
6.8	LA01/2024/1183/O (Referral) 150m NE of 78 Gracehill Road, Stranocum, Ballymoney	<i>Disagree and Approve</i>
7.	Correspondence	
7.1	Advance Notice of Listing - Agivey House, Aghadowey	<i>Noted</i>
7.2	Proposed Material Alterations to Proposed Variation No. 1 of the CDP 2024-2030	<i>Noted</i>
8.	Reports for Decision	
8.1	TPO Confirmation - Lands at 3 and 7 Bann View Place, Coleraine	<i>That Committee agree to Option 1 - Resolve to confirm the TPO, without modifications, as detailed above.</i>
8.2	Live Streaming and Audio Recording of Planning Committee Meetings	<i>That the Planning Committee - agrees to allow the live streaming of public sessions of Planning Committee meetings via a private YouTube channel that is accessible via a link from Democratic Services, with the live stream only</i>

		<i>available to watch throughout the duration of the meeting, and with recording of these meetings strictly prohibited.</i> - <i>that the Planning Committee agrees to aligning its live streaming arrangements with those for full Council and all other Committees, when the necessary arrangements have been put in place. This would be subject to the outcome of the DPIA and the staff and trade union consultation.</i> - <i>that the Planning Committee agrees to the audio recording of Planning Committee meetings with immediate effect, with public sessions to be published on the Council website within two days of the meeting</i>
9.	Reports for Noting	
9.1	LDP 6 month Work Programme	Noted
10.	Any Other Relevant Business (in accordance with Standing Order 12 (o))	Nil

**MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING
COMMITTEE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CIVIC HEADQUARTERS AND
VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE
ON WEDNESDAY 24 JUNE 2026 AT 10.30AM**

Chair: Alderman S McKillop (C)

Committee Members: Alderman Brown Stewart (C), Callan (C), Coyle (C), Hunter (R), Councillors C Archibald (C), Kennedy (C), McGurk (R), McMullan (C), McQuillan (R), Nicholl (R), Storey (C), Watton (C)

Officers Present: M Quinn, Director of Corporate Services (C)
S Mathers, Development Management Manager (C)
J Lundy, Development Management (local applications) Manager (C)
S Mulhern, Development Plan Manager (R)
R Beringer, Senior Planning Officer (C)
E Hudson, Senior Planning Officer (C)
M McErlain, Senior Planning Officer (C)
R Heaney, Senior Planning Officer (C)
S McKinley, Planning Officer (R)
U Harper, Senior Democratic Services Officer (C/R)
J Keen, Democratic Services Officer (R/C)

In Attendance: L Boyd, ICT Officer (C/R)
C Ballentine, ICT Officer (C/R)

K Morgan, BL (R) (Item 5.2)

Public 1 no. (C) 24 no. (R) including Speakers
Press 4 no. (R)

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

Registered Speakers

Item No	Name
LA01/2025/0517/F	D McLaughlin
LA01/2024/0743/O	A Boyle
LA01/2025/0530/F	L Kennedy S Deehan
LA01/2025/0342/O	J Simpson

LA01/2024/0119/O	M Kennedy S Mulholland
LA01/2024/1183/O	C Cassidy J McNeill

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 Boyle, Alderman Scott and Councillor Anderson.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Alderman Hunter declared an Interest in Item 6.8 LA01/2024/1183/O (Referral) 150m NE of 78 Gracehill Road, Stranocum, Ballymoney. Having declared an Interest, Alderman Hunter disconnected prior to consideration of this Item and did not vote.

3. CHAIR'S BUSINESS

The Chair advised Members that she had met with NILGA and that she and the Development Management (local applications) Manager attended an engagement session with Ministers Kimmins on 18 June 2026 to ensure that local government experience and elected member perspectives help inform the ongoing improvement agenda for the Planning Service.

The Chair proposed that the Planning Committee continues its systematic approach through engagement sessions with architects and stakeholders and special planning meetings, to ensure it meets its commitments within the Efficient Processing of the Planning Applications Protocol. This proposal was seconded by Councillor Kennedy.

Councillor Storey asked that the Chair uses these meetings to convey a request for a change in how Planning is delivered. He stated that the Department still wants to control the Planning process, but the process should not be as restrictive as it is. He stated that the current process is not made for process rather than delivery. The Chair asked that Officers feed that message back to the Department.

Proposed by Alderman S McKillop
Seconded by Councillor Kennedy

- that the Planning Committee continues its systematic approach through engagement sessions with architects and stakeholders and special planning meetings, to ensure it meets its commitments within the Efficient Processing of the Planning Applications Protocol.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

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

The Chair declared the motion carried.

RESOLVED - That the Planning Committee continues its systematic approach through engagement sessions with architects and stakeholders and special planning meetings, to ensure it meets its commitments within the Efficient Processing of the Planning Applications Protocol.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETINGS

4.1 Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting held Wednesday 27 May 2026

Copy, previously circulated.

Proposed by Councillor Watton

Seconded by Alderman Hunter

– That the Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held Wednesday 27 May 2026 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 27 May 2026 are signed as a correct record.

5. ORDER OF ITEMS AND CONFIRMATION OF REGISTERED SPEAKERS

5.1 LA01/2024/0096/F (Objection) Lands immediately south of No. 5-14 Bleachgreen Apartments, off Ann Street, Ballycastle

The Development Management (local applications) Manager advised:

Following publication of the Planning Committee on 17th June 2026 the Planning Department received a further objection from Mr P McCaughan. The objection refers to the Committee report and matters in relation to roads safety and the proposed access road. In order to consider these points the Planning

Department have re- consulted DFI Roads to provide comment on the points raised in the objection. The consultation response is currently outstanding.

Recommendation

In order to fully consider the latest objection received it is recommended that the Committee note the content of this addendum and agree to Defer the application to allow comments from DFI Roads to be considered. Should a change of opinion be received from DFI Roads it is recommended that the application would proceed in line with the Council's Scheme of Delegation.

Members queried the process regarding consultation with Department for Infrastructure (DfI) Roads and whether it would be possible to expedite the process. The Development Management (local applications) Manager emphasised the need to follow the process and to get a complete response from DfI Roads as the competent authority. She noted that the Ministerial review process is considering the issue of late information delaying decisions.

Proposed by Alderman Coyle

Seconded by Councillor Watton

- That the Committee defer application LA01/2024/0096/F to allow comments from DFI Roads to be considered. Should a change of opinion be received from DFI Roads, the application shall proceed in line with the Council's Scheme of Delegation.

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 recommendation Approved.

RESOLVED - That the Committee defer application LA01/2024/0096/F to allow comments from DFI Roads to be considered. Should a change of opinion be received from DFI Roads, the application shall proceed in line with the Council's Scheme of Delegation.

5.2 LA01/2020/1235/O (Referral) Site adjacent to No. 53 East Road, Drumsurn

Councillor Storey requested that this Item be deferred for a site visit, to ensure completeness of all relevant information.

Proposed by Councillor Storey

Seconded by Councillor Kennedy

- That the Committee defer consideration of Item LA01/2020/1235/O for a site visit, to ensure completeness of all relevant information.

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 recommendation Approved.

RESOLVED - That the Committee defer consideration of Item LA01/2020/1235/O for a site visit, to ensure completeness of all relevant information.

* **The Barrister disconnected from the meeting at 11.11am**

6. SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS

6.1 LA01/2026/0411/S54 (Major) Lands at and adjacent to 34 Agherton Road, Portstewart

Report and presentation were previously circulated and presented by the Development Management Manager.

Major Application to be determined by Planning Committee

App No: LA01/2026/0411/S54

App Type: Full

Proposal: Section 54 application to vary Condition No. 5 (Private Streets Determination) from Planning Approval LA01/2019/1217/F (Extension to existing holiday park)

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.

The Development Management Manager presented via PowerPoint presentation as follows:

- *Proposal comprises a variation of condition, condition 5, regarding the timing of when development can start relative to the provision of alterations to the public road. The approved scheme was for an extension of 74 static sites, 13 touring/ motorhome sites and retention of an existing area for tourers and motorhomes. This extends to either side of Agherton Road. It was approved in November 2022.*
- *While a major application, no PAN was required as this is a variation of condition application. A Design and Access Statement was required as the changes pertain to access issues.*
- *In terms of the Northern Area Plan 2016, the site is located in the open countryside. The Plan does not contain specific policy on tourism development and directs to regional policy.*

- *The Existing Condition 5- The approved application prohibits development until the alterations to the public road have taken place. These are principally, the provision of a footway and verge to the south side of Agherton Road and provision of a pedestrian crossing point to the northern side.*
- *The Proposed Condition 5- The proposed condition changes the limitation on development to the operational stage i.e. use of the holiday park stage. In practical terms, this will allow for a start of construction to be made to any of the approved buildings- site office, welfare building and laundrette to preserve the planning permission. DfI Roads are content with the change.*
- *Representations- None received.*
- *Conclusion- The proposed change to the wording of the condition is acceptable and the recommendation is to approve.*

There were no questions for the Officer.

Proposed by Councillor Storey

Seconded by Councillor Kennedy

- 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.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

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

The Chair declared the motion carried and application Approved.

RESOLVED - 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.

6.2 LA01/2025/0517/F (Objection) 47 Ballycairn Road, Coleraine

Report, presentation and speaking rights template were previously circulated and presented by Senior Planning Officer, R Beringer.

Objection Application to be determined by Planning Committee

App No: LA01/2025/0517/F

App Type: Full

Proposal: Proposed residential development comprising 23No. dwellings including 11No. chalet bungalows, 4No. detached and 8No. semi-detached 2.5 storey dwellings, garages, car parking, hard and soft landscaping and all associated site and access works.

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 PowerPoint as follows:

- *LA01/2025/0517/F is a full application for a proposed residential development comprising 23 No. dwellings including 11 No. chalet bungalows, 4 No. detached and 8 No. semi-detached 2.5 storey dwellings, garages, car parking, hard and soft landscaping and all associated site and access works.*
- *A Committee Report accompanies this application.*
- *This application is a local application being presented to the Committee as an objection item with a recommendation to approve. To date there have been 7 objections to the proposal from 6 separate addresses, 1 comment and one support. The objection points are set out in Section 5 of the Committee Report (and mainly relate to traffic/parking, loss of privacy/overlooking concerns, optional garages, boundary treatments, issues associated with demolition). These points and others have been considered within the Planning Committee Report.*
- *(Slide 2 - SLP) The site, as outlined in red, is located within the settlement development limit for Coleraine. The site is located at 47 Ballycairn Road and currently comprises vacant office buildings and hardstanding/tarmac which was previously occupied by a survey company. There has been some intermittent use of the main office building however the site has been largely vacant for the last 10 years.*
- *(Slide 3 – Site Layout) This is the proposed site layout. There are 23no. dwellings in total, comprising detached chalet bungalows and detached 2 storey dwellings and semi-detached 2.5 storey dwellings. Each dwelling has in curtilage parking available, with visitor parking on street. Private amenity space is provided to the rear of each dwelling, and landscaping to site boundaries.*
- *(Slide 4) These are some contextual elevations. Contextual 1 is the elevation to the Ballycairn Road. The existing dwelling at No 49 Ballycairn Road is to the left-hand side. Further to the right-hand side, and not pictured, would be the DH Christie Memorial Primary School. There are two 2 storey detached dwellings fronting onto the Ballycairn Road, with the front of the development denoted by 1m high estate railings with native species hedge planting to the rear. Contextual 2 is running west to east through the site, from the Ballycairn Road on the left-hand side through to Redlands Crescent. There is a detached dwelling at site 1, which presents a dual frontage to the Ballycairn Road and the new internal road, with chalet bungalows on sites 2-10. Contextual 3 is running east to west through the site, from Redlands Crescent on the left-hand side to the Ballycairn Road on the right-hand side. The*

house types vary along this side of the development from the detached chalet bungalows to 2 storey detached, 2.5 storey semi detached and then 2 storey detached at the Ballycairn Road end.

- *(Slide 5) Elevations and Floor Plans for HT H2 which is one of the Detached Chalet Bungalows*
- *(Slide 6) Elevations and Floor Plans for HT P which are the Semi-Detached 2.5 storey dwellings*
- *(Slide 7) Elevations and Floor Plans for HT A which is one of the Detached 2 storey dwellings*
- *(Slide 8) Site Sections through the site. A-A to D-D are north south through the middle of the site. Section E-E is east west at the eastern end of the site at Redlands Crescent. The dashed blue line indicates the outline of the existing office buildings on the site.*
- *Moving to some photographs of the site:*
- *(Slide 9) View of the site frontage along the Ballycairn Road. The existing access is positioned to the southwest corner, just at the right hand side of this image, and will be relocated to the middle of the site.*
- *(Slide 10) View looking down the Ballycairn Road. You can see the access to the school just to the right hand side of the image. The access to the site will be positioned further along on the right hand side. You can also see existing 2 storey dwellings along this part of the Ballycairn Road.*
- *(Slide 11) These are some images from within the site itself, looking up towards the Ballycairn Road, via the existing access.*
- *(Slide 12) This is a view of the main existing office building. There are large areas of existing hardstanding within the site.*
- *(Slide 13) View of the rear part of the site, at the back of the office building, with neighbouring properties along Cairn Road straight ahead and Redlands Crescent further over to the right hand side of the image.*
- *(Slide 14) View of the site along the northern boundary at the eastern end, towards what would be the back part of the site, with the existing properties along Cairn Road.*
- *(Slide 15) View of the site from No. 3 Redlands Crescent. You can see the existing office building on site.*
- *(Slide 16) Aerial image overview of the site, showing the site alongside neighbouring properties.*
- *The proposal is for a residential development comprising 23no. dwellings in total. During processing the scheme was reduced from 24 to 23 to address concerns in relation to parking and residential amenity. The proposed layout shows the dwellings adequately spaced within small front gardens, in curtilage parking and adequately sized private rear gardens above the recommended requirements. All dwellings are a minimum of 10m away from the rear boundaries in accordance with the guidance contained in Creating Places. Ground levels have been considered in the design of the proposed dwellings with the use of the different house types. The proposal is acceptable in terms of the layout, design, scale and massing of the dwellings and respects the*

surrounding context. Proposed materials and finishes are considered satisfactory and in keeping with those used in the area.

- Objections raised issues in relation to residential amenity in terms of overlooking, loss of privacy and loss of light in relation to both housing and garages. Chalet bungalows are proposed along the majority of the northern site boundary to Cairn Road, and the eastern boundary to Redlands Crescent. The rear elevation of these houses only have velux windows in the roof and adequate separation distances are provided along with appropriate boundary treatments. The design, layout and use of the different house types within the development means that the proposal will not result in unacceptable overlooking, overshadowing, loss of light or dominance. In relation to the garages, there were residential amenity concerns in relation to Sites 9 & 10 given the siting of these garages along the rear boundary with No 3 Redlands Crescent and the difference in levels. Amended plans were received removing these garages which addresses previous concerns. Recommended conditions are also provided removing permitted development rights on necessary sites within the development. The proposal is not considered to create conflict with adjacent land uses and there is no unacceptable adverse effect on neighbouring properties.
- A tree survey report was submitted in support of this application. Objections raised the issue of trees and boundary treatments. The removal of trees has been justified through the assessment of the survey report. A landscape plan has been provided detailing all plant schedules, including native species hedgerows with dispersed trees, and is deemed appropriate. Proposed boundary treatments are considered acceptable for this development and in keeping with the local context.
- In relation to access and parking, a Transport Assessment Form accompanied the application, and consultation has been carried out with DfI Roads who have no objection. Objections raised the issue of traffic congestion. Adequate in-curtilage parking has been provided for each dwelling. In relation to on-street parking provision within the development, while there is a shortfall of 1no. space, this is considered acceptable as the proposal would not result in a detrimental impact on amenity. The proposal is acceptable in terms of the access and car parking arrangements.
- Other matters raised included those associated with the demolition of the existing building and relate to noise, dust and potential asbestos. A Preliminary Risk Assessment and a Generic Quantitative Risk Assessment were submitted with this application. Consultation was carried out with Regulation Unit Land and Groundwater Team and Environmental Health. There were no objections and recommended conditions were provided which have been included at Section 10 of the Planning Committee Report.
- No objections have been raised by statutory consultees in relation to this proposal.
- The application has been assessed in relation to the relevant policy considerations including the Northern Area Plan, SPPS Ed 2, PPS 7, Addendum to PPS 7, PPS 15, PPS 3 and PPS 2, and the proposal is

considered acceptable. The recommendation is to approve planning permission (with conditions.)

Councillor Watton queried whether there would be a social/affordable element to the housing scheme. Senior Planning Officer stated that there is no indication of that in the application and no requirement was made for it.

The Chair invited D McLaughlin to speak in support of the application.

D McLaughlin stated that he endorsed Council's recommendation to approve. In response to a question from Councillor Watton, he confirmed that the development would be sited on the former BKS site.

Proposed by Councillor Nicholl

Seconded by Councillor C Archibald

- 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.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

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

The Chair declared the motion carried and application Approved.

RESOLVED - 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.

6.3 LA01/2024/0743/O (Referral) Site Adj to 57 Dunlade Road, Greysteel

Report, presentation, addendum and speaking rights templates were previously circulated and presented by the Development Management (local applications) Manager.

Referral Application to be determined by Planning Committee

App No: LA01/2024/0743/O

App Type: Outline

Proposal: Proposed Site for Dwelling in a Cluster

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 outline planning permission for the reasons set out in section 10.

Addendum Recommendation

It is recommended that the Committee note the content of this addendum and agree to refuse planning permission as set out in the Planning Committee Report and Erratum.

Addendum 2 Recommendation

It is recommended that the Committee note the content of this addendum and agree to refuse planning permission as set out in the Planning Committee Report, Addendum and Erratum.

The Development Management (local applications) Manager presented via PowerPoint presentation as follows:

- *The application is for Outline Permission, described as “Proposed Site for dwelling in a Cluster”.*
- *Along with the PCR there is a site visit note, erratum and addenda.*
- *The erratum amends paragraphs 8.8 and 8.9 of the PCR and Refusal reason 2.*
- *The first addendum details a review of the PAC decisions that were submitted by the agent. These are not considered comparable to the application or justify setting aside the planning policies. It is clear that the proposal fails 3 of the 6 criteria of Policy CTY 2a in that it is not bound by development on 2 sides, would if approved extend into the Countryside and is not located at a focal point. In addition as previously advised the proposal also fails Policy CTY 8 in that the building would add to a ribbon of development by bookending the line of 3 dwellings.*
- *The second addendum refers to the amended block plan in relation to DFI Roads and that information was received under policy CTY 6. The assessment set out the additional information that the applicant would benefit from living closer to family members. These are not compelling or site specific reasons furthermore no evidence was submitted that meets policy that a new dwelling is a necessary response to the particular circumstances of the case and that genuine hardships would be caused if refused and no alternative solutions have been explored. As previously mentioned at the last meeting such as a farm dwelling at the brothers farm. The J& A of the policy clearly sets out the tests to be met and the scenarios where this policy applies. There are no site specific reasons for this site particularly when it adds to a ribbon of development which is prohibited by policy CTY8.*
- *The 3rd addendum advises that DFI Roads have returned their consultation response and still recommend refusal.*
- *[SLIDE] The site, indicated in red is located outside any Settlement Development Limit and is located in the rural area and is not subject to any specific zonings or designations as set out in the NAP 2016. The site is*

located to the south of 3 roadside dwellings. Across the road is an agricultural field and to the south of those 2 dwellings.

- [SLIDE] this next slide shows a contextual plan with the site indicated in pink and the additional linear development along Dunlade Road indicated in a pale yellow. You will note this plan indicates that there is no development to the South of the application site.
- [SLIDE] And again then, this is a satellite image with the site identified by the red star and you will note from the image development fronting Dunlade Road and that there is no development directly to the South of the site.
The application has been submitted as an application for a cluster. Policy CTY 2a allows for a dwelling in a cluster if all 6 criteria are met. As set out in the PCR and erratum the proposal meets the 1st 2 criteria in that there are more than 4 dwellings outside of a farm and that the group appears as a visual entity. The proposal fails the 3rd, 4th and 5th criteria in that there is no focal point such as a social community building or is located at a cross roads.
- (slide)In relation to the 3rd criteria. Within the supporting information the agent advises that the dwelling located at No.58 is a Historic Dwelling, recognised locally and previously used as a ceili house and now as a meeting point. Planning History of this dwelling refs: B/2009/0376/F and B/2012/0090/F approved a replacement dwelling at this location which has been implemented. The Ceili house no longer exists. The replacement is not a social or community building today and functions as a dwelling house. The proposal fails criteria 3.
- The site as you can see is not bound by development on 2 sides, there is only development to the north. The proposal fails the 4th criteria.
- The site cannot be absorbed into the existing cluster through rounding off or consolidation and will visually intrude into the open countryside by continuing development along the Dunlade road and failing the 5th criteria of CTY 2a.
- The proposal is at the outline stage and the development could be controlled at RM stage to ensure it meets with the final bullet point and not adversely impact on residential development.
- The proposal fails to meet 3 of the 6 criteria of Policy CTY2a.
- Turning to some pictures of the site, this is a view looking north on Dunlade Road and the site you can see is at the end of this tree line to the west or left of the slide. The visibility splays have not been demonstrated and require 2.4 by 90m this would most likely result in the removal of the mature hedge row and trees.
- This next slide is a view looking south along Dunlade Road, which shows the ribbon of 3 dwellings along the road, with the site which continues development towards the trees.
- This is just a closer photo showing where the development ends and the site beyond.
- These final photos just show the site itself and you will note how open the site is, and the views into it and the requirement for further landscaping to help integrate any dwelling into the site. Given the openness of the site, and lack of boundary treatment and roadside vegetation, the site is contrary to CTY 13 Integration into the countryside as set out in Paras 8.16 – 8.20 of your PCR.
- Policy CTY 8 states that planning permission will be refused for a building which creates or adds to a ribbon of development. the J & A clearly states

Ribbon development has consistently been opposed and will continue to be unacceptable.

- *As the proposal is contrary to CTY 8, it is also contrary to CTY 14 as Ribbon Development is considered unacceptable in relation to rural character, as set out and considered in Paras 8.21-8.24.*
- *The extracts from the Rural Design Guide show the sites in purple that are unacceptable as they add to a ribbon of development and also fail the cluster Policy in that they are not bound by development on 2 sides and would extend development out into the countryside. Appeal reference 2019/A0214 is relevant the appeal was on the Brisland Road, Greysteel. The commissioner agreed with the Council that the proposal met the first 3 criteria of CTY 2a but it failed to meet policy CTY 2a in that it was not bound by development on two sides and that due to the lack of enclosure by development would fail to round off and consolidate the cluster. The appeal was dismissed as the proposal failed to meet criteria 4 and 5 of CTY 2a. This is also the case in the second appeal 2022/A0079*
- *The proposal is contrary to the SPPS, PPS 3 policy Amp 2, and Planning Policy Statement 21 policies CTY 1, policy CTY2a, CTY 6, CTY 8, CTY 13 and CTY 14 for the reasons set out in Section 10 of the PCR. The application is recommended for refusal.*

In response to a query from Councillor Storey, the Development Management (local applications) Manager noted that the addendum recommendation should be rectified to read:

It is recommended that the Committee note the content of this addendum and agree to Refuse planning permission as set out in the Planning Committee Report, Addenda and Erratum.

In response to a query from Councillor McMullan, the Development Management (local applications) Manager stated that DfI Roads was reconsulted on the amended block plan and still refused. She noted that the erratum fixed the point in the original report regarding there being no objections.

The Chair invited A Boyle to speak in support of the application.

A Boyle stated that the block plan that has been submitted shows that the visibility splays can be met. He noted that the applicant's nephew has given permission for his wall to be moved and a neighbour has given permission for his trees to be cut to allow for the requisite visibility splays. He noted that this is a genuine case, with the applicant having both left and then returned to the area due to tragedy. He advised that the applicant's doctor has offered to provide further evidence to support the application if required. He stated that the applicant's site is bounded by mature trees. He stated that the cases cited do not reflect the circumstances of this application.

There were no questions put to the speaker.

Councillor Nicholl proposed the application for approval, giving the following reasons:

- It would not create ribbon development.
- The site is bounded and not exposed.
- The DfI Roads visibility splays can be achieved.
- The development aligns with the character of the area.
- The site has been shown to be a focal point for the area.
- Statutory agencies did not submit any objections.
- It meets most of the criteria of CTY2A.

Councillor C Archibald seconded the proposal to approve the application.

The Development Management (local applications) Manager noted that, in respect of refusal reason 2, there would be a cluster associated with the focal point. She further noted that there is only development to the north of the site, not to the west or south. In response to this, Councillor Nicholl stated that a condition can be added to ensure that vegetation is provided to the front of the site.

In respect of refusal reason 3, ribbon development, Councillor Nicholl stated that the nature of the rural road means that it would not create ribbon development. He stated that Planning policy does not take account of rural roads and that the interpretation of this policy is subjective.

In respect of refusal reason 6, the Development Management (local applications) Manager noted that DfI Roads had recommended it for refusal. Councillor Nicholl stated that the block plan had been resubmitted. The Development Management (local applications) Manager advised that the DfI response regarding the block plan was still to recommend refusal.

Members requested guidance from the Council Solicitor.

MOTION TO PROCEED ‘IN COMMITTEE’

Proposed by Councillor C Archibald

Seconded by Alderman Brown Stewart

- That the Committee move In Committee.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

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

The Chair declared the motion carried.

RESOLVED – that the Committee moves ‘In Committee’.

- * Press were disconnected from the meeting at 11.46am.
- * Public were disconnected from the meeting at 11.46am.

The information contained in the following item is restricted in accordance with Part 1 of Schedule 6 of the Local Government Act (Northern Ireland) 2014.

The Council Solicitor provided guidance in respect of ribbon development and the need to provide cogent, fact-based reasons for a decision.

MOTION TO PROCEED ‘IN PUBLIC’

Proposed by Councillor C Archibald
 Seconded by Councillor Watton and

AGREED – to recommend that the Committee moves ‘*In Public*’.

The Director of Corporate Services rehearsed the reasons cited by Councillor Nicholl as follows:

- It would not create ribbon development.
- The site is bounded and not exposed.
- The DfI Roads visibility splays can be achieved.
- The development aligns with the character of the area.
- The site has been shown to be a focal point for the area.
- Statutory agencies did not submit any objections.
- It meets most of the criteria of CTY2A.

Councillor Nicholl stated that he was content that this covered his points.

Alderman Hunter requested a recorded vote.

Councillor Kennedy proposed that the application be deferred to allow the applicant to inform DfI Roads that the sight lines can be achieved. Councillor Watton seconded this.

Proposed by Councillor Nicholl
 Seconded by Councillor C Archibald

- 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 outline planning permission for the following reasons:

- It would not create ribbon development.
- The site is bounded and not exposed.
- The DfI Roads visibility splays can be achieved.

- The development aligns with the character of the area.
- The site has been shown to be a focal point for the area.
- Statutory agencies did not submit any objections.
- It meets most of the criteria of CTY2A.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

4 Members voted For; 5 Members voted Against, 2 Members Abstained.

The Chair declared the motion lost and application Refused.

RESOLVED - 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 outline planning permission for the reasons set out in section 10.

Recorded Vote Table

For (4)	Councillor C Archibald, McMullan, McQuillan, Nicholl
Against (5)	Alderman Brown Stewart, Coyle, Hunter, McKillop Councillor Storey
Abstain (2)	Councillor Kennedy, Watton

The Chair declared a recess at 11.58am

The meeting resumed at 12.14pm

The Director of Corporate Services undertook a roll call.

6.4 LA01/2025/0530/F (Referral) Lands to the rear of No. 127 Glenhead Road, Limavady

Report, presentation, site visit note, and speaking rights template were previously circulated and presented by Senior Planning Officer, R Heaney.

Referral Application to be determined by Planning Committee

App No: LA01/2025/0530/F

App Type: Full

Proposal: Full retrospective Planning Application for the retention of agricultural building for agricultural storage & concrete hardstanding

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.

Senior Planning Officer presented via PowerPoint presentation as follows:

LA01/2025/0530/F is a full planning Application for the retention of an agricultural building for agricultural storage & concrete hardstanding. At lands to the rear of 127 Glenhead Road, Limavady.

This local application was presented to the Planning Committee in May as a referred item following a recommendation to refuse planning Permission and was deferred for site visit.

An addendum, site visit report, planning committee report and erratum accompanies the application.

The site visit took place on Monday, the 22nd of June.

Since the last committee meeting the agent has submitted a further Supporting Statement, which is detailed in the written addendum.

Yesterday further information was also submitted, comprising the applicants Sheep Flock Register. This will be addressed now via verbal addendum.

The register shows that the applicant held 8 ewes and 11 lambs on the 6th of April 2026. It does not however demonstrate that the farm business has been active and established for the required 6 years, with the first entry in the register being 22nd March 2025.

No objections have been received in relation to this application

The application site is located outside of any settlement development limits as identified in The Northern Area Plan (NAP) 2016 and is not subject to any specific environmental designations.

[SLIDE] Aerial image of the site in red with the applicants dwelling indicated with the yellow dot.

The application site measures under 0.1ha and comprises an enclosed area of hardstanding, agricultural shed, and a section of a shared access lane. It is part of a holding, comprising the shed and a field, measuring 0.88ha.

The further supporting statement received since last committee states that the applicant has taken an additional 1.5ha. of lands, on the glenhead and Baranailt roads from his father. One of the additional fields is being claimed by a farm business which is not the applicants. The other field is not being claimed by any business.

The site is located to the rear of the Applicants dwelling, with the shed and hardstanding bounded on 2 sides with a field under the Applicants control. The boundary to the lane is defined with agricultural gates and 2m panel fencing. The boundary with the Applicants dwelling is defined with 3m hedging and the western

and southern boundaries with the Applicants field are defined with ranch and post and wire fencing, respectively.

[SLIDE] The proposed farm shed measures 14.3 metres by 9.1 metres. It is 4.2 metres to the eaves and 5.2 metres to the ridge. The finished floor level of the shed is set lower than Glenhead Road. The site is screened to the north and north east by Nos 127 & 135 Glenhead Road. There is a limited fleeting view of the shed from the north west.

[SLIDE] This is views on approach to the site. The first photo is on the approach from the east on the Glenhead road. You can see the access to 135 Glenhead road there, a dwelling neighbouring the site and applicants dwelling. The applicants dwelling and the shed are well screened there.

The second photo is taken from the shared lane looking south. The wall to the right is the boundary wall of the applicants dwelling.

The final photo on this slide shows the applicants dwelling and shed on approach to the site from the west on the Glenhead Road.

[SLIDE] The Sheep flock register submitted yesterday shows that the applicant had 8 ewes and 11 lambs on the 6th of April 2026.

[SLIDE] The shed will not be used to house livestock and the initial photographs of the inside of the shed submitted by the applicant showed it contained 1 tractor, 1 trailer, 1 sheep trough, 5 sheep hurdles, shelving, 1 spade, 1 shovel, 1 yard brush.

[SLIDE] The photos submitted on the 9th show many more items in the shed although no information as to where the items have come from or who owns them has been submitted.

The agent states the applicant is a newly established farmer and wishes to consolidate his farm holding and secure the efficiency and effectiveness of his farming operations by retaining the agricultural building situated on his farming lands.

The local area is characterised by agricultural lands and detached residential development on relatively large plots.

As this application has been submitted as an agricultural shed it falls to be determined primarily under CTY12 of PPS21. CTY12 allows for development on an active and established agricultural holding where it is necessary for the efficient use of that holding, is not harmful to character, integrates, will not harm natural or built heritage and will not result in detrimental impact on the amenity of residential dwellings outside of the holding.

The applicant's Farm Business ID was allocated on 20th May 2024 and the farm holding was established at this time. It is a Category 3 ID. The farm business has not claimed payments through the Basic Payment Scheme or Agri Environmental Scheme in any of the last 6 years. Therefore, the business and holding have not been established for the required 6 year period.

The applicant has submitted some receipts and invoices to demonstrate that the holding is active and established however they do not cover a period of at least 6 years, with the earliest being May 2024. The receipts are for things like animal feed, spot treatments, feeders, and sheep hurdles.

The applicant has 8 ewes and 11 lambs as of April 2026, and the business comprises a small area of agricultural land of approximately 0.8 of a ha. The additional lands do not form part of the applicants holding as detailed in the written addendum. It is not known if the farm business which is associated with one of the additional fields has existing agricultural buildings which could be used by the applicant.

It is noted that the applicants dwelling has a large garage and that the shed had initially been shown to hold limited contents.

[SLIDE] To demonstrate the garage would not be suitable, the final slide shows the inside of the applicant's garage.

It has therefore not been demonstrated that the proposal is necessary for the efficient use of the agricultural holding.

In terms of character and integration it is considered that the proposal will not offend Policies CTY 13 and CTY 14 of PPS21

Our reasons for recommending refusal are:

The proposal is contrary to Policies CTY1 of PPS21 and paragraph 6.73 of the SPPS

It is also contrary to Policy CTY12 of PPS21 in that it has not demonstrated that the proposed building is located on an active and established agricultural holding or that the proposal is necessary for the efficient use of the agricultural holding.

Members discussed the requirement for the business to be independently established for at least 6 years. Councillor McMullan stated that being registered for the single farm payment is not the only means of proving an established business, and neither is having livestock. Senior Planning Officer advised that there has been no argument made by the applicant that they are established and active for more than six years.

Alderman Coyle queried whether the farm equipment needed to belong to the applicant to be accepted as proof of farming activity and noted that many farmers now work for other farmers. Senior Planning Officer advised that the photographs were provided as evidence of farming activity but no information was provided regarding where the items came from or who owns them.

Alderman Callan queried whether a small farm holding is judged according to the same criteria as a large farming business in respect of the six-year rule under

CTY10. Senior Planning Officer advised that the guidance is that the same test should be applied under CTY10. Alderman Callan stated that applying the policy in this way works against someone who is trying to establish a modest farming activity. He stated that the policy is about supporting the development of farming activity and that there should be flexibility around its application.

Councillor McMullan emphasised the importance of having a shed to store equipment for maintenance and health and safety reasons.

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

L Kennedy stated:

- The application is being recommended for refusal due to the strict application of the six-year rule under Policy CTY12 of PPS 21 but Planning accepts every other aspect of this development under this policy criteria:
 - the building integrates into the landscape;
 - it is not a prominent feature;
 - it does not harm rural character;
 - there are no amenity concerns;
 - and there are no objections from any statutory agencies or third parties.
- Application is for a modest agricultural building located behind the applicant's family home, screened by existing vegetation and surrounding buildings, and accepted by the Council as visually acceptable in the landscape.
- Applicant wants to expand their holding but is unable to due to the need for storage facilities.
- The applicant comes from a strong farming background. He purchased the lands surrounding his home in 2010 and has farmed the lands since then for silage each year from this date. He has also recently taken two fields to accommodate the farm development.
- Historically, he used his grandparents' yard and buildings for the storage of machinery and agricultural equipment, but after his grandmother passed away in 2022, he lost access to the buildings in 2023. He built the shed in 2024 to meet his operational need for storage.
- This context means that he meets Policy CTY 1, which permits development in the countryside where overriding reasons exist as to why that development is essential in that location.
- The report accepts that the applicant has a registered farm business, holds flock numbers, has livestock on the holding, and has agricultural machinery and equipment associated with farming holding. Therefore, the issue is not whether the land is being farmed; it is the strict application of the six-year requirement.

- The strict application of this policy actively discriminates against any new farmers, as they are effectively prevented from developing even modest agricultural infrastructure for the first six years of operation.
- This policy approach does not reflect the aims and objectives of PPS21 or the SPPS, both of which seek to sustain rural communities, support rural enterprise and encourage ongoing agricultural activity within the countryside.
- The applicant has no other agricultural buildings available to him, and it is not practical or realistic to suggest that the equipment be stored domestically.
- The planning merits of this case are overwhelmingly positive as it meets all the other criteria of Policy CTY 12, namely:-
 - no landscape harm;
 - no road safety issue;
 - no environmental concern;
 - no neighbour objection;
 - no policy conflict other than the strict application of the six-year rule.

Alderman Callan queried whether the information regarding the operational need due to loss of access to a previous storage facility was highlighted to Planning Officers. L Kennedy advised that the information only became available after the last Planning meeting.

Members discussed how the applicant's farm operates. Alderman Hunter queried the location of the handling facilities for the sheep. L Kennedy advised that there is a concrete area at the front of the shed. Alderman Hunter stated that the site visit did not show any facilities for sheep outside. In response to Alderman Coyle, the applicant provided information regarding his ownership of some of the farming equipment pictured.

Councillor Storey noted that while paragraph 5.5 of PPS21 encourages Planning decisions that support the operational need of enterprises, section 5.6 restricts how this can be done. Councillor Storey stated that paragraph 5.6 of PPS21 refers to a dwelling rather than a farm building.

Councillor McMullan proposed that the Committee defer the application to allow the applicant to prove that he has been operating for more than six years.

Alderman Callan proposed that the Committee approve the application and gave the following reasons:

- The application has met most policy tests: the shed is modest in scale, well-screened, integrates into the landscape, does not harm rural character, raises no issues for residential amenity or natural heritage, and is acceptable in terms of access and road safety. There are no objections from neighbours or from any statutory consultee.

- The building is environmentally benign and uncontentious in planning terms. CTY 1 allows agricultural buildings that support genuine farm enterprises. CTY1 overrides the CYT12 refusal.
- The applicant has a registered DAERA herd/flock and is actively grazing sheep on these lands. There is clear evidence of agricultural activity from 2023 onwards. The shed is used daily for farming activities that are integral to managing the holding and safeguarding animal welfare.
- It is not realistic to suggest that this range of machinery and equipment could be stored in the small domestic garage behind the dwelling. That would be unsafe, impractical, and contrary to good farm management.
- The six-year benchmark appears elsewhere in policy in relation to dwellings on farms; it is not a hard, statutory bar on modest agricultural buildings. The CTY12 requirement that the holding is active and established should be understood as requiring that it is a genuine, ongoing agricultural enterprise with real activity on the land, rather than requiring that an arbitrary date has passed.
- This is a genuine and growing sheep enterprise on just under a hectare, with longstanding family involvement. It is an active holding the shed is critical to the farm operation. There is no other building on the holding that could reasonably or safely accommodate the farm equipment. This is exactly the sort of small rural enterprise that CTY 12 is designed to support, particularly where there is no identified harm to rural character, amenity or the environment.
- The requirements of CTY 1 have been met: the proposal falls within an accepted category of countryside development, there are clear and overriding operational and safety reasons why this modest agricultural building must be located on the holding rather than in a settlement, and it does not give rise to any unacceptable adverse impact. When read together with CTY 12 and the SPPS, that provides a sound basis to allow the retention of this building in its current rural location. The development is clearly tied to an active and established holding, it is necessary for the efficient running of that holding, and it causes no identifiable planning harm.

Proposed by Alderman Callan

Seconded by Councillor Watton

- That the Committee 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:

- The application has met most policy tests: the shed is modest in scale, well-screened, integrates into the landscape, does not harm rural character, raises no issues for residential amenity or natural heritage, and is acceptable in terms of access and road safety. There are no objections from neighbours or from any statutory consultee.

- The building is environmentally benign and uncontentious in planning terms. CTY 1 allows agricultural buildings that support genuine farm enterprises. CTY1 overrides the CYT12 refusal.
- The applicant has a registered DAERA herd/flock and is actively grazing sheep on these lands. There is clear evidence of agricultural activity from 2023 onwards. The shed is used daily for farming activities that are integral to managing the holding and safeguarding animal welfare.
- It is not realistic to suggest that this range of machinery and equipment could be stored in the small domestic garage behind the dwelling. That would be unsafe, impractical, and contrary to good farm management.
- The six-year benchmark appears elsewhere in policy in relation to dwellings on farms; it is not a hard, statutory bar on modest agricultural buildings. The CTY12 requirement that the holding is active and established should be understood as requiring that it is a genuine, ongoing agricultural enterprise with real activity on the land, rather than requiring that an arbitrary date has passed.
- This is a genuine and growing sheep enterprise on just under a hectare, with longstanding family involvement. It is an active holding the shed is critical to the farm operation. There is no other building on the holding that could reasonably or safely accommodate the farm equipment. This is exactly the sort of small rural enterprise that CTY 12 is designed to support, particularly where there is no identified harm to rural character, amenity or the environment.
- The requirements of CTY 1 have been met: the proposal falls within an accepted category of countryside development, there are clear and overriding operational and safety reasons why this modest agricultural building must be located on the holding rather than in a settlement, and it does not give rise to any unacceptable adverse impact. When read together with CTY 12 and the SPPS, that provides a sound basis to allow the retention of this building in its current rural location. The development is clearly tied to an active and established holding, it is necessary for the efficient running of that holding, and it causes no identifiable planning harm.

Alderman Hunter requested a recorded vote.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

9 Members voted For; 2 Members voted Against, 1 Members Abstained.

The Chair declared the motion carried and application Approved

RESOLVED - That the Committee 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:

Recorded Vote Table

For (9)	Alderman Callan, McKillop Councillor C Archibald, Kennedy, McGurk, McMullan, Nicholl, Storey, Watton
Against (2)	Alderman Brown Stewart, Hunter
Abstain (1)	Alderman Coyle

RESOLVED – That Conditions and Informatives are delegated to Officers.

The Chair declared a recess for lunch at 1:15pm

Senior Democratic Services Officer, U Harper left the Chamber at 1:15pm.

The meeting resumed at 2:00pm

Democratic Services Officer, J Keen joined the Chamber at 2:00pm

The Director of Corporate Services undertook a roll call.

- * **Alderman Hunter did not rejoin the meeting having given an apology for this afternoon at the beginning of the meeting.**

6.5 LA01/2025/0342/O (Referral) 40m West of 18 Ballyhackett Lane, Castlerock

Report, presentation, site visit note and speaking rights template were previously circulated and presented by Senior Planning Officer, M McErlain.

Referral Application to be determined by Planning Committee

App No: LA01/2025/0342/O

App Type: Outline

Proposal: Construction of a dwelling with detached garage and including a new access and parking area

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.

Senior Planning Officer presented via PowerPoint presentation as follows:

- *LA01/2025/0342/O is an Outline Planning Application for the Construction of a dwelling with detached garage and including a new access and parking area at lands 40 Meters West of 18 Ballyhackett Lane, 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 application was deferred from the May Committee Meeting to facilitate a site visit which was carried out on Monday June.*
- *No objections have been received in relation to this application*
- *The application site is located outside of any settlement development limits as identified in The Northern Area Plan (NAP) 2016 and is sited within the designated Binevenagh Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.*
- *The application site comprises the eastern portion of a larger agricultural field which fronts onto Ballyhackett Lane. The field undulates with gradual rises in a western and southern direction. The site is set at a high ground level with the Ballyhackett Lane rising steeply in a westerly direction from the adjacent No. 18.*
- *The site will be accessed via the creation of a new access onto Ballyhackett Lane.*
- *As this application has been submitted as a dwelling on a farm it falls to be determined under CTY1 and 10 of PPS21.*
- *Department of Agriculture and Rural Development have confirmed that the business is active and established for the required period, no development opportunities have been sold-off from the holding and the application site is considered to satisfactorily links with existing buildings on the farm holding.*
- *Officials are satisfied that the proposal meets with Policy CTY10.*
- *The application site comprises the eastern portion of a larger agricultural field. The northern and eastern site boundaries are defined only by post and wire fencing while the western site boundary is undefined to the remainder of the field. The southern boundary is defined by post and wire fencing and hedge line.*
- *The lack of any meaningful natural vegetation to site boundaries results in the application site appearing as overly open and exposed site when viewed on approach in both directions along Ballyhackett Rd, with the proposed dwelling ultimately unable to be integrated into the site and wider landscape.*
- *The application site is at an elevation position in the landscape, considerably higher than the existing development to the north-east , east and south east of the site which, has been set into the landform, utilizing the steeply rising slopes to their immediate rear to provide a strong backdrop to their development and avoiding appearing as overly prominent, skyline features.*
- *The prominent setting of the application site coupled with the lack of any meaningful natural vegetation to site boundaries result in the application site appearing as an overly prominent and exposed site.*

- *Even when viewed from further vantage points along Altikeeragh Rd, a dwelling on the application site will be a notable feature in the landscape, and while will note appear as a skyline feature given the rising distant backdrop, will still appear as a conspicuous feature in the landscape.*
- *Given the prominence and lack of integration afforded to the site the proposal is contrary to Paragraph 6.70 of the SPPS and policies CTY 13 and 14.*
- *Additionally, given the setting of the application site within the Binevenagh Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty the proposal would result in an adverse impact on the character and visual amenity of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and is also contrary to Paragraph 6.186 Policy NH6 of PPS2*
- *Given the proximity of the application site to a Scheduled Monument LDY006:014 (possible Motte) and a Rath (LDY006:013) consultation with Historic Environment Division was undertaken.*
- *Within their initial response Historic Environment Division advised that concerns in relation to the setting of the monuments could be overcome through appropriate design and siting within the application site.*
- *Initially Historic Environment Division advised that any dwelling should be sited in the northern portion of the site, contrary to the applicant's preferred siting within the southern portion of the as identified on the site location plan.*
- *Historic Environment Division were invited to attend May's Committee meeting to answer questions members may have in regard to the potential impact on the identified monuments. In preparation for the meeting Historic Environment Division undertook a site inspection. Upon assessment Historic Environment Division have provided an updated position to their formal response and have advised that given the condition and legibility of the scheduled monument and the separation between it and this application site, Historic Environment Division assess that satisfactory integration into the wider setting of the scheduled monument may be achieved though the design details noted in points 1 and 3 of our response. Historic Environment Division (Historic Monuments) would not advise that the positioning within the southern half of the site should in itself be seen as a reason to consider this proposal as contrary to Policy BH1 of PPS6 in this case.*
- *Given the comments from Historic Environment Division the Planning Department would now withdraw refusal reason 2 as set out at Section 10 of the Planning Committee Report and amend refusal reason 3 to remove reference to failure to respect features of importance to the heritage of the landscape.*
- *In addition to Department of Agriculture and Rural Development and Historic Environment Division Consultation was also carried out with Department for Infrastructure (Roads), Northern Ireland Environment Agency and Environmental Health who have raised no concerns.*
- *In Conclusion the proposal is contrary to Paragraphs 6.70 and 6.186 of the SPPS, Policies CTY13 and 14 of PPS21 and Policy NH6 of PPS2.*

- *Refusal is recommended*

In response to questions from Elected Members the Senior Planning Officer stated that this is the third planning application received for this parcel of land and has been refused on the grounds of integration and the impact on the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The Senior Planning Officer stated that the concerns from the Historic Environment Department have now been overcome. The Senior Planning Officer stated that the Planning Department have previously stated that an alternative site, on the sloped area, is preferable and stated that the applicant wants to build a shed on the slope under permitted development. The Senior Planning Officer advised that the application is accepted, that CTY10 is established and that it is accepted that there can be a dwelling on the site.

Councillor Watton commented that there is a natural dip in the ground and very little of top of the dwelling would be seen from the road.

In response to further questions regarding landscaping the Senior Planning Officer advised that each site is considered separately as there can be varying degrees of landscaping ranging from some sites having a considerable amount of landscaping to other sites being more exposed. The Senior Planning Officer explained that sites relying completely on landscaping being planted are not suitable as the dwelling needs to blend into the landscape.

Councillor McMullan stated that mature landscaping could be considered.

The Chair invited J Simpson to speak in support of the application.

J Simpson stated that the applicant is seeking approval for construction of a dwelling with detached garage and including a new access and parking area. He stated there have been no objections from statutory consultees and that the Historic Environment Division (Historic Monuments) has no objections. J Simpson stated that the applicant has an established Farm ID and that the site is located to integrate with the current operations of the farm and that landscaping can be dealt with at the reserved matters stage of the application. J Simpson stated that the dwelling will be located behind no 18, that the western hills will be seen in the background, the dwelling will be located within the dip and there will be no negative impact to critical viewpoints. The site for the dwelling is located fairly centrally behind no 18 which helps with integration into the area. J Simpson stated that the dwelling is of appropriate scale and design and it respects the character of the area. J Simpson stated that policies CTY10, 13 and 14 are met.

In response to questions about the dwelling being seen on the skyline J Simpson stated that it will not be seen from the road, that the contours of the land mean it will be integrated.

There were no further questions for the Senior Planning Officer.

The Chair stated the recommendation.

Proposed by Councillor Watton

Seconded by Councillor Kennedy

- 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 subject to the reasons set out in section 10 for the following reasons

- There are bungalows and 2 storey dwellings near this location and some on the skyline.
- It will not be a notable feature as only a small amount of the dwelling will be seen due to a natural dip in the ground
- There are no objections from the Historic Environment Division
- There are no further objections
- The dwelling is comparable to others in the area
- The dwelling does integrate into the area
- It complies with CTY13 and 14
- This site is on an established farm
- In relation to the AONB the site is within a dip and cannot be classified as a prominent feature
- Design will be in accordance with the AONB setting

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

7 Members voted For; 1 Members voted Against, 0 Member 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 subject to the reasons set out in section 10 for the following reasons

- There are bungalows and 2 storey dwellings near this location and some on the skyline.
- It will not be a notable feature as only a small amount of the dwelling will be seen due to a natural dip in the ground
- There are no objections from the Historic Environment Division
- There are no further objections
- The dwelling is comparable to others in the area
- The dwelling does integrate into the area
- It complies with CTY13 and 14
- This site is on an established farm

- In relation to the AONB the site is within a dip and cannot be classified as a prominent feature
- Design will be in accordance with the AONB setting

RESOLVED - That Conditions and Informatives are delegated to Officers.

6.6 LA01/2024/0119/O (Referral) Lands to the West of St. Patrick's Culfeightrin Church, 89 Cushendall Road, Ballyvoy

Report, presentation, addendum, letters of support, site visit note and speaking rights template were previously circulated and presented by Senior Planning Officer, E Hudson.

Referral Application to be determined by Planning Committee

App No: LA01/2024/0119/O

App Type: Outline

Proposal: Erection of 14 no. social and affordable housing units under Policy CTY 5 of PPS 21

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.

Addendum Recommendation

It is recommended that the Committee note the content of this addendum and agree to refuse planning permission as set out in the Planning Committee Report.

Senior Planning Officer presented via PowerPoint presentation as follows:

- *(Slide) Planning Application LA01/2024/0119/O. This is an outline application for 14 no. social and affordable housing units at lands west of St Patricks church, Culfaytrin, Cushendall Rd, Ballyvoy.*
- *There are 2 addenda to your committee report considering additional information to support the application and a second addendum referring to a further Historic Environment Division consultation, a letter of support from the local parish priest and an email from the agent referring to the Committee report.*
- *Since this Monday we have also received further information from the agent and letters of support which will be dealt with via verbal addendum. A letter of support has been received by Councillor Margaret Anne McKillop. Summary:*

- *Would deliver first new housing in Ballyvoy for many years;*
- *Ballyvoy sits on outskirts of Ballycastle and demonstrates a need for social housing;*
- *Housing data for Ballycastle shows 106 applicants on waiting list with 70 identifying Ballyvoy as second preference with Ballycastle housing programme for next 5 years representing less than 20% of identified need.*
- *Will have wider economic benefits including creation of construction jobs.*
- *Letter of support from Ballyvoy laundry services which is open in the village and supports the development which will support their business going forward.*
- *The agent has submitted an extract from the Housing Executive's Housing Investment Plan 2025. These refer to projected social housing figures for Ballyvoy which will be discussed later in the presentation.*
- *(Slide) The red line boundary of the site. The site is the corner edge of a larger agricultural field located along the roadside on approach into the small settlement of Ballyvoy. The site is located outside the Settlement Development Limit of Ballyvoy, in the countryside. It is also within the Antrim Coast and Glens Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the St Patricks Local Landscape Policy Area as designated in the area plan.*
- *(Slide) Extract from the Area Plan. The site is marked with the red star and the Settlement Development Limit for Ballyvoy includes 2 separate parcels of land. That to the west which is centred around the church and the Gaelic sports ground, opposite the site, and the parcel to the east which is centred around Hunters bar and restaurant and housing along Blackpark Road.*
- *Looking at the Local Landscape Policy Area. The policy in the plan states that it will be protected from all development other than sensitively sited development essential for farming operations. The adjacent church is also identified as a key feature of the Local Landscape Policy Area that contributes to the environmental quality, integrity and character of the area. As the proposal is not for development essential for farming operations it is contrary to this area plan policy.*
- *In terms of the principle of development the application has been submitted as a PPS21 CTY5 application which is titled social and affordable housing. Policy CTY5 allows for a group of no more than 14 dwellings adjacent to or near a small settlement or within a dispersed rural community to provide social and affordable housing to meet the needs of the rural community. Permission will only be granted where the application is made by a registered Housing Association and where a demonstrable need has been identified by the Northern Ireland Housing Executive which cannot be readily met within an existing settlement in the locality. The application has been made by the Registered Housing Association and a third party.*

- *The Northern Ireland Housing Executive carry out housing needs assessment annually and in the latest they have identified an unmet need for one social housing unit in Ballyvoy for the period 2024- 2029. As such the proposal is contrary to this policy. The agent submitted a housing capacity assessment in which they explored alternative sites in Ballyvoy and advised there is no current capacity. However, this alternative search was based around providing 14 units and not the housing need of one dwelling. It is expected that a need for one dwelling could be accommodated within the existing settlement limit.*
- *The agent has also acknowledged that there is a need of less than 5 social units in Ballyvoy and has referred to housing need in Ballycastle which is a local hub and where there is a need for 70 social housing units. However, the policy is clear that it is to meet a rural need, in a settlement of less than 2250 of a population, not an urban one and as there is not a need for 14 social and affordable housing units in Ballyvoy it is contrary to CTY5. Essentially the proposal is seeking to apply a rural policy to address an urban need which is not what the policy is in place to do.*
- *The agent submitted an email on Monday referring to an extract from the Housing Executives Housing Investment Plan 2025 update for the Council area. He referred to Appendix 7 of the report which refers to Applicants and Allocations at March 2025 which advises there are 6 applicants and 4 in housing stress for Ballyvoy. The table on the right, appendix 2, is from the same document. It refers to housing supply requirements and advises that in the 5 year projected social housing requirement 2024-2029 there is a projected housing need of 1 in Ballyvoy. This tallies with the latest Northern Ireland Housing Executive response on the application and information contained in paragraph 8.12 of the Committee report.*
- *The application is for social and affordable housing. It is unclear what portion of the site is to be affordable housing and what portion is social housing. The applicant, the Registered Housing Association, appears to be a social housing provider and the mix identified in the Planning Statement would indicate it is all social housing.*
- *This is an extract from the North East Area Plan 1987-2002 which predated the current Northern Area Plan and which the agent has referred to in their submission. The site along with additional lands was included in the Settlement Development Limit under this plan. However, lands were removed from the Settlement Development Limit as part of the inquiry and adoption of the Northern Area Plan 2016. The Northern Area Plan is the current adopted plan and which all applications should have regard to as outlined in part 6.1 of the committee report.*
- *Although it is an outline application an indicative layout has been submitted in accordance with Policy QD2 of PPS7. There are concerns with the proposed layout these include:*

- In the context of the wider Ballyvoy settlement. PPS7 states that many villages and small settlements in Northern Ireland display an essentially rural character and proposals for housing development in such locations should reflect this in their design, layout and detailing. This contextual layout demonstrates how the proposed layout is out of keeping and at odds with the distinct low density informal pattern of development which can be seen opposite the site and that which the site will be viewed with. The formal high density, road dominant layout is more in keeping with an urban context not on the edge of a small rural settlement. The terraced layout, dominant parking and hardstanding are uncharacteristic of the area which has developed in an informal way witnessed on the opposite side of the road. The layout also sits forward of the adjacent Listed Church which is a prominent feature on the western approach to Ballyvoy. Concern also relates to the lack of private amenity for some of the dwellings which is as little 28sq m for one unit. This is significantly below even the lowest requirement of 40sq m which would be more for an urban context and not a rural location such as this where typically curtilages are more generous. Dwellings to the rear of the site sit at a higher level facing towards the back of those along the front this gives a perception of overlooking to those at the front. Department for Infrastructure (Roads) have advised the parking provision and roads layout is not in keeping with published guide lines in Creating Places. The concept plan does not fully take account of the context and its setting and the site is too restricted to accommodate a development of this scale whilst appreciating its rural setting. The proposal is contrary to Policy QD1 and 2 of PPS7.*
- The proposal is also contrary to Policies CT13, 14 and 15 of PPS 21 which relate to integration, rural character and the setting of settlements.*
- Indicative elevational details of the proposed scheme. The application was accompanied by a topographical survey which outlined the levels of the site. There is an approximate difference in levels of around 8 and half metres from the front of the site to the rear and a difference in 4 metres from the front row of dwellings to those along the rear. This does not appear to be reflective of the indicative elevations shown on the drawings which would indicate the row of dwellings to the rear would sit at a much higher level to that suggested in the illustrative elevations. Alternatively the development will require significant ground works, retaining structures and level changes which in itself would have an impact on the character and appear of the surrounding context. The application is also located in the Antrim Coast and Glens Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and the form, scale and massing are considered unacceptable and will harm the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty location. The proposal is contrary to Policy N6 of PPS 2.*

- *Photo 1 – Approach from the west into Ballyvoy. The Listed Church. Historic Environment Division have been consulted and have concerns on the Listed Church. The proposed building mass with associated curtilage structures form a competing adverse harm to the both the immediate and greater rural setting which currently enriches the contribution the setting makes for the listed building. Historic Environment Division consider the planned site form shall significantly alter the use of the Listed Building, graveyard and general curtilage. Historic Environment Division advised in their response additional info to be provided and points to consider. The agent advised they considered the layout was appropriate to the location and no further plans were submitted. Additional information submitted as outlined in the addendum to the committee do not address Historic Environment Division concerns. The proposal is contrary to Policy BH11 of PPS6. Historic Environment Division are available online for any questions.*
- *A Pre Application Discussion was submitted prior to the submission of the application. The same issues were raised at that time with the layout and impact on the Listed Building. These were not addressed at submission of the application.*
- *Photo 2- Take from the car park opposite the site.*
- *Photo 3 – Eastern approach coming out of the village*
- *Photo 4 – From the site frontage to the rear of the site.*
- *There have been no objections to the proposal and 20 letters of support.*
- *Our recommendation is to refuse permission for the reasons outlined in Part 10 of the Committee report.*

In response to questions from Elected Members the Senior Planning Officer confirmed that this is an outline application, that the description is for 14 dwellings and that a concept plan was required to establish if the principle of development is acceptable - the Planning Department consider the principle of development unacceptable. The Senior Planning Officer stated that a Pre Application Discussion occurred prior to the submission of the planning application. The Senior Planning Officer stated that the issue is in relation to the principle of development and the need for housing in Ballyvoy.

In response to further questions the Senior Planning Officer stated that the Planning Department did not consider what an acceptable number of dwellings would be on this site because the principle of development is unacceptable.

Councillor McGurk stated that there is a lack of confidence in the figures provided by the Housing Executive and questioned if the true latent need for housing in Ballyvoy has been considered. Councillor McGurk questioned if seconded preferences for Ballyvoy were considered.

In response to Councillor McGurk the Senior Planning Officer stated that the figures shown in Appendix 7 on slide 4 of the presentation is still less than the proposed number of dwellings the applicant is proposing to build. The Senior Planning Officer stated that if there is a need for housing in Ballycastle it should be met in Ballycastle. Senior Planning Officer advised that the Housing Executive was contacted on Monday when the Agent submitted information regarding the figures for the unmet need for housing in Ballyvoy and they have not yet responded.

Councillor McMullan spoke of the need for housing in Ballyvoy and how the businesses are still operating. Councillor McMullan also questioned the number of people who had stated Ballyvoy as their second preference for housing. Councillor McMullan stated that this application does not urbanise a rural area.

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

S Mulholland stated that she lives locally to Ballyvoy and has a connection through the GAC Association. S Mulholland stated that there is housing stress in Ballyvoy and there has been no social housing built in the village for some time. S Mulholland provided anecdotal evidence of local people leaving the area to find housing and there is evidence of a growing number of young people involved in the village who have to travel from Ballycastle to participate in activities. S Mulholland challenged the policy to state that there is a need for housing in the area and referred to the need and desire of local people to stay in the area. S Mulholland stated that the design and character of the application are acceptable and that CTY13 and 14 are met in terms of layout and integration. She further stated that matters of principle can be addressed at the reserved matters stage. S Mulholland stated that this is a modest proposal, that is a logical extension to the village and will work towards reinvigorating the community. S Mulholland referred to a new day care facility which is at capacity within a year, and how this adds to the evidence of a thriving community.

M Kennedy stated that a detailed rebuttal to the refusal reasons for this application has already been submitted. M Kennedy stated there are 2 questions that need to be addressed: is there is demonstrable need, and is this the right site? M Kennedy stated that the projected need in Appendix 2 on slide 4 of the presentation is the actual need for Ballyvoy and what is stated in the Planning Committee report is wrong. M Kennedy stated that the need for housing in Ballyvoy has increased as shown in Appendix 7 on slide 4 of the presentation. M Kennedy stated that the local people are unable to stay due to the lack of housing, he stated that people in Ballyvoy are forced to register for housing in Ballycastle because there is no housing being built in Ballyvoy. M Kennedy stated that the need for housing in Ballycastle is far greater than the supply and

that of the 270 applications for housing registered in Ballycastle, 160 have stated Ballyvoy as a second option. He stated there is clearly a demonstratable need for housing in Ballyvoy and that there is a focal point of the Chapel and old primary school. He stated that criteria A is met in CTY5 as this application is adjacent to the settlement limit. M Kennedy stated that this site is suitable for development, there was building work completed beside the Chapel in 2002 so there is already urbanisation in the area and this application is a logical extension to the settlement. M Kennedy stated that this is an outline application and that details can be worked out at the reserved matters stage and the block plan can be withdrawn. M Kennedy stated that the parish priest supports the application as this enhances the Chapel. M Kennedy stated that there is a rural need in Ballyvoy for housing and that there is no confidence in the figures presented from the Northern Ireland Housing Executive. M Kennedy stated there are no young people in rural areas, if there is additional housing to allow young people to stay in the area sports clubs and other associations benefit.

Alderman Coyle commented on rural areas being depleted with infrastructure and schools closing down and asked M Kennedy for information about the need for housing in Ballycastle and Ballyvoy.

M Kennedy stated that of the 270 applicants registered for a house in Ballycastle, 160 have stated Ballyvoy as a second preference. At the time the statistics were published the housing need was not there and M Kennedy stated that there was no doubt the figure of 6 in March 2025 has increased.

Councillor Watton spoke of the need to have the right figures for the housing needs of the area.

The Chair stated that there is a lack of confidence in the Northern Ireland Housing Executive figure and there is a need to get evidence of housing needs.

The Development Management (local applications) Manager stated that the figures have not been received from the Housing Executive and there was no representative in attendance at the meeting. The Development Management (local applications) Manager referred to policy CTY 5 and stated that demonstrable need has been approved elsewhere. The Development Management (local applications) Manager stated that outline planning permission is to seek approval in principle for a planning application and that the shortcomings within this application have been highlighted by the Senior Planning Officer and added that the Department for Infrastructure (Roads) have raised issues with the safe movement of traffic and people.

M Kennedy stated that the applicant is concerned with meeting the housing need in Ballyvoy and that the concept of the application can be changed at the reserved matters stage.

The Development Management (local applications) Manager referred to the refusal reasons presented to the Committee and the ability to deliver the no of dwellings on a restrictive site. The Development Management (local applications) Manager stated there is uncertainty with how this application meets policy at this point in time.

Proposed by Councillor McMullan

Seconded by Councillor McGurk

- 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 subject to the reasons set out in section 10 for the following reasons:
- There is a demonstrable need for approval of this application
- The impact on the surrounding context and character of the application can be resolved at reserved matters through the design
- The Chapel is a local amenity and the parish priest supports this application
- Road safety concerns can be resolved with DfI Roads and PSD stage
- The lack of enclosure can be resolved at the reserved matters stage with landscaping
- Site will integrate as its across the road from the site, chapel and 2 dwellings.
- The development will integrate into the countryside, 2 houses have been built across the road in the last 5- 10 years
- This development would enhance Ballyvoy and the residents should have a worthwhile place to live. Businesses are still operational here.

The Development Management (local applications) Manager stated in respect of refusal reason 5 regarding the proposed road layout and car parking as outlined on Site Plan 02 having an adverse impact on road safety, the Department for Infrastructure stated that approval should not be given.

Councillor McMullan stated that this can be dealt with at the reserved matters stage.

Councillor McGurk stated that the concerns regarding the proposed layout can be dealt with at the reserved matters stage where the Agent can reconsider the design and DfI Roads can give consideration to the new design. Councillor McGurk stated that this site is on the edge of the development limit and that there is a demonstrative need for the housing and this application meets policy.

D Madden indicated via MS Teams that he wished to speak. This was brought to the Chair's attention. Councillor McGurk stated that he was there to answer questions and does not have speaking rights. The Chair declared that D Madden would not be permitted to speak and that a vote would be taken on the motion.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

8 Members voted For; 0 Members voted Against, 1 Member 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 subject to the reasons set out in section 10 for the following reasons:

- There is a demonstrable need for approval of this application
- The impact on the surrounding context and character of the application can be resolved at reserved matters through the design
- The Chapel is a local amenity and the parish priest supports this application
- The proposed road layout and car parking as outlined on Site Plan 02 having an adverse impact on road safety can be addressed at reserved matters
- Access to the site, a suitable degree of enclosure for the buildings to integrate into the landscape; relying primarily on new landscaping for integration, the design and layout and visual integration can be worked out at reserved matters
- The development will integrate into the countryside, 2 houses have been built across the road in the last 5 - 10 years
- This development would enhance Ballyvoy and the residents should have a worthwhile place to live. Businesses are still operational here.

RESOLVED - That Conditions and Informatives are delegated to Officers.

The Chair declared a recess at 3:42pm.

The meeting reconvened at 3:56pm.

6.7 LA01/2023/0755/O (Referral) 30m South East of 23 Gaults Road, Cushendall

Report, presentation, addendum, speaking rights template were previously circulated and presented by Senior Planning Officer, M McErlain.

Referral Application to be determined by Planning Committee

App No: LA01/2023/0755/O

App Type: Outline

Proposal: Dwelling on the Farm

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.

Addendum Recommendation

It is recommended that the Committee note the content of this addendum and agree to approve planning permission subject to conditions.

Senior Planning Officer presented via PowerPoint presentation as follows:

- *LA01/2023/0755/O is an Outline Planning Application for a Farm Dwelling at Lands 30m South East of 23 Gaults Road, Cushendall*
- *This is a local application and is presented to the Planning Committee as a referred item following a recommendation to refuse planning Permission*
- *No objections have been received and one letter of support has been received*
- *This application was deferred from the May Planning Committee to facilitate a site meeting to view the application site in the context of the nearby Listed Building. However, following deferral of the application further consultation with Historic Environment Division was carried out who, following a further site inspection have withdrawn their objection and are content with the proposal subject to conditions. These conditions are set out in within the addendum which forms part of member's pack.*
- *As officials are satisfied that the application meets with the other relevant planning policies in regard to the principle of development under CTY10 and integration and rural character, the recommendation on the application is now one of approval subject to delegated conditions, including those set out within the Addendum.*
- *I will briefly recap the application*
- *The application site is located outside of any settlement development limits as identified in The Northern Area Plan (NAP) 2016 and is sited within the designated Antrim Coast and Glens Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.*
- *The application site is sited approximately 95m from the public road in the northern portion of an agricultural field. The site is accessed via a private laneway which serves a number of other dwellings and agricultural buildings. The site is bound to the north-western and north-eastern boundaries by post and wire fencing with mature vegetation whilst the remaining boundaries remain undefined as this is where the site meets the wider agricultural field. The topography of the site rises relatively steeply from Gaults Road in a north western direction towards the application site. Views of application site are*

minimal from the Gaults Road due to mature trees and vegetation at the roadside.

- *As this application has been submitted as a dwelling on a farm it falls to be determined under CTY1 and 10 of PPS21.*
- *Department of Agriculture and Rural Development have confirmed that the business is active and established for the required period, no development opportunities have been sold-off from the holding and the application site is considered to satisfactorily links with existing buildings on the farm holding.*
- *Officials are satisfied that the proposal meets with Policy CTY10.*
- *Despite the application site's elevated setting above Gault's Rd, there will be no critical views of the site from Gault's Rd or surrounding area, given the mature roadside vegetation either side of the access laneway. Additionally, Department for Infrastructure (Roads) have confirmed the existing access to be acceptable, with no requirement to remove existing vegetation which would open up views of the site.*
- *Given the enclosed and well integrated nature of the application site officials accepted that a dwelling in keeping with those in the immediate vicinity would not appear as a prominent or conspicuous feature in the landscape, and satisfy Policies CTY13 and 14 in respect of Integration and Rural Character.*
- *Consultation was carried out with Department of Agriculture and Rural Development, Historic Environment Division, Department For Infrastructure (Roads), NI Water, Northern Ireland Environment Agency, Department For Infrastructure (Rivers), and Environmental Health who have raised no concerns.*
- *Approval is recommended*

In response to questions the Senior Planning Officer stated that this is the same field as previously mentioned and the distance a dwelling needs to be from a Listed Building depends on the Listed Building, views and how the new building interacts with it.

Proposed by Councillor McMulan

Seconded by Councillor Kennedy

- That the Committee note the content of this addendum and agree to approve planning permission subject to conditions.

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 approved

RESOLVED – That the Committee note the content of this addendum and agree to approve planning permission subject to conditions.

6.8 LA01/2024/1183/O (Referral) 150m NE of 78 Gracehill Road, Stranocum, Ballymoney

Report, presentation, addendum and speaking rights template were previously circulated and presented by Senior Planning Officer, M McErlain.

Referral Application to be determined by Planning Committee

App No: LA01/2024/1183/O

App Type: Outline

Proposal: Proposed Site for Dwelling and Domestic Garage as Policy CTY10 (Dwelling on a Farm)

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 outline planning permission for the reasons set out in section 10.

Senior Planning Officer presented via PowerPoint presentation as follows:

- *LA01/2024/1183/O is an Outline Planning Application for Proposed Site for Dwelling & Domestic Garage at lands 150m North East of 78 Gracehill Road, Stranocum, Ballymoney*
- *This is a local application and is presented to the Planning Committee as a referred item following a recommendation to refuse planning permission*
- *No objections have been received in relation to this application*
- *The application site is located outside of any settlement development limits as identified in The Northern Area Plan (NAP) 2016.*
- *The site is a square shaped plot of land located along the roadside, comprising the South West corner of an agricultural field. The site is defined on its South West and South East boundaries by existing hedgerow and post and wire fencing, with the remaining boundaries are currently undefined and open to the remainder of the field and is relatively flat. The proposed site is to be accessed via the creation of a new access onto Gracehill Rd.*
- *As this application has been submitted as a dwelling on a farm it falls to be determined under CTY1 and 10 of PPS21.*
- *Department of Agriculture and Rural Development have confirmed that the business is active and established for the required period, no development opportunities have been sold-off from the holding. Officials are satisfied that the proposal meets with Criteria A and B of Policy CTY10.*
- *Paragraph 6.73 of the SPPS and Criteria C of Policy CTY10 outline that a new dwelling must be visually linked or sited to cluster with an established group of buildings on the farm.*

- *The main farmhouse is located at no. 78 and is surrounded by a number of agricultural buildings to the east, south and west. The application site is located 84m from the nearest building within this group of buildings, on the opposite side of Gracehill Road. This physical separation is enhanced by the site not being readily visible from the farm grouping, and vice versa due to intervening mature trees and vegetation.*
- *On approach from the North East the farm buildings are largely screened from view with only brief, filtered views attainable until the application site has been passed and rounding the bend in the road. From this approach a dwelling on the application site will appear very much as a singular entity in the landscape both physical and visually removed from the existing farm grouping and would neither cluster or visually link with the established grouping to a satisfactory degree*
- *On approach from the South West the farm dwelling and buildings sit against the backdrop of tall mature trees, and the site is not visible until having largely passed the farm holding and rounded a slight bend in the road. Similarly, on this approach a dwelling on the application site would not read as part of the farm grouping and appear as a single entity in the landscape and fails to satisfactorily cluster or visually link with the established grouping.*
- *While Paragraph 5.41 of PPS21 advises that a dwelling is acceptable where the existing group of buildings is well landscaped, which makes the degree of visual connection between the two very limited, this is only the case when the proposed site is adjacent to the group and would otherwise link or cluster. In this instance, the application site is on the opposite side of the road and is some 84m from the nearest farm building where a dwelling could be sited around 100m from the group of buildings. Regardless of the presence of mature landscaping the application site appears both physically and visually removed from the existing farm grouping and would read as an and would neither cluster or visually link with the established grouping to a satisfactory degree and is considered contrary to Paragraph 6.73 of the SPPS and Criteria C of Policy CTY10.*
- *CTY10 requires that where an alternative site is proposed, appropriate and demonstrable evidence from a competent and independent authority such as the Health and Safety Executive or Environmental Health to justify the siting. No such evidence has been submitted. Additionally, evidence relating to future expansion of the farm business may include planning permissions, building control approvals or contractual obligations to supply farm produce.*
- *A planning application for a poultry unit exists on lands to the west of the existing farmyard under application reference LA01/2024/1254/F. This application is undetermined and remains under consideration and can be given limited weight at this time. A dwelling in this location would benefit from the backdrop of existing farm buildings and would have a clear visual link. While a dwelling in this area would comply with policy officials recognise that*

the lands to the west of the farm yard would represent a suitable or natural area for the expansion of the farm yard and note that other acceptable sites have been identified which would also comply with policy.

- *Additionally, a CLOPUD (Certificate of Lawful Proposed Use or Development) application has been submitted to the council for the erection of a farm storage shed, located between the application site and the group of farm buildings and on the opposite side of the road from the application site. To date no decision has been reached, and the location remains undeveloped. Given the proposed siting of the shed remains undeveloped, the CLOPUD (Certificate of Lawful Proposed Use or Development) does not address the issue of the application site's separation from the farm grouping and can only be given limited weight. Regardless, even if a shed on this site were to be constructed, this is the only building that would satisfactorily cluster or visually link to the application site and would not constitute a group of buildings as required by policy.*
- *Two parcels of land to the north of the farm buildings, as indicated on the slide, either side of a small stream were proposed as alternative sites. While these lands are shown to be partially within the floodplain, Northern Ireland Flood Maps show that the flooding is restricted to the eastern corner of the field to the west of the stream and to along the western boundary of the field to the east of the stream. Officials consider a dwelling could be sited within these areas, outside of the identified floodplains, resulting in a suitable site for a dwelling in relation to the group of farm buildings.*
- *The agent submitted a diagram indicating the extent of flooding which is shown on the speaking note template and referral request documentation. However, this map is not reflective of Northern Ireland Flood Maps, which show considerably less extent of flooding. When viewed on approach towards the farm in both directions, a dwelling on either site would be visually associated with the farm buildings and benefit from the mature vegetation along the watercourse which would provide a backdrop and screening to the site.*
- *Land to the South East of the group of buildings would require access through the group of farm buildings which may give rise to health and safety concerns. However, these issues would have to be demonstrated and would be considered if no other alternative sites were available.*
- *There are other more appropriate sites available on the farm holding which would provide a satisfactory level of visual linkage and cluster with the existing farm grouping and it has not been adequately demonstrated that these sites are not feasible. There are no overriding reasons as to why a dwelling being sited at the application site is necessary. The proposal fails to satisfy criterion (c) of CTY10.*
- *With regard to integration the application site is open to the wider field, with the North East and North West boundaries currently undefined. Existing*

boundaries are comprised of hedgerow and are not sufficient in providing a suitable degree of enclosure.

- *Roadside hedgerow removal would be required to facilitate the proposed access and visibility splays. Approx. 180m of new planting is required to define the site, as well as the relocation of 36m of roadside hedgerow which currently bounds the field to the SW of the site. This level of additional and augmented planting is excessive and indicates the lack of long-established natural boundaries, and the reliance of new landscaping.*
- *A dwelling at this roadside location would be incongruous with the landscape, regardless of scale and design and would fail to satisfactorily integrate within the landscape. The proposal fails criteria (b), (c) and (g) of Policy CTY13.*
- *Consultation was carried out with Department for Infrastructure (Roads), Northern Ireland Environment Agency, Environmental Health, Department of Agriculture and Rural Development and NI Water who have raised no concerns.*
- *In conclusion the proposal is contrary to Paragraphs 6.70 and 6.73 of the SPPS, Policies CTY1, CTY10 and CTY13 of PPS21.*
- *Refusal is recommended.*

There were no questions put to the Officer.

The Chair invited C Cassidy and J McNeill to speak in support of the application.

C Cassidy stated that the application is a result of the practical realities of the family needs. C Cassidy stated that there is a family succession of the farm from father to son and that the parents wish to retire and remain nearby. This application site is the most practical and sustainable location available. C Cassidy referred to the Council's report and flood map which demonstrates that significant areas surrounding the farm are affected by flood risk. The proposed site is the closest available land to the farm complex that lies outside the identified floodplain. The suggested alternative lands to the west of the farm were discounted because of the proposed 30,000 bird poultry house. Evidence submitted with the proposal indicates that odour impacts would extend across lands to the north and west of the existing farm buildings, making those locations unsuitable for a family dwelling and potentially prejudicing the future operation of the farm. C Cassidy stated that the Officer's suggested alternative sites do not adequately reflect the operational realities of the holding, including flood constraints, planned agricultural development and the long term needs of the business. C Cassidy requested that Committee Members give due weight to the unique circumstances of the holding, the practical constraints affecting alternative locations and the absence of technical objections and to approve the application.

J McNeill stated that this application remains associated with the farm, is visually linked to it and segmentary planting can be conditioned for the boundaries. J McNeill cited PPS21 and stated there is a visual link to the farm and that the dwelling can be accepted.

There were no questions put to the speakers.

The Chair stated the recommendation.

Proposed by Councillor Kennedy

Seconded by Alderman S McKillop

- 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 outline planning permission for the reasons set out in section 10 for the following reasons
 - There is a genuine need
 - There are overriding reasons as there is a need for the dwelling and the issues with the floodplain
 - There is a proposed 30,000 bird house which will emit odours and the dwelling needs to be at a distance from the odours
 - As there is no alternative this is the most suitable site
 - Many farms are on both sides of the road and the dwelling would be visually linked
 - The application meets CTY13
 - There are no objections from statutory bodies
 - Integration can be dealt with through planting for landscaping
 - Health and Safety issues relating to building on a floodplain means this is the most suitable 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 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 outline planning permission for the reasons set out in section 10 for the following reasons

- There is a genuine need
- There are overriding reasons as there is a need for the dwelling and the issues with the floodplain
- There is a proposed 30,000 bird house which will emit odours and the dwelling needs to be at a distance from the odours
- As there is no alternative this is the most suitable site.

- Many farms are on both sides of the road and the dwelling would be visually linked.
- The application meets CTY13
- There are no objections from statutory bodies
- Integration can be dealt with through planting for landscaping
- Health and Safety issues relating to building on a floodplain means this is the most suitable site.

RESOLVED - That Conditions and Informatives are delegated to Officers.

7. CORRESPONDENCE

Items 6.1 – 6.2 inclusive were presented by the Development Plan Manager as read.

7.1 Advance Notice of Listing - Agivey House, Aghadowey

Copy, previously circulated was presented as read.

Correspondence re: Early Warning of Advance Notice of Listing

Planning Committee NOTED the correspondence.

7.2 Proposed Material Alterations to Proposed Variation No. 1 of the CDP 2024-2030

Copy, previously circulated, presented as read.

Correspondence re: Proposed Material Alterations to Proposed Variation No. 1 of the CDP 2024-2030; and associated Environmental Report, Natural Impact Report and Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Report.

Planning Committee NOTED the correspondence.

*** Councillor McMullan left the meeting at 4:29pm.**

8. REPORTS FOR DECISION

8.1 TPO Confirmation - Lands at 3 and 7 Bann View Place, Coleraine

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

Purpose of Report

To present the TPO confirmation, without modification, for Lands at and Adjacent to 3 and 7 Bann View Place, Coleraine.

Following a review of the existing TPO on the site, a Provisional TPO was served on site, documentation was posted to interested parties and adjoining neighbours, and copies of the Order were attached to protected trees in obvious locations within the site - on 15th April 2026.

No representations were received within the 28-day statutory period.

A total of 11no. individual trees and 3no. tree groups were surveyed, all of which are considered worthy or suitable for TPO protection.

Options

Option 1: Resolve to confirm the TPO, without 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 Alderman Coyle

Seconded by Councillor Watton

- That Committee agree to Option 1 - Resolve to confirm the TPO, without modifications, as detailed above.

The Chair put the motion to the vote

8 Members voted For; 0 Members voted Against; 0 Members Abstained

The Chair declared the motion carried.

RESOLVED - That Committee agree to Option 1 - Resolve to confirm the TPO, without modifications, as detailed above.

8.2 Live Streaming and Audio Recording of Planning Committee Meetings

Report, previously circulated, was presented by the Director of Corporate Services.

Purpose of Report

At the Corporate Policy and Resources Committee Meeting on 24 March 2026, it was agreed that Officers would bring back a Report covering public accessibility of Council Meetings Online (live streaming).

The purpose of this report is twofold

- a) update Members on the changes to the meeting broadcast system and
- b) to ask Members to consider how live streaming and audio recording will be managed in respect of Planning Committee Meetings.

Further information was presented within the report.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Planning Committee agrees to allow the live streaming of public sessions of Planning Committee meetings via a private YouTube channel that is accessible via a link from Democratic Services, with the live stream only available to watch throughout the duration of the meeting, and with recording of these meetings strictly prohibited.

It is further recommended that the Planning Committee considers aligning its live streaming arrangements with those for full Council and all other Committees, when the necessary arrangements have been put in place. This would be subject to the outcome of the DPIA and the staff and trade union consultation.

It is further recommended that the Planning Committee agrees to the audio recording of Planning Committee meetings with immediate effect, with public sessions to be published on the Council website within two days of the meeting, and with In Committee sessions to be held confidentially, in line with the Council's Guidance on Audio Recordings.

In response to questions regarding the rationale for the private YouTube Channel the Director of Corporate Services advised this is phase 1 of implementing the livestreaming process and will bring Planning Committee into line with the other Council and Committee meetings.

Alderman Callan stated that it would be beneficial to get further reports with more details coming back to Committee.

In response to questions regarding risks to Agents and speakers at the Planning Committee the Director of Corporate Policy stated that this is subject to the decision made at Planning Committee today and Agents and speakers will be consulted after the decision is made.

In response to questions regarding the enforcement of the requirement that meetings must not be recorded by members of the public, the Director of Corporate Services stated that they will be advised not to record.

Proposed by Alderman Callan

Seconded by Alderman Coyle

- That the Planning Committee agrees to allow the live streaming of public sessions of Planning Committee meetings via a private YouTube channel that is accessible via a link from Democratic Services, with the live stream only available to watch throughout the duration of the meeting, and with recording of these meetings strictly prohibited.

- that the Planning Committee agrees to aligning its live streaming arrangements with those for full Council and all other Committees, when the necessary arrangements have been put in place. This would be subject to the outcome of the DPIA and the staff and trade union consultation.
- that the Planning Committee agrees to the audio recording of Planning Committee meetings with immediate effect, with public sessions to be published on the Council website within two days of the meeting.

The Chair put the motion to the vote

8 Members voted For; 0 Members voted Against; 0 Members Abstained

The Chair declared the motion carried.

RESOLVED - That the Planning Committee

- agrees to allow the live streaming of public sessions of Planning Committee meetings via a private YouTube channel that is accessible via a link from Democratic Services, with the live stream only available to watch throughout the duration of the meeting, and with recording of these meetings strictly prohibited.
- that the Planning Committee agrees to aligning its live streaming arrangements with those for full Council and all other Committees, when the necessary arrangements have been put in place. This would be subject to the outcome of the DPIA and the staff and trade union consultation.
- that the Planning Committee agrees to the audio recording of Planning Committee meetings with immediate effect, with public sessions to be published on the Council website within two days of the meeting.

9. REPORTS FOR NOTING

9.1 LDP 6 month Work Programme

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

Purpose of Report

To present, in line with the Council's current published Local Development Plan (LDP) Timetable, the 6-month, high level, indicative LDP Work Programme (see Appendix 1 attached) which outlines the range of work to be carried out by the Council's Development Plan team within this programme (Jun-Dec 2026).

Further information was provided within the report.

Recommendation

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

Alderman Callan requested an informal meeting in early Autumn to receive an update on progress made with the outcome of the housing research study completed by the University of Ulster.

The Development Plan Manager referred to the workshop held on 11th March which provided background information from the housing study and how it was considered in the proposed housing allocation, distribution and rural housing policies.. The Development Plan Manager advised she is meeting with the Department of Agriculture, Environment and Rural Affairs tomorrow to consider any updates required. The Development Plan Manager advised that the evidence base is now outdated and therefore the topic areas within the Plan need to be reviewed and updated. Up to 26no. reports and an updated Sustainability Appraisal and SA Scoping Report are also required. The Development Plan Manager stated she can meet with Committee Members to provide more details.

Alderman Callan queried if the Ulster University's research was included in the plan and requested an updated version with tracked changes is provide to Committee Members. Alderman Callan referred to the differences in the need for housing in rural and urban areas and stated that there needs to be political input from Elected Members.

The Development Plan Manager stated that the Local Development Plan is being worked on and advised that due to the passing of time, consultations may need to be completed again. The Development Plan Manager stated she will provide Elected Members with an updated version of the Local Development Plan with tracked changes and a workshop (likely to be held late summer/early autumn). The Development Plan Manager reiterated that it was her understanding that the topics discussed at the on 11th March workshop were agreed and on that basis further topics were now being progressed for presentation and agreement.

Alderman Callan and Councillor McGurk both stated that their understanding was that no agreement was made at the March meeting.

The Development Plan Manager agreed to email Committee Members with an update of what officials understood to have been agreed at the 11th March workshop. She highlighted that, based on any delay in moving forward with the evidence base/SA update, the LDP timetable will need to be reviewed and updated.

Committee NOTED the report.

*** Councillor Watton left the meeting at 4:52pm.**

10. ANY OTHER RELEVANT BUSINESS (IN ACCORDANCE WITH STANDING ORDER 12 (O))

There were no items of Any Other Relevant Business.

Alderman Callan stated that he missed the beginning of the meeting and requested an update regarding future meetings between Planning Committee and Agents.

The Chair confirmed she had attended a meeting with NILGA and has agreed to continue a systematic approach to holding meetings with Agents.

This being all the business the meeting closed at 4:55pm

Chair