

# Addendum

## LA01/2024/1183/O

### 1.0 Update

- 1.1 1no. letter of support has been received from Jim Allister KC MP in relation to this application, resulting in a total of no objections and one letter of support.
- 1.2 Comments raised include the following:
- *Alternative sites being unsuitable for locating a dwelling, by reason of health and safety concerns, impeding the chances of farm expansion, the advocacy of building on a flood plain, and that as yet undecided planning applications not being considered material considerations.*

### 2.0 Assessment

- 2.1 Paragraph 6.73 of the SPPS and Policy CTY 10 outline that applications for a dwelling on a farm must be sited to visually link or cluster with an established group of buildings on the farm. Policy CTY 10 exceptionally permits for a dwelling at an alternative site elsewhere on the farm where it has been evidenced that there are either demonstrable health and safety reasons or verifiable plans to expands the farm business. Officials in this instance consider there to be alternative sites which are considered to meet the siting requirements outline in policy. An assessment of alternative sites has been considered at Paragraphs 8.12 to 8.16 of the Planning Committee Report
- 2.2 In relation to the comment that the alternative site to the north of the farm buildings is within the floodplain, Paragraph 8.14 of the Planning Committee Report confirms that NI Flood Maps show the flooding to be restricted to the eastern and western corners of the

respective fields, and a dwelling could be sited beyond this flooding extent whilst still visually linking with the group of farm buildings. It has not been suggested that any development take place within the floodplain which, ultimately would be contrary to regional planning policy contained within the SPPS and PPS15.

- 2.3 It has been acknowledged in Paragraph 8.15 of the Planning Committee Report that the site to the south east of the farm buildings may give rise to health and safety concerns, given the access requirements through the farmyard. However, these concerns would need to be demonstrated by the applicant or agent before the site could be discounted from consideration where there are no other suitable alternative sites available which are sited to cluster or visually link.
- 2.4 Paragraph 5.42 of CTY10 states that evidence relating to the future expansion of a farm business may include valid planning permissions. The undecided applications referred to in the supporting letter were both submitted after the submission of this application, with LA01/2026/0023/CLOPUD being submitted after the referral request for this application was accepted. As neither of these applications have been concluded determining weight cannot be afforded to them given. Regardless, officials remain of the opinion that there are suitable alternative sites available which would not impact upon the applications submitted.
- 2.5 It remains that the alternative sites would provide more appropriate siting as per the requirements of the SPPS and CTY10. It has not been adequately demonstrated that these sites could not be developed. The proposed site does not visually link with existing buildings on the farm, it has not been adequately demonstrated that alternative sites are not feasible, and there are no overriding reasons as to why a dwelling at the application site is necessary. Additionally, it remains that the proposed site would require excessive new planting in order to successfully integrate into the countryside, and there is a clear lack of long-established natural boundaries.

### **3.0 Recommendation**

- 3.1 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.