Causeway Coast & Glens Borough Council

PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD
WEDNESDAY 23 SEPTEMBER 2026

Table of Key Adoptions

No.	Item	*Summary of Decisions*
1.	Apologies	***Alderman Brown Stewart, Councillors Anderson, McQuillan***
2.	Declarations of Interest	***Alderman Callan and Councillor Storey***
3.	Minutes of Previous Planning Committee Meetings	
3.1	Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting held Wednesday 26 August 2026	***Confirmed as a correct record***
4.	Order of Items and Confirmation of Registered Speakers	
4.1	LA01/2023/1276/F (Referral) Lands 300m SE of 41 Dogleap Road, Limavady	***Deferred for site visit***
4.2	LA01/2024/0137/F (Referral) Lands 300m SE of 41 Dogleap Road, Limavady	***Deferred for site visit***
5.	Schedule of applications	
5.1	LA01/2023/1085/F (Major) Craigahulliar Holiday Park, 23 Ballymacrea Road, Portrush, (including Land to South of existing holiday park)	***Approved***
5.2	LA01/2024/0737/F (Major) 297 Drumsurn Road, Drumsurn, Limavady	***Approved***
5.3	LA01/2026/0501/F (Major) 250m South West of No. 8 Straid Road, Ballycastle	***Approved***

5.4	LA01//2026/0593/LBC (Council Interest) Coleraine Town Hall, The Diamond, Coleraine	***Approved***
5.5	LA01/2019/0322/F (Objection) 48m south-west of 23 Fairhead Road (Access from Craigfad Road) Ballycastle	***Approved***
5.6	LA01/2025/0372/O (Referral) Lands Approximately 400m South of No 13 New Line Road, Limavady	***Site Visit***
5.7	LA01/2025/0048/F (Objection) 1 Harryville, Portstewart	***Approved***
5.8	LA01//2026/0356/F (Objection) 51 Cappagh Avenue, Portstewart	***Defer for one month***
5.9	LA01/2022/0927/O (Referral) Approximately 25m South East of 219 Seacon Road Ballymoney	***Disagree and Approve***
5.10	LA01/2024/1184/O (Referral) Lands adjacent and west of No. 281 Moycraig Road, Dervock	***Disagree and Approve***
6.	Correspondence	
6.1	NILGA – Ministerial Led Planning Engagement Forum	***That a report be brought to the October Planning Committee meeting highlighting the Shared Environmental Services status including a review in respect of Causeway Coast and Glens Borough Council to take into account Notice of Motion brought to Mid and East Antrim Borough Council in July***
6.2	DC&S DC – LDP Plan Strategy Revision – POP Consultation – HMO Policy	***Noted***
6.3	DfC - HED Historic Environment Policy consultation	***Noted***
6.4	County Donegal Development Plan 2024-2030 (as varied)	***Noted***

6.5	Correspondence – Historic Buildings Council (HBC) Meeting with Causeway Coast and Glens Borough Council	***Noted***
7.	Reports for Decision	
7.1	TPO Confirmation – 45 Quay Road, Ballycastle	***That the Committee note the content of this report and verbal erratum and agree to Option 1 (confirm the TPO) as set out in section 4.0 of the Committee report.***
8.	Reports for Noting	
8.1	Finance Report – Period 4	***Noted***
8.2	Quarterly LDP Update	***Noted***
8.3	LDP – Steering Group – Annual Monitoring Report (2025/26)	***Noted***
8.4	LDP – Project Management Team – Annual Monitoring Report (2025/26)	***Noted***
8.5	Fourth Quarterly Report on Planning Performance	***Noted***
9.	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 AND VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE ON WEDNESDAY 23 SEPTEMBER 2026 AT 10.30AM

Chair: Alderman S McKillop (C)

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

Officers Present: M Quinn, Director of Corporate Services (C)
S Mathers, Development Management Manager (C)
S Mulhern, Development Plan Manager (C)
J Lundy, Development Management (local applications) Manager (C)
R Beringer, Senior Planning Officer (C)
J McMath, Senior Planning Officer (C)
R Heaney, Senior Planning Officer (C)
E Hudson, Senior Planning Officer (C)
M McErlain, Senior Planning Officer (C)
J Mills, Acting Senior Council Solicitor (R)
U Harper, Senior Democratic Services Officer (C)
I Owens, Democratic Services Officer (R/C)
H Campbell, Civic and Corporate Support Assistant (R)

In Attendance: A Lennox, ICT Manager (Interim) (C/R)
N Meenagh, ICT Officer (C)

Public 15 no. (C) 8 no. (R) including Speakers

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

Registered Speakers

Item No	Name
LA01/2023/1085/F	David Alexander (O)

	David Dalzell (S) Niall Burns (S)
LA01/2026/0501/F	Conor McGarry (O)
LA01/2025/0048/F	Catherine Regan (O) (S) Robbie Sholdis Andrew Burnside
LA01//2026/0356/F	I Goldsworthy (O)
LA01/2022/0927/O	Jason Martin (S)
LA01/2025/0372/O	David Donaldson (S) Sean Mullan
LA01/2024/1184/O	Lee Kennedy (S)

The Director of Corporate Services undertook a roll call.

The Chair reminded Planning Committee of its obligations and protocol whilst the meeting was being audio recorded and of their obligations under the Local Government Code of Conduct and Remote Meetings Protocol.

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were recorded for Alderman Brown Stewart, Councillor Anderson and Councillor McQuillan.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

During discussion of Item LA01//2026/0356/F, Alderman Callan declared an Interest and did not participate in the vote.

Prior to discussion of Item LA01/2022/0927/O, Councillor Storey declared an Interest and did not participate in the vote.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETINGS

3.1 Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting held Wednesday 26 August 2026

Copy, previously circulated.

Proposed by Councillor McMullan
Seconded by Councillor C Archibald
– That the Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held Wednesday 26 August 2026 are signed as a correct record.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.
10 Members voted For; 0 Members voted Against, 1 Member Abstained.
The Chair declared the motion carried.

RESOLVED - That the Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held Wednesday 26 August 2026 are signed as a correct record.

4. ORDER OF ITEMS AND CONFIRMATION OF REGISTERED SPEAKERS

4.1 LA01/2023/1276/F (Referral) Lands 300m SE of 41 Dogleap Road, Limavady

Councillor Watton requested that this item and the next item be deferred for a further site visit due to Elected Members being unable to attend.

Councillor Kennedy stated that he was unable to attend the site visit due to another meeting with the Causeway Heritage Trust and noted that a meeting of the Portrush Town Centre Forum also clashed with the site visit.

The Development Management (local applications) Manager advised that it states in the protocol that consideration of an application should generally only be deferred once for a site visit.

The Development Management (local applications) Manager stated that Democratic Services will send out site visit calendar invitations to Planning Committee Members in future.

Proposed by Councillor Watton
Seconded by Councillor McMullan
- That the Committee defer consideration of Item LA01/2023/1276/F for a site visit due to Elected Members being unable to attend.

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 defer consideration of Item LA01/2023/1276/F for a site visit due to Elected Members being unable to attend.

4.2 LA01/2024/0137/F (Referral) Lands 300m SE of 41 Dogleap Road, Limavady

Proposed by Councillor Watton
Seconded by Councillor McMullan
- That the Committee defer consideration of Item LA01/2024/0137/F for a site visit due to Elected Members being unable to attend.

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 defer consideration of Item LA01/2024/0137/F for a site visit due to Elected Members being unable to attend.

5. SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS

5.1 LA01/2023/1085/F (Major) Craigahulliar Holiday Park, 23 Ballymacrea Road, Portrush, (including Land to South of existing holiday park)

Report, presentation, addendums, speaking rights templates and site visit report were previously circulated and presented by the Development Management Manager.

Major Application to be determined by Planning Committee
App No: LA01/2023/1085/F
App Type: Full
Proposal: Extension of existing holiday park including design amendments to part of previously approved holiday park layout (approved under planning permission C/2013/0097/F). Demolition of former Production Building and associated landscaping. Temporary foul cesspool (pending connection to public foul sewer)

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.

Addendum Recommendation
That the Committee note the contents of this Addendum and resolve to approve the application subject to the conditions listed under Paragraph 3.0 of this addendum.

Addendum 2 Recommendation
That the Committee note the contents of this Addendum and resolve to approve the application subject to the conditions listed under Paragraph 3.0 of this addendum.

Addendum 3 Recommendation
That the Committee note the contents of this Addendum and resolve to approve the application subject to the conditions listed under Paragraph 3.0 of Addendum 2.

Addendum 4 Recommendation
That the Committee note the contents of this Addendum and resolve to defer the application to allow further consideration of the further information relating to the cesspool and objection concerns. This recommendation supersedes that at Paragraph 1.1 of the Planning Committee Report.

The Development Management Manager provided a verbal addendum as follows:

- *An objection from Mr D Alexander was received yesterday and circulated to Members. It provides a visualisation of the proposal from Craigahulliar Road. It is not attributed to a specific individual or company, unlike that provided with the application, which is by Digital Aspect.*
- *It shows the near complete elevation of the units being visible and the conclusion of the document broadly sets out that the relevant visual change is therefore not only the appearance of individual units, but the cumulative extension of repetitive built forms across a greater proportion of the site.*
- *It also says that it introduces built form into areas presently perceived principally as vegetation or open ground, and cumulatively changes the prominence of the holiday park when experienced from Craigahulliar Road and the adjoining rural landscape.*
- *Our position is that unlike the visualisations presented by the agent accompanying the application, this document is not accredited to any professional individual. In addition, the visualisation does not appear to correlate with the proposed site layout plan.*

The Development Management Manager advised on the site visit report as follows:

- *Because of the nature of the site, the fact it was in private land and that it was necessary to go through a private holiday park and get access through a construction site, the agent was present at the site visit to allow safe access through the site. The agent had no engagement at the site visit other than that. The attendance of the agent was necessary to allow access.*

The Development Management Manager provided a verbal erratum as follows:

- *In addendum 3, paragraph 1.20 says that the 35 static caravan units are additional to the 129 static caravan. It is actually the case that 129 is the overall total.*

The Development Management Manager presented via PowerPoint presentation as follows:

LA01/2023/1085/F
Craigahulliar Holiday Park Extension

1. *The proposal seeks to create an additional 35 plots. This is in addition to those that were approved in the initial scheme approved in 2017 and the subsequent reconfiguration applications approved in 2023 and 2024- overall total of 129 statics. Relative to the approved scheme, the additional caravans are accommodated by extending the site to the south.*
2. *This is a major application given the size of the site. The proposal had a PAN and a Community Consultation Report was submitted with the application.*
3. *In terms of the Northern Area Plan 2016, the site is located in the open countryside, outside any designated settlement. The Northern Area Plan 2016 does not provide specific policy on tourism development. Rather, it directs to regional policy in PPS 16 Tourism. Policy TSM 6 is the lead policy to assess the proposal.*

MAIN ISSUES

4. *<u>Principle of Development</u>- Provision is made in PPS 16 for extensions to existing holiday parks. The site can absorb the development without adverse impact on visual amenity or landscape character. This was demonstrated, in part, through the submission of photomontages from critical views. While in part elevated, the proposal will not result in any unacceptable visual impact, will integrate appropriately and will not impact on rural character.*
5. *<u>Layout</u>- The layout takes the form of informal layout of units. The amenity of the layout is enhanced through the provision of abundant existing and additional landscaping. Adequate open space is provided.*
6. *<u>Access</u>- Access is through the established entrance at Ballymacrea Road and then through the existing internal road network. DfI Roads has been consulted and are satisfied with the proposed arrangements.*

7. *<u>Sewerage</u>- Consultation with NI Water has identified that the sewerage infrastructure does not have capacity for an additional load of 35 caravans. Accordingly, a cesspool is to be used as an interim measure. Its provision is regulated by planning conditions.*
8. *<u>Other Issues-</u> Given the characteristics of the site, other issues arose regarding: badger setts; land stability; proximity to the now closed landfill site and; contamination. All these issues were resolved.*
9. *<u>Representations</u>- Details provided in report.*

CONCLUSION- The proposal is considered acceptable and the recommendation is to approve subject to conditions.

The Chair invited questions to the Officer.

Alderman Scott asked how temporary the cesspool will be.

The Development Management Manager stated that addendum 2 details the condition that the cesspool shall only be used as a temporary drainage solution and shall cease operation and be decommissioned upon connection to the permanent drainage system or within 12 months of first occupation, whichever occurs sooner. He further stated that if the applicant does not achieve connection within the 12 months they would default on this condition. The applicant would have the option to apply to vary the condition in that instance.

There were no further questions to the Officer.

The Chair invited D Alexander to speak in objection to the application.

D Alexander requested that his visualisation be displayed.

The Development Management Manager advised that objections are not displayed but the information was circulated to and is in the possession of Members.

D Alexander stated:

- My visualisation was prepared by Pro Planning Consultancy, a professional planning consultant who was a previous employee of Causeway Coast and Glens Borough Council as a professional planner.
- The applicant's agent was in attendance at the site visit – they gave access and escorted Members around the site, as noted in the site visit notes.
- This caravan site has been subject to High Court judicial review cases with permission having been previously quashed and subsequently granted only following commitments by the developer that they would not extend up the

hillside. Application is contrary to that commitment to the High Court. This was brought to the attention of the Planning department in March 2024.

- The applicant cannot achieve a connection to the public sewer due to the lack of capacity. NI Water has confirmed that capacity is not there.
- The temporary cesspool cannot be lawfully installed due to the required building control distance requirements of seven metres from any structure and four metres from any wall. Building Control has not been consulted on this application.
- The application is contrary to policy TSM 6, which requires that the site must have the natural capacity to absorb the holiday park without harming the natural look or visual look or rural character of the area. My visualisation shows this is not the case.
- The row of sycamore trees that the applicant is relying on for screening were planted by the previous owner of my ground. I contend they are in my ownership, not the applicant's ownership. Concerns were raised regarding the seasonality of this screening as the trees are deciduous.
- The proposed caravans are very close to the landfill leachate lake.
- Previously, a single dwelling set further back on adjacent lower lying land was refused as being too prominent in the landscape and visible from 2.5km away.
- I also have concerns regarding: the vehicle access and egress disturbing our livestock as access is within two metres of the boundary; potential of the badgers identified on the site to migrate to the farmland; the subsidence of the adjacent mine, which was not previously visible.

The Chair invited questions to the objector.

Councillor McMullan asked for more information regarding the temporary cesspool.

D Alexander stated that the connection to the public sewer has been refused by NI Water due to lack of capacity. He stated that a cesspool cannot be temporary when there is no connection available to the sewer. Housing developments have been refused in this Chamber due to lack of capacity. The proposed location of the cesspool does not comply with building regulations.

The Chair invited D Dalzell, K Schmidtke and N Burns to speak in support of the application.

D Dalzell stated:

- We support the Planning Officer's recommendation to approve this application.
- The cesspool is a temporary solution. Northern Ireland Water has, in the meantime, signed off our stage one wastewater impact assessment for a

storm offsetting solution, which will provide the capacity in the sewer. That job is currently with NI Water's contractors to price and implement.

- A building control officer called out on the site this week and is content with the proposed arrangements.
- The objector's visualisations are wrong. The arrangement and position of the caravans on it do not align with the site layout; the whole thing is misaligned.
- We had amended the scheme, further to discussions with Planning Officers, by reducing the levels of areas. Cross sections clearly show the relationships between the existing terrain.
- There is extant planning approval for nine camping cabins on that terrace; we are doing four twin units instead.
- In accordance with good design principles, we will retain mature trees on the site, but we are not relying on trees entirely for screening. As a buffer, the western side of the site has trees, then the access road, then another wooded and gorse covered bank up to the ridgeline, and the main part of the site sits behind the ridge. Gorse is evergreen.
- New planting is primarily to enhance biodiversity, along with the protection of badger setts and bird and bat boxes. It is right that existing habitat should be properly managed in accordance with the habitat management plan, which was agreed with NIEA. The site does not overlap the ASSI.
- The access to the site uses an old quarry road that was used by heavy vehicles. Traffic will be lighter with a caravan park.
- The old mine has been assessed to the geologists' satisfaction of Geological Survey of Northern Ireland. Environmental Health are content in terms of the relationship to the landfill site.

N Burns stated:

- Blair's is a long established tourism business.
- This proposal represents approximately £1million of private investment into the area, creating 35 additional holiday home opportunities and allowing us to continue investing in the park, our people and the visitor experience.
- It helps us to sustain close to 100 local employees at peak season across our operation by supporting local contractors, suppliers and other businesses throughout the wider visitor economy.
- The Council's tourism strategy for 2026-36 is focused on growing tourism while ensuring that the benefits are spread across the borough, supporting sustainable economic growth, good jobs and community benefit. We believe this proposal fits very comfortably within that ambition.
- Caravan park visitors represent an additional tourism capacity feeding into the wider local economy.

The Chair invited questions to the applicant and agents.

There were no questions.

Proposed by Alderman Scott
Seconded by Councillor Nicholl
- 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.

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.

5.2 LA01/2024/0737/F (Major) 297 Drumsurn Road, Drumsurn, Limavady

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

Major application to be determined by Planning Committee
App No: LA01/2024/0737/F
App Type: Full
Proposal: Extension to existing Clubhouse. Extension and alterations to existing training pitch with provision of ball stops, goalposts and fencing. Construction of new covered terrace. Construction of new open terrace

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.

Addendum Recommendation
That the Committee note the contents of this Addendum and agree with the recommendation to approve planning permission subject to the conditions set out in Section 10 of the Planning Committee Report in addition to those set out at Paragraph 1.3 above

The Development Management Manager presented via PowerPoint presentation as follows:

LA01/2024/0737/F St Matthews GAC, Drumsurn

1. *This application relates to the long established sporting facilities in Drumsurn. The proposal comprises several elements- a small extension to the existing club house, the provision of a covered and open terrace alongside the main pitch and provision of a new training pitch with ball stop fences. The new training pitch is proposed to replace the existing one and is both reorientated and extended.*
2. *In terms of the Northern Area Plan 2016, the site is located partly inside and partially outside the settlement development limit of Drumsurn. While the main pitch and the proposed development relating to same are inside the settlement development limit, the proposed training pitch is located outside the settlement development limit. The Northern Area Plan does not have specific policy provision regarding sport and recreation uses, directing to regional policy.*
3. *As a major application, it was preceded by a PAN and was accompanied by the submission of a Community Consultation Report. In addition, as a major application, it was accompanied by a Design and Access Statement.*
4. *MAIN ISSUES*
5. *Principle of Development- The site is long established with various permissions over the years for improved facilities. The most recent permission was that in June 2022 for refurbishment of the main pitch. Policy OS3 of PPS 8 Open Space, Sport and Outdoor Recreation is the lead policy to assess the new training pitch element while Policy DES 2 from the Planning Strategy is the lead policy to assess the clubhouse and stands elements.*
6. *Visual Amenity- The small extension to the clubhouse is for the purpose of a gym. This and the stands elements of the proposal are contained within the established site and are screened by the substantial vegetation alongside Drumsurn Road. Given this, the proposal is sensitive to the character of the area surrounding the site. The proposed training pitch element is located to the rear of the existing development and is not open to critical views.*
7. *Access/ Parking- The proposal uses the existing access to Drumsurn Road and the existing parking. No alterations are proposed. DfI Roads is content with same.*
8. *Amenity- The proposal is located near several dwellings at Drumsurn Road. To ensure the proposal does not result in unacceptable disturbance to nearby residents by reason of use into the late evening, a condition restricting hours of use is proposed.*
9. *Flooding- The proposal is located adjacent the Castle River, the floodplain of which extends into the application site adjacent the proposed training pitch. However, no development is proposed within the floodplain. The proposal is acceptable to DfI Rivers provided no raising or development is located with the floodplain.*

10. *Natural Heritage- The proposal initially included floodlighting of the proposed training pitch. This presented the need for assessment of the impact on bats. This issue was resolved through removal of the floodlighting element.*
11. *Representations- None submitted.*
12. *Conclusion- The proposal is considered acceptable and the recommendation is to approve.*

The Chair invited questions to the Development Management Manager.

There were no questions.

Proposed by Councillor McGurk
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.

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.

5.3 LA01/2026/0501/F (Major) 250m South West of No. 8 Straid Road, Ballycastle

Report, presentation, addendum and speaking rights template were previously circulated and presented by the Development Management Manager.

Major application to be determined by Planning Committee
App No: LA01/2026/0501/F
App Type: Full
Proposal: Retrospective Farm Diversification Scheme for a Camp Site & Alpaca Walking Tours and Occasional Open Farm Days (maximum 6 per annum) and associated facilities and amenities, Toilet Block, Reception Hut, Craft Barn, Children's Play Area & Parking.

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** full planning permission subject to the conditions set out in section 10.

Addendum Recommendation
That the Committee note the contents of this Addendum and agree with the recommendation to approve planning permission subject to the conditions set out in Section 10 of the Planning Committee Report.

The Development Management Manager presented via PowerPoint presentation as follows:

LA01/2026/0501/F Straid Road, Ballycastle

1. *This application is a retrospective proposal comprising the key elements of a camp site, ancillary buildings and occasional use as an open farm. The proposal is presented as a farm diversification scheme and is to be operated on a seasonal basis. The scale of the overall scheme is modest, with accommodation comprising 10 pitches.*
2. *In terms of the Northern Area Plan 2016, the site is located in the open countryside. The Northern Area Plan does not have specific policy provision regarding tourism or farm diversification use, directing to regional policy.*
3. *As a major application, it was preceded by a PAN and was accompanied by the submission of a Community Consultation Report. In addition, as a major application, it was accompanied by a Design and Access Statement.*
4. *MAIN ISSUES*
5. *Principle of Development- As the farm business is established for more than 6 years, it qualifies for a farm diversification proposal. The proposal in terms of character and scale is appropriate to its location. It will be run in conjunction with the farm business and qualifies under Policy CTY 11 of PPS 21 Sustainable Development in the Countryside. The proposal also complies with Policy TSM 6 Tourism for a new holiday park development in the countryside.*
6. *Visual Amenity & Layout- The proposal is set back from Straid Road some 430m and is well screened by intervening vegetation and topography. There will be limited to no views of the development from Straid Road. The layout of the pitches is informal and there is ample open space provision, well exceeding the 15% site area requirement. The new buildings for the toilet block and reception hut are modest.*
7. *Access/ Parking- The proposal is accessed by a laneway to Straid Road. DfI Roads are content subject to works being required to widen the access. This is proposed by condition.*

8. *Flooding- The proposal is located adjacent a watercourse to the western boundary, the floodplain of which extends into the application site. However, no development is proposed within the extent of the floodplain.*
9. *Archaeology- As the site may contain archaeology, a programme of works is conditioned within specified timeframes.*
10. *Representations- None submitted.*
11. *Conclusion- The proposal is considered acceptable and the recommendation is to approve.*

The Chair invited questions to the Development Management Manager.

There were no questions.

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

C McGarry stated that this is a modest farm diversification scheme that will run in conjunction with the existing farm business.

The Chair invited questions to C McGarry.

There were no questions.

Proposed by Councillor Kennedy
Seconded by Alderman Scott
- 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** full 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.

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** full planning permission subject to the conditions set out in section 10.

5.4 LA01/2026/0593/LBC (Council Interest) Coleraine Town Hall, The Diamond, Coleraine

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

Council Application to be determined by Planning Committee

App No: LA01/2026/0593/LBC
App Type: Listed Building Consent
Proposal: Proposed Replacement Window at Coleraine Town Hall.

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** Listed Building Consent subject to the conditions set out in section 10.

Senior Planning Officer presented to the Committee as follows:

LA01/2026/0593/LBC Council Interest Application

- *This seeks LBC to replace the existing window with a commemorative window to mark the centenary of Northern Ireland at the Town Hall which is a grade B1 Listed Building, located at the Diamond in Coleraine.*
- *The site is located within the settlement development limit of Coleraine, the town centre and within an Area of Archaeological Potential and Area of Townscape Character as provided by the NAP.*
- *The window to be replaced is located on the eastern gable end of the town hall. It is currently clear glass and measures 1.7m W x 3.9m H.*
- *The proposed window comprises 6mm handmade coloured and textured glass pieces assembled with lead frames depicting various themes commemorating the centenary of NI.*
- *Consultation was carried out with Historic Environment Division who following the submission of further information have not offered any objection.*
- *The proposal will not impact upon the essential character of the Grade B1 Listed Building. The panes match those of the window to be replaced and as much of the existing frame will be retained as possible, the proposed works make use of the traditional materials and techniques which will match or are in keeping with those found on the building. The proposal is compliant with BH8 and BH11 of PPS6 in that it respects the character and essential features of this listed public building. In addition the proposal respects the surrounding context and will not affect the form, character or finishes of the surrounding listed buildings or the wider ATC. Overall it makes a positive contribution to the overall fabric of the building and wider area.*
- *The proposal complies with all relevant planning policies including the Northern Area Plan, SPPS Edition 2 (2025) and PPS6, PPS6A.*
- *The recommendation is to Grant Listed Building Consent*

The Chair invited questions to the Officer.

There were no questions.

Proposed by Alderman Scott
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** Listed Building Consent 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 Member Abstained
The Chair declared the motion carried.

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** Listed Building Consent subject to the conditions set out in section 10.

5.5 LA01/2019/0322/F (Objection) 48m south-west of 23 Fairhead Road (Access from Craigfad Road) Ballycastle

Report and presentation, previously circulated, was presented by the Senior Planning Officer E Hudson.

Objection Application to be determined by Planning Committee
App No: LA01/2019/0322/F
App Type: Full
Proposal: Extension of existing farm yard to include new farm livestock shed with underground slurry storage tank.

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 as set out in section 10.

Senior Planning Officer presented as follows:

- *Planning Application LA01/2019/0322/F is a full application for an extension of an existing farm yard to include new farm livestock shed with underground slurry storage tank at 70m SW of 23 Fairhead Road, Ballycastle.*
- *(SLIDE) This is the red line boundary of the site. The site is located within the open countryside as defined in the NAP and within the Antrim Coast and Glens AONB. The map includes other land in ownership of the applicant – outlined in Blue.*

- *(SLIDE) This is the latest submitted site plan. The applicants dwelling is outlined in red line and is located directly opposite the application site. The applicant has 2 existing sheds located within the yard area surrounding the dwelling. The applicants dwelling and yard is bound by 3rd party properties to the south and east which also have associated farm buildings – neighbouring properties identified in orange.*
- *The application is being presented as an objection item and officers recommendation is to grant planning permission with conditions. There are a total of 67 letters of objection submitted from 23 separate addresses and 3 addresses unknown. The points of objection are summarised in para 5.1 of your committee report and include:*
  - *Impact on privacy and amenity*
  - *Road safety and impact on infrastructure;*
  - *Impact on AONB/tourism in the area;*
  - *Unsympathetic scale and massing;*
  - *Inconsistencies with submitted info*
  - *Insufficient justification for need;*
  - *Environmental impacts*
  - *Length of determination time*
- *(SLIDE) The proposal is for a livestock shed with underground slurry tank. The shed measures 14m by 18m and has a ridge height of 6.1 m. The materials are rendered masonry with green clad covering. Double doors lead to a central concourse providing access to 8 livestock pens with a slatted floor and an underground tank measuring 1.5m deep. The shed will have provision for up to 41 cows and they will be housed in the shed for 5 months of the year during the closed season and grazed on land surrounding the shed during the remaining 7 months.*
- *The application has been assessed against the relevant policies in PPS 21 together with PPS 2 in relation to its siting in the AONB and environmental considerations. The applicant has a category 1 business ID which was allocated in 1991. DARD have confirmed that the applicant has been active and established for the required 6 year period. In support of the application for a livestock shed a herd list, included a herd of 48 animals, has been submitted together with letters from 2 farmers that sheds are currently rented from approx. 5 miles from the site. The applicant has advised that that this is not a sustainable long term solution.*
- *(SLIDE) The application has been subject to a number of amendments and requirements for additional information during its processing time. This is the original layout submitted. It was originally submitted as a storage shed and was sited lower down the field and was larger in scale. Concerns were raised in relation to scale, massing, siting and prominence when viewed from surrounding public vantage point and neighbouring properties. The scale of the shed was reduced and sited further away from the neighbouring 3rd party*

dwelling at no. 2 Craigfad Road and closer to a copse of trees sited north of the site.

- *(SLIDE) – back to site layout*
- *CTY 12 requires new buildings to be necessary for the efficient use of the agricultural holding. The applicants holding comprises 42 hectares of land made up of 35 fields located around the vicinity of the site and land at Drumavoley. The applicant has 2 existing sheds sited within the existing farm yard opposite the site. These consist of a small stone built outbuilding and a large agricultural shed which are used primary for the storage of farm machinery, vehicles and domestic use. Neither building are capable of housing livestock without significant alterations and adaptations and there are no other farm buildings located on the holding. The applicant has submitted a herd list of 4 8 cattle. The agent states that housing cattle at a distance from the holding can impede timely intervention during periods of illness or calving and can impact animal welfare. It is considered that the farm shed is necessary for the holding.*
- *Policy also requires buildings to be sited beside existing farm buildings. The shed is sited as close as practical to the applicant's current farm complex despite be located on the opposite side of Craigfad Road. This is due largely to the fragmented parcels of land which are separated by lands in 3rd party owner ship. Land directly to the east and south of the applicant's farm grouping is in 3rd party control. As such the proposed siting is considered a logical and appropriate location in terms of relationship to the existing buildings and the operational needs of the agricultural enterprise.*
- *The shed was amended from a storage shed to a livestock shed and finally a livestock shed with underground slurry tank which is the proposal before us today. A number of national, European and internationally designated sites are within 7.5 km of the site. These are outlined in para 8.24 of the Committee report. As such a number of environmental reports were required to determine if there would be any adverse impacts on priority habitats or designated site in the vicinity of the site. This assessment was carried out in consultation with NIEA and SES. An AQIA, Soil Analysis Report and NMP were submitted and subject to amendments during processing. The NMP demonstrates that the 294 m3 of slurry generated by the proposal will be disposed of via land spreading on fields identified on the applicant farm maps – 2 fields near the application site at Fairhead Road and a further 9 fields at other farm lands at Drumavoley amounting to 12 ha of land. This will take place approx. 4 times a year between the grazing season of April – September. The soil analysis report demonstrates that the identified fields have a capacity for this land spreading without having undue environmental impacts. NIEA and SES have been consulted have no objections subject to conditions.*

- *(SLIDE) Looking at some photographs. This is a photo on approach along Fairhead Road. The site and surrounding buildings have an elevated position in the landscape. However from this view the shed will be clustered with other buildings in the surround. There is also rising land to the rear ensuring a new building wont breach the ridge line. New landscaping is also proposed along the western boundary of the site which will, in time, provide additional enclosure.*
- *(SLIDE) Closer view of the site from Fairhead Road. Shed proposed just left of the trees. 3rd party and objectors dwelling sited opposite the site. Objections have been raised in relation to residential amenity. The shed has been re-sited so as not directly opposite the dwelling. It is sited approximately 33 m from this property. Environmental Health have been consulted on objections to consider the impact on residential amenity. EH have acknowledged a livestock shed located less than 75 m from a 3rd party could give rise to noise and odour impacts. However, they have noted the site is within an established agricultural area where farming activities are characteristic. The AQIA undertook an assessment of impacts on sensitive receptors and concluded that when combined with emissions from the site and grazing it is not considered that it will exceed appropriate limits. Furthermore, there are other sheds located closer and they have not received any complaints to date on farming operations.*
- *(SLIDE) View from Craigfad road*
- *(SLIDE) View of entrance to site*
- *(SLIDE) View from front of neighbouring property towards site.*
- *(SLIDE) View of existing agricultural shed from neighbours' property.*
- *(SLIDE) View from within the site looking towards existing farm grouping.*
- *No statutory consultees have objections to the proposal.*
- *Recommendation is to approve planning permission.*

The Chair invited questions to the Officer.

There were no questions.

Proposed by Councillor Kennedy
Seconded by Alderman Hunter
- 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 as set out in section 10.

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 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 as set out in section 10.

* **The Chair called a recess for a comfort break at 11.46am**
* **The meeting resumed at 12.05pm**

The Democratic Services Officer joined the meeting in the Chamber

The Director of Corporate Services took a roll call.

The Chair invited Councillor McMullan to put his question to Officers which he had wished to raise prior to the recess.

In response to Councillor McMullan the Development Management (local applications) Manager advised that less weight is given to objections that do not contain a postal address and that for an application to be tabled at the Planning Committee there has to be five or more valid objections.

5.6 LA01/2025/0372/O (Referral) Lands Approximately 400m South of No 13 New Line Road, Limavady

Report, presentation and speaking rights template previously circulated was presented by the Senior Planning Officer, M McErlean.

Referral Application to be determined by Planning Committee
App No: LA01/2025/0372/O
App Type: Outline
Proposal: Proposed Site For Dwelling On A Farm With Use Of Existing Access From New Line Road

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.

The Chair proposed that this application be deferred for a site visit to view existing buildings on the farm.

Proposed by Alderman S McKillop
Seconded by Councillor McMullan

-That the Committee defer consideration of Item LA01/2025/0372/0 for a site visit to view existing buildings on the farm.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote
12 Members voted For; 0 Members voted Against; 0 Abstained
The Chair declared the Motion Carried

RESOLVED –That the Committee defer consideration of Item LA01/2025/0372/0 for a site visit to view existing buildings on the farm.

5.7 LA01/2025/0048/F (Objection) 1 Harryville, Portstewart

Report, presentation and speaking rights template, previously circulated was presented by the Senior Planning Officer J McMath

Objection Application to be determined by Planning Committee
App No: LA01/2025/0048/F
App Type: Full
Proposal: Proposed extensive refurbishment and alteration of existing dwelling, to include new two and a half storey side extension, enhanced single storey ground floor rear extension, enhanced first floor rear extension and roof level dormer extension, including all associated siteworks

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 Senior Planning Officer presented via PowerPoint as follows:-

- *This is a full application for the refurbishment, alteration and side and rear extensions, a roof level dormer extension and associated site works.*
- *The site is an end of terrace two and a half story dwelling at 1 Harryville, the side elevation onto Upper Heathmount. The site is within the settlement development limit of Portstewart as provided for by the NAP.*
- *Site includes a small hard surfaced amenity space and a wall to front, a driveway with parking space and a long grassed garden extends to the side and rear of the property.*
- *The proposal is for the extensive refurbishment and alteration and extension of the existing dwelling, which includes a new two and a half storey side extension which extends 5.1m beyond the side elevation, single storey ground*

floor extension which projects a further 2.1m beyond the existing rear elevation, first floor rear extension which extends 1.5m beyond the rear elevation and roof level dormer extension.

- *The existing dwelling will be largely intact with part of the existing rear return demolished and replaced with side and rear extensions.*
- *The front elevation will retain the traditional architectural character of the existing dwelling and reflect the established built form along Harryville preserving features such as decorative banding, window proportions, bay windows and the step down in ridge and eaves levels. The rear adopts a more contemporary design approach reflected by the wider context on Upper Heathmount and The Hill.*
- *Associated works include a 1.5m close boarded fence with 1.2m high landscaping along the western boundary and a 1.8m fence along the remaining boundaries.*
- *Twelve (12) letters of objection and one (1) comment have been received in relation to the proposal. The objections were from ten (10) individuals from six (6) different addresses. Six (6) of the objections were the same. Objections were received from:*
  - *Four (4) neighbouring properties on Harryville.*
  - *One (1) property in Portstewart.*
  - *One (1) property in Belfast.*
- *The issues raised were*
  - *Inappropriate form, scale, massing and design (including over development and dominance)*
  - *Impact on character of the area*
  - *Overshadowing and loss of light*
  - *Overlooking and loss of privacy*
  - *Issues relating to right of way/ fee farm grants*
  - *Pressures on existing infrastructure*
  - *Potential use as an Airbnb or subdivision*
  - *Effect on property value*
  - *Poor precedent*
  - *Environmental concerns*
  - *Poor separation distance*
  - *Lack of Neighbour notification to wider area*
  - *Building on party wall*
- *The application was submitted as a house holder and the extent of works was clarified during the processing of the application therefore the proposal falls to be assessed primarily under PPS7A as a house extension. PPS7a requires proposal to meet 4 criteria*

  The scale, mass, design and character of the area.

- *Firstly, the proposal is for a side and rear extension. The existing dwelling will remain largely intact and the proposed built form remains domestic in scale and is visually subordinate to the host dwelling. The majority of the extension is to the side and unlike the remainder of the terrace the host dwelling has a large side and rear garden which accommodates the extension without overdeveloping the site.*
- *The extension is complementary in detailing, proportions and vertical emphasis of the host dwelling and repeats the pattern of the streetscape by stepping down.*
- *The extension to the rear projects out further by 2.1m at GF and 1.5m at FF level. The rear elevation although modern and contemporary remains proportionate, domestic and not incongruous to the host dwelling or character of the area.*
- *The proposal is subordinate to the principle dwelling the scale, mass and design is found to be acceptable and the finishes match the existing resulting in a cohesive appearance which integrates with the dwelling and the wider terrace. This complies with criteria A of PPS7A.*

  Privacy and amenity, Overshadowing and loss of light
- *Slide - Due to the terrace formation, neighbouring properties already experience a degree of mutual overshadowing and loss of light. The Department has considered the scale of the rear extensions (2.1m GF and 1.5m FF) and the agent provided a light test which demonstrated that the rear extension will not result in additional overshadowing that would render the internal living accommodation unusable. Similarly the rear dormer is not considered to restrict light.*
- *The proposed windows do not facilitate direct overlooking into neighbouring habitable rooms. Objections raise concern about windows from first and second floors would view into neighbouring rear gardens and private amenity spaces.*
- *It is acknowledged that the proposed development introduces additional accommodation at upper floor levels, the proposed windows face towards the front and rear and reflect the existing arrangement of windows (on F and S floors). Side windows overlook the properties own private amenity space and the public road. Views from the second floor balcony are cleverly blocked by the second floor extension.*
- *Overlooking between neighbouring rear gardens is a characteristic of the area. The proposed windows provide views similar to that already experienced from F and S floor accommodation. The level of intervisibility created is not considered unusual or excessive within the context of the surrounding area.*
- *The proposal complies with criteria b of PPS7A.*

  Landscaping

- *The site possesses a large rear garden and front and side amenity spaces, they do not contain any trees or landscape features that make a significant contribution to local environmental quality therefore the development does not result in the unacceptable loss of or damage to significant landscape features. In addition, the proposal includes enhancements with replacement of boundary treatments including provision of 1.5 and 1.8m timber fencing and native species planting. The proposal complies with criteria c of PPS7A.* ***Amenity space and parking provision*** *has been explored in detail in committee report. The site currently enjoys generous private amenity space and sufficient spaces remains within the curtilage for recreation and domestic purposes including parking and manoeuvring. It is noted that the number of bedrooms reduces from 6 to 5 but the parking provision increases from 1 to 2 in curtilage spaces. The proposal is considered to comply with criteria d of PPS7A.*
- *Concerns raised by third parties have been considered in detail in the committee report.*
- *Rights of way and restrictions contained within a fee farm grant covenants. These are civil matters between the relevant landowners and interested parties. Planning is concerned with the use and development of land in the public interest. It does not determine private property rights, nor does the grant of planning permission override or extinguish any private legal rights or obligations that may exist.*
- *Concerns were raised about additional pressure added to the capacity of existing wastewater infrastructure. Whilst the number of wastewater sources will increase this must be balanced with the fact that the proposal will result in a reduction in the number of bedroom spaces and there is no evidence to suggest that the proposal would generate an increased wastewater demand beyond the existing dwelling.*
- *Concern was raised as to the effect on the designated features of the Skerries SAC. The site is approximately 215m S of SAC. The proposal is for works within the existing curtilage of a dwelling, and does not involve works within, adjacent to or hydrologically connected to SAC in a manner that would adversely affect the designated features.*
- *Concerns were raised as to the potential future subdivision of the dwelling and its use as short term tourist accommodation, the turnover of guests and resulting safety and security concerns. The application was submitted on a householder application form and the description does not make provision for subdivision or commercial short term letting. Any future proposal would be considered on its own merits under the relevant policy at the time. Turnover of guests and safety and security concerns are therefore speculative and are not given weight.*
- *Concerns were raised concerning loss of property value. This is speculative and no valuation evidence has been submitted.*

- *Concern was raised about undesirable precedent and harm to character of area. The development is found to be acceptable in terms of design, scale, form and is appropriate to the surrounding area.*
- *Concern was raised as to the proximity of extensions to the shared boundary, limited separation distances and future maintenance issues. The historic pattern of the area is terraced properties with rear returns on eastern boundary, the proposal is consistent with built form. Future maintenance is a civil matter.*
- *All neighbours were notified in line with the statutory requirements.*
- *Having consider the issues raised by third parties, the proposed development, policy and all other material consideration the proposal is one of an approval.*

The Chair invited questions to the Senior Planning Officer

Alderman Boyle asked for clarity around overshadowing. The Senior Planning Officer showed a slide showing the footprint of the existing building and extension and context of adjoining property at number 3 saying at ground floor the extension to back is 2.1m, first floor 1.5m with no extension beyond what is there at present on second floor. The Senior Planning Officer said that existing windows along the main part of the property are already affected by return of existing property and that the light test carried out attributed to patio doors on ground floor complied with light test. The Senior Planning Officer also said that when assessing light it should be noted that the rear of the property faces north so there is natural light restriction.

The Chair invited C Regan to speak in objection to the application.

C Regan stated that she does not object to the refurbishment as she believes it adds value to the property but asked for due consideration to be given to lighting in particular as the application was detrimental to lighting and said that the light test has been carried out from a glass door at back of property which is not the main living area. C Regan said that being an Edwardian terrace light is limited. C Regan stated that there was a previous application from number 7 to extend which was refused on the basis of light and referred to plans which demonstrate that there will be overlooking issues and an increased footprint of 50% with 9 of her rear windows being impacted negatively. Regarding parking C Regan stated that only number 1 has parking and referred to double yellow lines all around. C Regan said she and her family lived and worked in the borough and said she had concerns that the proposal was more than just a holiday home.

The Chair invited questions to the Objector.

At the request of Councillor Watton C Regan referred to correspondence she had submitted which was speculative expressing concerns around an Air B&B. At the request of Cllr Watton C Regan confirmed that the extension to rear extends to 2.1m.

The Chair invited the R Sholdis to speak in support of the application.

R Sholdis stated:

- His client acknowledged the concerns received, were keen to offer reassurance and confirmed that the applicants from the Great Belfast area had grown up children and grandchildren and wished to relocate to the north coast and become active members of the community.
- It is their intention to enhance the dwelling by carefully considered interventions whilst respecting the environment and paying close attention to the character.
- The end terrace site offers a substantial footprint with overlooking being an inherent characteristic with the level of visibility not out of context with the rear being north facing and significant overshading inherit from buildings at present.
- The restrictive covenant and associated legal restrictions have been given due diligence during purchase process with agreement being reached in terms of planning permission.
- This proposal will be the client's main home with no intention for any other use and the external steps are solely to achieve the required access.
- This application is to provide high-quality accommodation consistent with SPPS, is visually appropriate and will not detract from character and will not adversely impact.

The Chair invited questions to the Agent.

At the request of Alderman Boyle, R Sholdis advised that the window in imagery was not to the side of the proposal

Proposed by Councillor Kennedy
Seconded by Alderman Coyle

- 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
8 Members voted For; 0 Members voted Against; 2 Members Abstained
The Chair declared the Motion Carried and application approved.

RESOLVED – That 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.

Alderman Scott said that the volume in the Chamber was minimal and asked for intervention. The Chair and other Elected Members present in the Chamber concurred.

The Chair asked for ICT to rectify the sound in the Chamber.

* **The Chair declared a recess for lunch at 12.40 pm**
* **The meeting resumed at 1.30 pm**

The Director of Corporate Services took a roll call.

Councillor C Archibald did not return to the Chamber following recess.

Alderman Callan declared an interest in Application LA01//2026/0356/F and left the Chamber during consideration of this Item.

5.7 LA01//2026/0356/F (Objection) 51 Cappagh Avenue, Portstewart

Report, presentation and objections, previously circulated was presented by the Senior Planning Officer R Beringer.

Objection Application to be determined by Planning Committee
App No: LA01/2026/0356/F
App Type: Full
Proposal: Change of Use from dwelling to House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) property.

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 Chair invited the Senior Officer to present to the Committee.

The Senior Planning Officer presented via PowerPoint presentation as follows:

- *LA01/2026/0356/F is a full application for a change of use from dwelling to House in Multiple Occupation (HMO) property.*

- *A Committee Report accompanies this application. A verbal addendum is also provided.*
- *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 45 objections to the proposal from 38 separate addresses. The objection points are set out in Section 5 of the Committee Report and mainly relate to overprovision of HMO in family area, waste and rubbish concerns, noise / anti-social behaviour, health & safety, HMO size requirements, increased traffic and parking issues, over-crowding problems, impact on schools and services, impact on character of the area, impact on property values. These issues and others have been considered within the Planning Committee Report.*
- *(Slide SLP/Block Plan) The site, as outlined in red, is located within the settlement development limit for Portstewart. The application proposes the change of use of the existing dwelling with no internal or external alterations proposed. The existing dwelling is a semi-detached dwelling set within the wider Cappagh Avenue development. The existing character of the surrounding area is residential comprising a mix of detached, semi-detached and townhouse dwellings. The property fronts onto an existing area of open space. There is car parking to the west of the property within a communal parking area. The property also benefits from an existing area of private amenity space to the east.*
- *(Slide – Floor Plans) The floor plans indicate the layout of accommodation to the ground and first floors. There are no changes proposed to the existing arrangements. The property has a lounge, kitchen/dining room, utility and wc on the ground floor. Access is available from the kitchen/dining to the private amenity space. On the first floor are four bedrooms, an ensuite and a separate shower room.*
- *(Slide - Elevations) There are the existing external elevations of the property, with no changes proposed to any of these existing arrangements.*

Moving to some photographs of the site

- *(Slide) This is the front elevation of the existing dwelling.*
- *(Slide) Existing private amenity area, with space for bin storage and the oil tank as shown. This is the existing private amenity space for the property as a 4 bed dwelling and there are no changes proposed to these arrangements.*
- *(Slide 7) View of the side elevation of the property, with the property identified in red, and the existing parking arrangements. No changes proposed.*
- *(Slide 8) This is the existing area of open space adjacent to the property (sitting off to the front of it).*
- *The proposal is for the change of use of an existing 4 bed dwelling house to a 4 bed HMO property. Policy HOU 4 of the NAP 2016 relates to the use of dwellings for Multiple Occupation and states that Planning Permission will*

only be granted for the use of dwellings for multiple occupation where all of the 5 criteria are met.

- *As previously mentioned there are no internal or external alterations proposed. The property currently comprises 4 bedrooms and the proposal is for a 4 bedroom HMO. Objections raised issues in relation to HMO size requirements and overcrowding. The bedrooms exceed the minimum space standard as set out in the Houses in Multiple Occupation Act (NI) 2016. Communal kitchen/dining and lounge spaces are provided along with a wc, ensuite shower room and shower room. Consultation was carried out with the NI HMO Unit who raised no objection. The premises are suitable to accommodate the proposed number of occupants.*
- *The proposed change of use will not result in an adverse impact on the amenity of neighbouring properties and the character of the surrounding area. The general nature of a residential use remains. Objections raised issues in relation to the character of the area and overprovision of HMO properties in the area. It is considered that there would be minimal adverse impacts from this change of use as it would not be unusual for similar number of occupants to occupy the existing dwelling and the proposed HMO. It is considered that the change of use would not be substantially detrimental to the character of the surrounding area which would remain residential. There are no other HMO properties recorded for Cappagh Avenue on the HMO Licence Register. Consultation has been carried out with Environmental Health and the NI HMO Unit with no objection. Issues raised in objections also referred to noise and anti-social behaviour. The proposal would require to be licensed under The Houses in Multiple Occupation Act (NI) 2016, which is a separate process to the planning application. In the event of any noise or anti-social behaviour issues this matter would be dealt with through Environmental Health. Responsible management of the property should include procedures to deal with noise and anti-social behaviour.*
- *Externally, there are no changes proposed to the property. There is an existing private amenity area of a safe and secure design, with space for bin storage provided as per the existing dwelling. Objections were received in relation to waste and rubbish concerns. The proposed arrangements are unchanged from existing and are considered acceptable in this regard. Parking arrangements are as existing with 2 spaces for the property within the adjacent parking area and comply with Policy AMP 7 of PPS 3.*
- *Parking and service requirements for the proposed HMO are as existing. Objections raised issues in relation to traffic and parking. Consultation was carried out with DfI Roads during the processing of the application, who had no issues of concern. There are no parking standards for HMO use within PPS 3 or the Parking Standards Guidance. A Parking Statement accompanied the application which identified the existing arrangements. There are no changes to the existing arrangements. It is considered that*

there is sufficient capacity in the area to accommodate the proposed development without adversely impacting the existing parking provision. There are available communal parking spaces to accommodate visitors. The proposal is within the settlement of Portstewart with access to public footpaths and the public transport network. Public transport and cycling are suggested to be encouraged in the accompanying Planning Statement to promote a sustainable and environmentally friendly ethos. The parking arrangements are considered acceptable.

- *The application proposes no changes to the existing landscaping arrangements which reflect the character of the property and neighbourhood. The external appearance of the property will not change. The proposal complies with all 5 of the criteria of HOU 4 of the NAP 2016.*
- *Other matters raised included anti-social problems, child safety, increased crime and house values. The planning system operates in the public interest of local communities and the region as a whole in terms of good design and layout, and it cannot control the behaviour of future residents and anti-social issues. No evidence was provided in relation to house values decreasing as a result of the proposed change. The application also received a separate representation stating that the HMO will reduce the supply and thus increase the house value therefore pricing out families and first time buyers. Both representations provide conflicting views and in any event the housing market will dictate house prices within an area. Conflicting views were again received in relation to anti-social behaviour. This is an existing residential housing development. The proposal will add to the mix of accommodation. HMOs are one of the most heavily regulated forms of housing and are subject to continuous compliance – if approved the proposed development will require to be licenced under the HMO Act 2016. Impact on services, healthcare and schools. No demonstrable evidence of any impact was submitted. The perceived impact is not a planning consideration to which significant weight can be attached.*
- *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 2016, the SPPS Ed 2, and PPS 3, and the proposal is considered acceptable. The recommendation is to approve planning permission.*

Verbal Addendum

- *Since 10am Monday morning, a further objection has been received, a copy of which has been circulated to members. This brings the total number of objections to 45.*
- *By way of an update in relation to this, the objector seeks the opportunity to talk to the Council Planning Committee regarding concerns the community*

has over the HMO application. The objector notes that this is contrary to the protocol. The objector also states that they were informed as to the date of the council sitting at 10.30am on Monday 21st and were then told that they had missed the deadline to register to speak.

- *In line with the Protocol for the Operation of the Planning Committee, the Agenda for the Planning Committee is published on the Council's website one week prior to the Planning Committee Meeting. The schedule for this month's Planning Committee was published on Wednesday 16th September.*
- *Details of the operation of the Planning Committee are available on the Councils website, via the Planning tab. A specific page provides information on how to get involved in Planning Committee Meetings. Links are provided to the Schedule of Applications and the Timetable of Meetings. Details on how to register a desire to speak are also provided.*
- *Issues raised in the objection relate to: a family home being modified to a different use, unsuitability of the house, unsuitability of the neighbourhood, unsuitability of the infrastructure, and public safety concerns surrounding additional demands on an already highly populated housing development.*
- *These issues have been raised previously and are considered and assessed in the Planning Committee Report under Section 8.0 Considerations and Assessment - It is recommended that the Committee note the contents of this verbal addendum.*

Councillor Watton referred to the extenuating circumstances and established if the speaker was present in the Chamber which was confirmed by the Chair.

Proposed by Councillor Watton
Seconded by Councillor Storey
-That I Goldsworthy be heard to determine the reasoning for his objection, given the details in the verbal addendum.

The Development Management (local applications) Manager advised that this proposal was stepping outside of protocol. Councillor Storey informed the Committee that this had been permitted in the past.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote
7 Members voted For; 0 Members voted Against; 4 Members Abstained
The Chair declared the Motion Carried.

RESOLVED - That I Goldsworthy be heard to determine the reasoning for his objection, given the details in the verbal addendum.

The Chair invited I Goldsworthy to speak in objection to the application.

I Goldsworthy stated:

- He was speaking to the Case Officer 10 days ago and was advised it was unlikely this item would be considered until the October Planning Committee meeting and was informed he would receive email correspondence. When advised on Monday that this would be heard at September Planning Committee meeting I Goldsworthy telephoned requesting speaking rights and was advised the deadline had passed.
- None of the residents had had an opportunity to confer or consider an approach and that although he was glad to have the opportunity to speak he was not fully prepared.
- The main reason for his objection is that this is a small development settled community some 20 years old and residents are fearful and worried and have concerns about how an HMO would be regulated.
- He requested that the Committee consider deferring the application to allow the residents the opportunity to present their case, index the objections and give a proper representation to the Committee.

Councillor Storey said that in the interest of fairness to both parties a deferral would be a solution.

At the request of Councillor Storey the Development Management (local applications) Manager clarified that HMO unit was managed centrally by Belfast City Council with dedicated officers responsible for each Council area. The HMO licence register was previously online however due to recent unrest and safety concerns it was not currently. Officers contact the local HMO Officer to seek information of the number of licences in an area. At the request of Councillor Storey the Officer confirmed that there was no standard specification for parking in relation to HMO's and consideration is given to local transport links in tandem with planning department requirements.

At the request of Alderman Boyle the Development Management (local applications) Manager confirmed that it was clear from the Council website details of the deadline for requesting speaking rights.

Proposed by Councillor Watton
Seconded by Councillor Storey
-That application LA01//2026/0356/F is deferred for a month on grounds of fairness to allow an opportunity to present a case to the Planning Committee in objection to the application.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote
6 Members voted For; 0 Members voted Against; 5 Members Abstained
The Chair declared the motion Carried.

RESOLVED - That application LA01//2026/0356/F is deferred for a month on grounds of fairness to allow an opportunity to present a case to the Planning Committee in objection to the application.

*** Alderman Callan re-joined the meeting in the Chamber at 1.50 pm.**

*** Councillor Storey declared an interest in Application LA01/2022/0927/O and left the Chamber during consideration of this Item.**

5.8 LA01/2022/0927/O (Referral) Approximately 25m South East of 219 Seacon Road Ballymoney

Report, addendums, presentation and speaking rights template previously circulated was presented by the Senior Planning Officer R McGrath

Referral Application to be determined by Planning Committee
App No: LA01/2022/0927/O
App Type: Outline
Proposal: Proposed dwelling keeping within the neighbouring ridge height.

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

Addendum Recommendation
That the Committee note the contents of this Addendum and agree with the recommendation to defer the application to allow for an office meeting to discuss the amended application.

Addendum 2 Recommendation
That the Committee note the contents of this Addendum and agree with the recommendation to Refuse the planning application as set out in Section 9 and 10 of the Planning Committee Report.

The Chair invited the Senior Planning Officer to present

The Senior Planning Officer presented via PowerPoint as follows:-

- *This is an application for outline planning permission for a dwelling adjacent to 219 Seacon Road Ballymoney.*

- *The application was presented to Planning Committee in March where it was deferred to allow for a meeting between Planning Officers and the Agent to address concerns in relation to loss of trees on the site.*
- *The site is located within the settlement limit of Ballymoney as identified within the Northern Area Plan (NAP) 2016. The area is predominantly residential and as you can see from the location plan, the pattern of development is low density with mainly detached houses on fairly generous plots.*
- *The application site occupies a prominent corner plot at the junction of the Seacon Road and Newbridge Road. This gives the site its triangular form as it is constrained to both sides by the converging roads.*
- *219 Seacon Road currently operates as a children's daycare facility, having previously been a dwelling, until a change of use application in 2002.*
- *(Slide) The next slide shows an aerial view of the site with the red line superimposed. Members will note the extensive tree coverage of the site, with mature trees to the north, south and eastern boundaries.*
- *You can also see the extent of tree coverage in the surrounding area. Whilst the site itself is not covered by any specific designations, the land to the immediate south is within the Leslie Hill Historic Park and Garden and the Leslie Hill Local Landscape Policy Area.*
- *(Slide) The application is for a single dwelling within the side amenity area of 219. This slide shows the initial indicative block plan submitted in support of the application. Officers queried the accuracy of the plan and if retention of the trees was physically possible given the proximity of the proposed dwelling to the trees.*
- *(Slide) An amended plan was submitted which accurately reflected the trees and following the office meeting a further amendment was submitted which revised the siting of the dwelling.*
- *However, over the July holiday, works were carried out to the trees which are not in accordance with the amended plans and which have altered the character of the site. A total of 10 trees were cut down from in and around the site and there was evidence that a nesting site was destroyed which would be an offence under Article 4 of the Wildlife (NI) Order 1985.*
- *The 6 trees highlighted in purple were cut down along with hedging and shrubs. 4 trees were also removed from the roadside verge on Newbridge Road and trees 184, 186, 190 & 197 are still to be removed as part of the proposal.*
- *(Slide) If we have a look at some images of the site. The application site is in the centre of the image, with Newbridge Rd to the left and Secon Rd to the right. The trees to the left define the boundary of the Leslie Hill estate. You can see how the area is characterised by the mature trees which line the road and enhance the environmental quality of the area. This picture is taken from GSV from September 2025.*

- *(Slide) This image shows the site from Newbridge Road, this is also taken from GSV from 2025. You can see the sign for the nursery on the right, but the site itself is completely screened.*
- *(Slide) This is an image taken from the same location in July after the works were carried out to the trees. The trees which were on the roadside verge have all been removed, tree188 from within the site has been removed along with hedges and shrubs and 184, 186 and 190 are also to be removed as part of the proposal. You can see just how open the site has now become.*
- *(Slide) This next slide shows the site in the opposite direction from Newbridge Road, again taken from GSV.*
- *(Slide) And this image is from the same location in July, trees 176, 177 & 178 have been cut down and 184 highlighted in red is still to be removed along with 186, and 190 which are to the right of the image. Again you can see how open and exposed the site has become, you can even see a car on the Seacon Road through the site.*
- *(Slide) Again from Newbridge Road, you can see the open nature of the site with views through to Seacon Road, the conifers within the site are also to be removed as part of the proposal.*
- *(Slide) The application is assessed against policy QD 1 of PPS 7 and Policy ENV 3 of the NAP 2016.*
- *Policy QD1 states that planning permission will only be granted for new residential development where the design and layout draws upon the positive aspects of the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and will not be permitted where they would result in unacceptable damage to the local character & environmental quality of the area. In addition, the development must conform to a range of criteria.*
- *Criterion (a) of QD 1 requires the development to respect the surrounding context and be appropriate to the character and topography of the site in terms of layout, scale, proportions, massing and appearance of buildings, structures and landscaped and hard surfaced areas;*
- *Criterion (b) requires landscape features to be identified and, where appropriate, protected and integrated in a suitable manner into the overall design and layout of the development.*
- *Policy ENV 3 of the NAP states that development that would result in the loss of trees, hedges or other features that contribute to the character of the landscape, or are of nature conservation value, will not be permitted unless provision is made for appropriate replacement planting and the creation of new features.*
- *When considered in the context of planning policy, the extensive loss of trees to the boundaries of the site has significantly altered the character and environmental quality of the area.*
- *The impact on the character and environmental quality of the area would be compounded by the contrived introduction of a dwelling within now open and*

exposed site. The siting of the dwelling so close to the roadside boundary on both Seacon and Newbridge Road would be incongruous and completely at odds with the leafy suburban character of the area.

- *Tree groups in urban areas are not just important for visual amenity purposes but also have nature conservation value. They provide important habitat for a range of species and linear groups such as this, provide important wildlife corridors which are crucial for biodiversity by connecting fragmented habitats, allowing species to move safely and as such are protected under planning policy.*
- *Therefore, the proposal is contrary to Policy ENV 3 of NAP, and Policy QD 1, criteria 'a' and 'b', of PPS 7.*
- *Refusal is recommended.*
- *Trees Removed:*
  - *176 - No action required at this time*
  - *177 - Remove willow (Refers to small willow growing at base)*
  - *178 - No action required at this time*
  - *183 - Fell to facilitate development*
  - *188 - Monitor overhanging branches*
  - *196 -*
  - *Retained trees*
  - *182 - Fell to facilitate development*
  - *183 - Fell to facilitate development*

The Chair invited questions to the Senior Planning Officer

Councillor Kennedy questioned how removal of the trees altered the character saying that at the end of Seacon Road, houses were nestled amongst trees and that there was a range of configurations with some gardens having no trees. Councillor Kennedy said that as this is outline planning permission being sought the size or design of the house is not known.

The Senior Planning Officer advised that the character of the area was completely tree lined with only one house with complete tree removal and had a leafy suburban feel which extends to this site. The work done at present has completely opened the site which will render the house very prominent with 4 large trees still requiring to be removed as part of proposal.

At the request of Councillor Kennedy the Senior Planning Officer said that he could not determine the reason for removal of trees as they were not required to be removed as part of proposal. These were very mature trees linked to historic gardens nearby and provided screening.

The Senior Planning Officer said that it had been suggested to the applicant that the house be relocated forward however that was not forthcoming.

Councillor Kennedy said that there were sufficient trees in the vicinity to accommodate wildlife and the Senior Planning Officer advised of biodiversity reports and risks associated with tree removal.

In response to Alderman Boyle regarding the removal of nesting from the site the Senior Planning Officer advised that this was not a planning offence but a PSNI matter as it is against the law.

The Senior Planning Officer said that having considered the proposal a total of 4 trees were earmarked for removal with supplementary planting agreed and this would have been unacceptable.

Councillor Watton referred to the 60% retention and referred to the staggered nature of the area saying this proposal would not be out of character as looks to be last in a line of development and questioned a recommendation to refuse being as a result of the loss of three or four trees.

The Senior Planning Officer said that policy legislation states that there should be least impact on area and where environmental features are present and that these should be protected and incorporated into development and that this had not been achieved as part of this proposal. The Senior Planning Officer referred to the 40mph speed limit and the historic park in the vicinity and said that significant weight should be given to trees.

Alderman Scott asked whether, given the proposal was almost at approval stage at one point, would replacement trees be an option.

The Senior Planning Officer said that fully mature trees could not be planted and that trees when they exist should be retained.

The Chair asked if this discussion could take place at reserved matters stage in the process and the Senior Planning Officer advised that outline planning permission supersedes the protection of trees at reserved matters stage.

The Senior Planning Officer said that the proposal was a fairly modest house in terms of physical constraints of site and reiterated that the suggestion to move the house moved forward was not agreed by the applicant. The Senior Planning Officer referred to biodiversity and climate change requirements also.

The Development Management (local applications) Manager referred to the Addendum 2 – that 10 of the 23 trees are to be removed. The impact at the

site of Seacon and Newbridge Road following the loss of trees is that the rear garden is more open, there is an impact on character and limited screening on approach roads to Ballymoney town.

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

J Martin stated:

- Refusal reason 1 - Does not state that no tree removal is allowed; Additional planting can be included at reserved matters for their replacement which would be permissible. It is clear that the proposal is in compliance with Policy ENV3 as replacement planting can be conditioned as part of the application.
- Refusal reason 2 - The Planning department state that the proposed development fails to respect the surrounding character in terms of siting and layout and fails to integrate existing landscape features. They have also stated that the proposal is shoehorned.
- Criterion B relates to the trees and as stated previously, there are a significant amount of trees on site, with the majority of them being retained. All trees on the site are not being removed and with the retention of the majority the proposal will respect the existing landscape features. On approach from all directions the proposal will still be screened and backdropped by vegetation.
- No proposal can be invisible, and the neighbouring properties are certainly not invisible either.
- Criterion A requests that development respects the surrounding context and is appropriate to the character and topography of the site in terms of layout, scale, proportions etc.
- The case officers report states that there is no typical building line and that the proposal is not too far removed from the established building line and is satisfactory. They also state that the proposal has approximately 371sqm of amenity space, which is far above the minimum standard.
- Most importantly, the case officers report states in paragraph 8.21 that the site follows the existing pattern of development and fits in with the character of the area with a detached dwelling with driveway and front, side and rear garden, the proposal has sufficient amenity space to respect the character of the existing area. How can they state that the proposal does not fit with the character when assessed against QD1 of PPS7, but does fit with the character when assessed against Policy LC1 of the addendum to PPS7.
- At the request of the previous Committee meeting a potential scheme was provided to the planning department that provided a modern family home, integrated with the site and blended with the character of the area, though this was still not deemed acceptable and the Planning

department requested that the site be made larger and take over the car park of the nursery.

- In relation to the addendum and subsequent trees that have been removed from site the tree survey provided to the Planning department was done so at the start of 2024. Two and a half years have passed since this and four years from the application being submitted. In that time there have been significant storms which have caused damage to trees and works to upkeep the land could not continue to wait.
- Trees 176 & 177 does not form part of the application site, though these were noted in the report as having suppressed crowns and growing at angles and without vigour. They were removed for the safety of the adjacent active nursery.
- Tree 178 was also removed for the safety of the nursery, having an unbalanced and suppressed crown and also impacting tree 179.
- Tree 183 had an unbalanced crown due to competition for light and crossed/fused deadwood branches as well.
- Tree no.188 had a suppressed crown with minor deadwood and was weighted towards the road.
- Tree no. 196 had a suppressed crown, deadwood and was overhanging the street and a streetlight.
- The crown lift that was completed on the trees was done so for their health and to avoid overcrowding and competition for light.
- The trees removed along the roadside were done for road safety as the trees were growing over the roads due to lack of light. All trees that have been removed will be replanted with native species.
- The tree surgery and removals were completed by Maine Valley Tree Services. The company has undertaken LANTRA training, has a City & Guilds NPTC Certificate and Tree Surgeon and Foresty Insurance. The works were completed by a competent professional.
- Prior to the removal of the trees they were inspected by the surgeon for nesting birds, as required by law. The PSNI were also contacted regarding the tree removal and no subsequent action has been taken.
- The trees that have been removed were done so for health and safety of the general public and not to facilitate development. The proposal is in compliance with Policy ENV3 of the Northern area plan and criterion A and B of PPS7. The proposal will provide replacement planting at reserved matters stage which in our opinion negates any issues that the planning department have raised.
- This proposal complies with policy.

The Chair invited questions to the speaker.

At the request of Alderman Boyle, J Martin confirmed that in relation to nesting birds and removal of nests the PSNI had met with the owner and no further action was being taken.

In response to Councillor Watton, J Martin said that the policy did not state that trees could not be removed and it was the applicant's desire to retain as many trees as possible. A tree surgeon was engaged who confirmed the state of trees which included competition for light, dead wood and branches growing in the wrong direction.

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 for the following reasons:-

- Work has been carried in line with development
- Property dwelling is not out of character
- Largely agreed by planning department and close to agreement
- Property is within the provisions of PPS of Northern Area Plan 2016 and PPS7
- Consider that retention of 60% of trees meets policy
- Looking at configuration there are varying levels of trees in dwellings with lots of open sites so not a reason for refusal
- Possible to fit a modest sized house
- Additional requirements can be considered at reserved matters stage.

At the request of Alderman Boyle the Development Management (local applications) Manager provided clarification on the percentage of trees to be left which would be around 56%.

Alderman Boyle suggesting obtaining tree surgeons report and rationale for tree removal and made reference to storm damage cited by J Martin. The Chair ruled that the decision was required based on information available to the Committee, that trees had been removed for a legitimate reason and said that this decision was for outline planning with further options available at reserved matters stage.

The Senior Planning Officer said that there were no valid reasons made available in relation to removal of the trees and it had been well documented by Planners the trees which required remedial action and summarised the details as previously circulated.

The Chair referred to the four year period which had passed and said that J Martin had covered in his presentation the reason for removal of the trees.

Alderman Hunter requested a recorded vote.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.
7 Members voted For; 3 Members voted Against, 0 Members Abstained
The Chair declared the Motion carried and application approved.

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

- Work has been carried in line with development
- Property dwelling is not out of character
- Largely agreed by planning department and close to agreement
- Property is within the provisions of PPS of Northern Area Plan 2016 and PPS7
- Consider that retention of 60% of trees meets policy
- Looking at configuration there are varying levels of trees in dwellings with lots of open sites so not a reason for refusal
- Possible to fit a modest sized house
- Additional requirements can be considered at reserved matters stage.

Recorded Vote Table

For **(9)**	Alderman S McKillop, Scott
	Councillors Kennedy, McGurk, McMullan, Nicholl, Watton
Against **(3)**	Alderman Boyle, Coyle, Hunter
Abstain **(0)**	-

*** Councillor Storey re-joined the meeting in the Chamber at 2.50pm.**

*** The Chair declared a recess at 2.50 pm**
*** The meeting resumed at 3.00 pm**

The Director of Corporate Services took a roll call.

5.12 LA01/2024/1184/O (Referral) Lands adjacent and west of No. 281 Moycraig Road, Dervock

Report, presentation and speaking rights template previously circulated was presented by the Senior Planning Officer M McErlean.

Referral Application to be determined by Planning Committee
App No: LA01/2024/1184/O
App Type: Outline
Proposal: Site for 2 no. infill dwellings.

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 subject to the reasons set out in section 10.

The Chair invited Senior Planning Officer to present to the Committee
The Senior Planning Officer presented via PowerPoint as follows:-

- *LA01/2024/1184/O is an Outline application for the provision of 2 no. infill dwellings at Lands adjacent and west of No. 281 Moycraig Road, Dervock*
- *This is a local application and is presented to the Planning Committee as a referred item following a recommendation to refuse planning Permission*
- *The site is located in the rural area as defined in NAP2016 and is not located within any environmental designations.*
- *No objections have been received in relation to this application.*
- *The application site is located on lands at the Junction of Carncullagh Road and Moycraig Road to its northern side. The application site is located on lands formerly occupied by agricultural buildings which have recently been largely demolished.*
- *The application site is bound to the east by a dwelling (No. 281) and a number of associated farm sheds and to the west by a standalone building which is set behind a grass verge and access laneway, separating it from the public road. The roadside boundary is defined by the remaining remnants of one the former building with a lane of hedgerow to the front of it.*
- *There is no previous planning history on the application site. Planning history on the adjacent lands to the east of the application site is set out in Section 3 of the Planning Committee Report.*
- *As this application has been submitted as an infill dwelling it falls to be determined under paragraph 6.73 of the SPPS and Policy CTY 8 of PPS 21.*
- *Policy CTY8 allows for the development of a small gap site sufficient only to accommodate up to a maximum of two houses within an otherwise substantial and continuously built-up frontage provided these respects the existing development pattern along the frontage in terms of size, scale,*

siting and plot size and meets other planning and environmental requirements.

- *Whether a building forms part of a substantial and continuously built-up frontage is a matter of fact as to the circumstances on the ground. In this instance in order to form part of a substantial and continuously built-up frontage the relevant building's curtilage must extend to the edge of the public road and not be separated from it by land or development outside of its curtilage. This matter is clarified within Planning Appeal 2022/A0189 (Appendix A)*
- *To the immediate east of the application site is the remains of a largely demolished building (building 2 on concept plan). Further east is the dwelling at No. 281, with agricultural buildings to the rear, with further agricultural buildings to the east of No. 281. For the purposes of Policy CTY8, given the largely demolished state of the building immediately adjacent to the application site (building 2) it would not qualify as a building for the purpose of contributing to a substantial and continuously built-up frontage. Both the dwelling and adjacent sheds to the east of the dwelling have direct frontage onto the public road.*
- *To the west of the application site is a disused two storey building. This building is set back from public road and its curtilage is separated from the public road by a grass verge and separate laneway which runs parallel to the Carncullagh Rd. As this building does not have direct frontage onto the public road it cannot be considered to form part of a substantial and continuously built-up frontage.*
- *This slide shows the former boundary fence to the front of the building which defined the building's curtilage to the rear of the existing laneway.*
- *Consequently, as there are no buildings to the west of the application site that have frontage onto the public road the application site cannot be considered to be a gap within a substantial and continuously built-up frontage. As the application site does not represent a gap site the proposal fails to meet with the specific policy requirements the proposal is contrary to Paragraph 6.73 of the SPPS and Policy CTY8 of PPS21.*
- *Additionally, the proposed dwellings would result in adding to the linear pattern of development at this location, adding to ribbon development, contrary to Paragraph 6.73 of the SPPS and Policy CTY8 of PPS21.*
- *In regard to integration the application site benefits from existing buildings and mature trees to its eastern and western approaches which provide suitable screening and enclosure for the application site.*
- *The slide on screen shows the approach to the site from the west along Carncullagh Rd with the application site set behind the mature trees, screening views along this approach until at the application site.*

- *This slide shows the approach to the site from the east along Moycraig Rd. The application site is screened by the mature roadside hedge and the two storey dwelling at No. 281.*
- *This slide shows the site from the junction of the Carncullagh Rd and Moycraig Rd.*
- *Overall, it is considered that two modestly sized dwellings would not appear unduly prominent or conspicuous in the landscape and would satisfactorily integrate with their surroundings. It is considered that the proposal would meet with the requirements of Policy CTY13.*

- *Policy CTY 14 advises that planning permission will be granted for a building in the countryside where it does not cause a detrimental change to, or further erode the rural character of an area.*
- *As previously set out, the application site does not sit within a substantial and continuously built-up frontage. The buildings that occupied the site were demolished and the gap that currently exists on site sets the current character of the area. Development of the application site will result in buildings which, when viewed with the existing buildings in the immediate vicinity of the application site will result in adding to ribbon development and result in a further accumulation of development, having an urbanising effect on the immediate location and resulting in a suburban style of build-up which is detrimental to rural character.*
- *The proposal fails Paragraph 6.70 of the SPPS and Policy CTY14.*
- *Consultation was carried out with DFI Roads, Environmental Health, NIEA Water Management Unit and NI Water who raise no objection.*
- *In Conclusion the proposal is therefore contrary to Paragraphs 6.70 and 6.73 of the SPPS and Policies CTY8 and CTY14 of PPS21 in that there is no gap within a substantial and continuously built-up frontage at this location, the proposal would result in the addition to ribbon development along the public road and would result in suburban style build-up when read with existing built development.*
- *In addition, no overriding reasons have been forthcoming as to why the development is essential, therefore the proposal is contrary to CTY1*
- *Refusal is recommended*

The Chair invited questions for the Senior Planning Officer.

Councillor Kennedy said that this is a current farm holding and that the road was realigned some 20 years ago and most likely that the Department for Infrastructure still own the access road right into the verge of application.

Councillor Kennedy, referring to a slide said that there was no sprawl and proposal was within the curtilage of the existing farm holding.

At the request of Councillor Storey the Senior Planning Officer showed via the slides the structures which he defined as largely demolished and provided further commentary. Councillor Storey said he suspected the roofs were no longer present due to rates impact and age. The Senior Planning Officer said the issue was that of inadequate frontage.

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

L Kennedy stated:

- This outline application seeks permission for two infill dwellings on lands west of No. 281 Moycraig Road.
- The site is clearly an infill opportunity within a continuous and built-up frontage that meets all the criteria of Policy CTY 8.
- The recommendation to refuse is based solely on officers refusing to
- accept Building 1 as shown on the plans, as being part of the overall built-up frontage.
- When Building 1 is viewed from the public road, it makes a significant contribution to the overall frontage of development. It is clearly inter-visible with the other buildings, visually linked, and has a strong physical presence along the roadside.
- The illustrative plan and photographs submitted with this planning application clearly demonstrate this is a substantial, permanent building, clearly visible from the public road and forms the western end of the group of buildings. The presence of the grass verge does not alter the fact that the building fronts the roadside as required by the Policy CTY 8.
- The building shares a strong physical and visual presence along the roadside with the other buildings to the east.
- The appeal decision cited in the report is significantly different to this application. This appeal was separated from the road by fencing, a substantial grassed area, a vegetated embankment and a vehicle restraint barrier. The appeal sites were also in an open field that required extensive hedgerow removal and is, significantly different to this current planning application.
- This current site forms part of an established substantial agricultural roadside holding along Moycraig Road.
- It extends to over 100 metres and sits between Building 1 to the west and the dwelling at No. 281 and the substantial agricultural buildings further to the east.
- The two proposed dwellings would occupy the gap site within the heart of the grouping rather than project into an open field or create a ribbon of development.

- Paragraph 8.10 accepts that the development would not rely on new boundary treatment for integration and that the existing buildings and mature trees provide satisfactory integration from Moycraig Road.
- Paragraph 8.12 accepts that the proposal would not appear prominent in the landscape. The remaining Policy CTY 14 concerns of suburban build-up and ribbon development are substantially driven by the same reasons to exclude Building 1 from the frontage.
- Policy CTY 8 permits up to two houses within an established small gap like the application site.
- Detailed siting, scale, design and materials can be applied at the reserved matters stage to ensure modest rural dwellings that respect the established settlement pattern of this area.
- There are no objections from any third parties to this development proposal and statutory agencies fully support the development.
- The question is does Building 1 form part of the overall frontage: if yes, this is clearly a gap site that fully meets the criteria of Policy CTY 8.
- I ask the Committee to overturn the officers' recommendation and grant outline planning permission for this development.

The Chair invited questions to the speaker.

At the request of Councillor Storey, L Kennedy confirmed that the application site is clear, open and sits directly on roadside frontage and referred to policy CTY8 paragraph 5.33 saying that there is an overall frontage with buildings to west, existing house and agricultural buildings with a gap site evident.

Proposed by Councillor Storey
Seconded by Kennedy

-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:-

- Not speculative development
- Applicant wishes to provide family housing in land holding adjacent to exist home place
- Reporting shows a genuine need
- Location is logical
- Underlying principal of sustainable development.
- Applicant and agent clearly outlined that planning authority have taken a restrictive interpretation of frontage and continuous built-up frontage in this case and agent has set out and demonstrates compliance with CTY8
- Aerial photography from 2022 confirms multiple structures on site

- Not previous open field or gap but part of long-standing development frontage.
- The Officer has accepted that application meets integration in countryside.
- Application would not be unduly prominent in landscape
- Not suburban build up and not going to create urban sprawl
- Respects pattern in area
- There is common frontage
- Does not create or add to issue of ribbon development
- No objections from statutory agencies including Road Services.

The Chair put the proposal to the committee to vote
7 Members voted For; 2 Members voted Against; 2 Members Abstained
The Chair declared the Motion carried and the 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 following reasons:-

- Not speculative development
- Applicant wishes to provide family housing in land holding adjacent to exist home place
- Reporting shows a genuine need
- Location is logical
- Underlying principal of sustainable development.
- Applicant and agent clearly outlined that planning authority have taken a restrictive interpretation of frontage and continuous built-up frontage in this case and agent has set out and demonstrates compliance with CTY8
- Aerial photography from 2022 confirms multiple structures on site
- Not previous open field or gap but part of long-standing development frontage.
- The Officer has accepted that application meets integration in countryside.
- Application would not be unduly prominent in landscape
- Not suburban build up and not going to create urban sprawl
- Respects pattern in area
- There is common frontage
- Does not create or add to issue of ribbon development
- No objections from statutory agencies including Road Services.

6. CORRESPONDENCE

Items 6.1 – 6.5 inclusive were presented by the Development Plan Manager as read.

6.1 NILGA – Ministerial Led Planning Engagement Forum

Copy, previously circulated was presented as read.

Alderman Callan referred to the matter of Shared Environmental Services being raised at NILGA and said he would like a paper for Elected Members consideration and referred to current review being undertaken at Mid and East Antrim Borough Council. The Development Plan Manager agreed to bring a report to the October committee meeting. Alderman Callan said it would be good to get an understanding given the cost implication of this service to determine effectiveness saying he was mindful of the impact of this service on applications. Councillor Nicholl concurred with Alderman Callan and questioned the level of input from this stakeholder given that they were not a statutory body. The Development Management (local applications) Manager confirmed that although they were not a statutory consultee they acted as a shared service amongst Councils as a means of ensuring compliance with the Habitats Regulation within a legal framework. Councillor Storey referred to the associated cost and impact on the farming community.

The Development Management (local applications) Manager advised that prior to 2015 NIEA were the consultee. The process now requires consultation with NIEA which is then considered by Shared Environmental Service.

The Development Plan Manager clarified that there are two separate ways in which the council engaged with Shared Environmental Service, as follows:

i) Core funded work where SES carry out the HRA (for both planning applications and the LDP); and
ii) Consultancy-based work (totally separate to i) above) carrying out the Sustainability Appraisal (including Strategic Environmental Assessment) of the LDP. This service is no longer offered to local councils.

Proposed by Alderman Callan
Seconded by Councillor Storey and

-That a report be brought to the October Planning Committee meeting highlighting the Shared Environmental Services status including a review in respect of Causeway Coast and Glens Borough Council to take into account Notice of Motion brought to Mid and East Antrim Borough Council in July.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote
9 Members voted For; 0 Members voted Against; 0 Members Abstained

The Chair declared the Motion Carried.

RESOLVED - That a report be brought to the October Planning Committee meeting highlighting the Shared Environmental Services status including a review in respect of Causeway Coast and Glens Borough Council to take into account Notice of Motion brought to Mid and East Antrim Borough Council in July.

Planning Committee NOTED the correspondence.

6.2 DC&S DC – LDP Plan Strategy Revision – POP Consultation – HMO Policy

Copy, previously circulated, presented as read.

The main proposal is to reduce the limit of HMOs in any street from the current 30% cap to a 10% cap, across all of the District, with immediate effect, and pending the LPPs definition/designation of HMO Management Areas in certain local parts of the centre of the City, in which up to 30% would then be acceptable.

At the request of Councillor Watton the Development Plan Manager said that Derry City and Strabane District Council had an interim cap of 30% which will be the case until the next stage of the plan if unchanged.

The Development Manager (local applications) Manager confirmed at the request of Councillor Watton that, currently, proposals are assessed against the HMO policy and determined by impact on character and residential amenity and a balanced assessment is undertaken by the Officer based on the number of HMOs in their area.

At the request of the Chair, the Development Plan Manager said that the HMO Policy for Causeway Coast and Glens Borough Council is based on the current Plan for the area the Northern Area Plan which has no percentage cap. The Development Plan Manager agreed this matter can be considered through policy-related discussions with the LDP Steering Group..

Planning Committee NOTED the correspondence.

6.3 DfC - HED Historic Environment Policy consultation

Copy, previously circulated, presented as read.

The consultation document proposes NI's first ever overarching historic environment policy. It positions the historic environment as an asset that can contribute to regeneration, housing, tourism, wellbeing, biodiversity, climate objectives and economic development.

The policy is structured around three broad themes:

- Strengthening: improving protection, skills, capacity and management.
- Connecting – connecting heritage with communities, places, landscapes, biodiversity and tourism.
- Innovating – using heritage to support regeneration, investment, research, technology and new ways of working

The 17 no. policy aims cover matters such as identifying and safeguarding heritage, skills, owners and volunteers, adaptive reuse, climate change, access, wellbeing, biodiversity, tourism, partnerships, education, research and innovation. These are the proposed foundation of the new policy.

The draft policy establishes a broad strategic direction and expressly envisages that councils will use the policy to inform LDPs, community planning, placemaking, heritage plans, environmental plans and tourism, as well as social cohesion and good relations.

Initial comments:

- Give the policy clear status within the NI planning policy hierarchy and clarify its relationship with the SPPS, LDPs and Community Plans, etc.
- Provide specific guidance for councils on implementing the policy through LDP preparation, community planning, regeneration and development management.
- Develop a comprehensive digital historic environment evidence base including the GIS resource that is made available to councils and the public.
- Strengthen the policy's treatment of locally significant/non-designated heritage assets.
- Recognise the historic environment as part of wider place-making and regeneration policy, rather than treating it solely as a development constraint.
- Develop practical adaptive-reuse guidance so that historic buildings can contribute to housing, town-centre regeneration and economic development.
- Establish a coordinated Heritage at Risk programme, including funding, technical advice and intervention mechanisms.
- Provide long-term funding mechanisms to assist owners.
- Provide councils with access to specialist conservation and archaeological expertise, particularly where this does not exist in-house.

- Develop measurable indicators that demonstrate the economic, social, environmental and regeneration benefits of heritage investment.
- Develop clear guidance on heritage and climate change, particularly energy efficiency, retrofitting, flood/coastal resilience and renewable technologies.
- Clearly set out responsibilities and resources between DfC, councils and other delivery partners.
- Ensure the policy does not create additional unnecessary bureaucracy, and instead improves the speed, clarity and consistency of heritage-related decision-making.

The Development Plan Manager advised that the consultation closes on 23rd October 2026 and that if members wish to add to these comments they can be sent via email by close of play on Friday 16th October.

Alderman Callan asked that a draft response be shared with relevant stakeholders in Council to include Environmental Services, Tourism and Estates etc signed off by SMT with key points highlighted.

Alderman Callan said he was keen not to create an unnecessary bureaucracy burden and questioned the department prescribing a document with no budget for implementation and spoke of financial risks to Council as a result of responsibility relating to Historic Buildings.

Alderman Callan said he would like the HED to present the document to facilitate dialogue to determine the role of Council and consider the many buildings currently at risk.

Councillor Storey concurred with Alderman Callan saying it would be worth undertaking a cost analysis of implementation required by the Department.

The Development Plan Manager said she currently chaired the Northern Ireland Local Government Conservation Area Officers Forum at which there was a presentation and following which initial responses were brought to the Planning Committee today.

The Development Plan Manager agreed to collate responses and circulate to Elected Members and ask HED to present to Council. The Development Plan Manager also agreed, following response from Council to explore the cost of a piece of work currently being consulted on by Department. Ivy I'm not sure what this sentence relates to?

Planning Committee NOTED the correspondence.

6.4 County Donegal Development Plan 2024-2030 (as varied)

Copy, previously circulated, presented as read.

Planning Committee NOTED the correspondence.

6.5 Correspondence - Historic Buildings Council (HBC) Meeting with Causeway Coast and Glens Borough Council

The Development Plan Manager advised Elected Members of an invite from HBC to an event on 23rd October commencing at 11.30am including lunch and to advise of a request for suggestions on a venue in Coleraine to host the event which required wi-fi connectivity to facilitate presentations.

Alderman Callan suggested that the Council Chamber be offered to HBC as a venue for the meeting. All members in attendance were in agreement.

7. REPORTS FOR DECISION

Item 7.1 was presented by the Development Plan Manager as read.

7.1 TPO Confirmation – 45 Quay Road, Ballycastle

Report, previously circulated, was presented by the Development Plan Manager who provided a verbal erratum advising that Paragraph 1.1 should read “with modification”.

Background
Site is within the Ballycastle Conservation Area and Area of Archaeological Potential. The site comprises the front amenity space of a residential unit at 45 Quay Road: a B1 Listed Building constructed between 1880-1899.

There are currently no planning applications associated with this site.

As prescribed by The Planning (Trees) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2015 trees within a conservation area are already protected (as though they are covered by a TPO) provided they have a minimum trunk diameter of 7.5cm, measured at a minimum 1.5m above ground level.

In 2005, a request was submitted to fell trees at this property. The former Department for the Environment (DOE) refused consent, imposing a formal TPO on the site, as was required under legislation at that time. Subsequently, TPO15 (TPO/2005/0006) was served on the site on10th March 2005.

The review of the TPO was considered appropriate, given the time of the original provisional TPO in 2005, consented works and additional planting.

The site was surveyed on 14th May 2026. A Provisional TPO was served on site on 19th June 2026. This notice took effect immediately and provides protection for all trees on the site for a period of six months (until 18th December 2026).

On 19th June 2026 a copy of the Provisional TPO documentation was posted to inform interested parties and adjoining neighbours and copies of the Order were also attached to protected trees in obvious locations within the site.

The consultation process allowed comments/representations to be submitted within 28 days from the date of Notice of the Provisional TPO (up to 17th July 2026). None were received in this timeframe.

However, the occupant of No. 45 Quay Road had previously informed the planning department of his desire to fell a number of trees on site due to his concerns regarding health and safety of the trees and the physical, mental and financial burden of managing protected trees. The occupant has expressed concerns amid an increase of storms recorded in Northern Ireland and the proximity of these trees to Quay Road and Ballycastle Integrated Primary School. He has indicated that he may submit an application for works to these trees once the status of the TPO is confirmed.

A detailed assessment of trees was previously circulated.

Summary
The site contains 11no. individual trees, five of which (Tree No's 4-8) are considered to be worthy and suitable for TPO protection due to their condition and high public amenity value along Quay Road. Six of the trees (Tree No's.1, 2, 3, 9,10 and 11) are not considered worthy of protection due to their condition, low public amenity value or impacts on the listed building.

Recommendation
That the Committee note the content of this report and verbal erratum and agree to either Option 1 (confirm the TPO) or Option 2 (do not confirm the TPO) as set out in section 4.0 of the Committee report.

Proposed by Councillor Kennedy
Seconded by Alderman Boyle

- That the Committee note the content of this report and verbal erratum and agree to Option 1 (confirm the TPO) as set out in section 4.0 of the Committee report.

The Chair put the motion to the vote
9 Members voted For; 0 Members voted Against; 0 Members Abstained
The Chair declared the motion carried.

RESOLVED – That the Committee note the content of this report and verbal erratum and agree to Option 1 (confirm the TPO) as set out in section 4.0 of the Committee report.

8. REPORTS FOR NOTING

8.1 Finance Report – Period 4

Report, previously circulated, was presented as read.

Purpose
This Report is to provide Members with an update on the financial position of the Planning Department for Period 4 of the 2026/27 business year.

Details
Planning is showing a variance of around £100k favourable position at end of Period 4 based on draft Management Accounts.

The favourable position at the end of Period 4 is due to a favourable position in relation to income from planning application fees and property certificate income of around £46K.

This favourable position is supported by a favourable position of around £55K in salaries and wages and a favourable Development Plan of £30k and Other Professional Costs £15k.

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

Recommendation
It is recommended that the Planning Committee considers and notes the content of this report for Period 4 of the 2026/27 financial year.

Committee NOTED the report.

8.2 Quarterly LDP Update

Report, previously circulated, was presented as read.

Purpose of Report
To provide an update on the Council's Local Development Plan (LDP) preparation.

Details were previously circulated regarding:-
Background
Studies to inform the LDP Preparation

- Housing Study
- Retail & Leisure Capacity Study

LDP Timetable

Recommendation

It is Recommended that the Planning Committee note the content of this Report.

Committee NOTED the report.

8.3 LDP – Steering Group – Annual Monitoring Report (2025/26)

Report, previously circulated was presented as read.

Purpose of Report
To present the Council's Local Development Plan (LDP) Steering Group Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) for the 2025/26 reporting period.

Further details were provided regarding background.

Recommendation
It is Recommended that the Planning Committee note the attached LDP Steering Group Annual Monitoring Report.

Alderman Callan said that Elected Members should be involved with the Steering Group in some form, possibly as a sub-committee of the Planning Committee to allow for more engagement.

Alderman Callan felt that Elected Members were not involved fully on the Steering Group which reported quarterly to the Planning Committee to ensure deliverability on the Local Development Process.

The Development Plan Manager clarified that, as set out in the attached Terms of Reference, the Planning Committee is the LDP Steering Group.

The Chair spoke of the need to strengthen the process.

The Development Plan Manager explained that pre-covid all Elected Members were invited to topic-based workshops, following which the agreed policies were presented to the Steering Group prior to getting formal agreement at the Planning Committee meeting.

Alderman Callan suggested there was a disjointed approach and a need to revisit the Steering Group.

The Development Plan Manager set out the process, including recent workshops and Steering Group Meetings.

The Development Plan Manager referred to the three main areas of contention in relation to the Local Development Plan since its deferral back in 2022 which had not been resolved with Elected Members:-

- Housing allocation
- Distribution of housing allocation
- Rural policies

The Development Plan Manager clarified that the next LDP Steering Group meeting is scheduled for 30th September. Alderman Callan said it would be prudent if the Chair of Planning Committee could potentially Chair the Steering Group and that Elected Members attend the next meeting and consider a way forward including looking at the Terms of Reference. At the request of Alderman Callan the Development Plan Manager agreed to, following the Steering Group Meeting on 30th September, bring a report to the Planning Committee for consideration.

The Chair said it was important for Elected Members to be aware of the key stages throughout the process.

Committee NOTED the report.

8.4 LDP – Project Management Team – Annual Monitoring Report (2025/26)

Report, previously circulated was presented as read.

Purpose of Report
To present the Council's Local Development Plan (LDP) Project Management Team (PMT) Annual Monitoring Report (AMR) for the 2025/26 reporting period.

Recommendation
It is Recommended that the Planning Committee note the attached LDP Project Management Team Annual Monitoring Report.

Committee NOTED the report.

8.5 Fourth Quarterly Report on Planning Performance

Report, previously circulated was presented as read.

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

Further details of background were previously circulated.

Recommendation
It is Recommended that the Planning Committee note the Planning Department's Fourth Quarterly Report.

Alderman Callan said he wished to congratulate the Planning team on the trajectory reached and on the excellent work undertaken to achieve a 17.2 week turnaround on major applications and 15 week turnaround for local applications in quarter 4. Alderman Callan said this was a remarkable performance and extended his appreciation for the efficiency of staff.

The Chair concurred with Alderman Callan saying she had already offered her congratulations to the Senior Officer.

Committee NOTED the report.

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

There were no items of Any Other Relevant Business

This being all the business the meeting closed at 4.30 pm

_____

Chair