

Implementation Date: 01 September 2023

Template for Requesting Speaking Rights at the Planning Committee

The Protocol for the Operation of the Planning Committee provides for interested person(s) to register to speak on a planning application that is scheduled to be determined at the next meeting of the Planning Committee. This request must be received by the Planning Department no later than 10am on the Monday before the Planning Committee meeting via email account planning@causewaycoastandglens.gov.uk.

Planning Reference	LA01/2024/1184/O
Name	Lee Kennedy
Contact Details	Tel: Email:
Support or Objection – please tick relevant box	Support ☒ x Objection ☐
Written representation summarising key points to be addressed and supplementary information in support of your case (minimum font size 10 and maximum length two sides of A4 page). Refusal Reason 1: <i>Contrary to CTY 1 and Paragraph 6.73 of the SPPS – No overriding reason why development must be in the countryside.</i> The applicant respectfully submits that the proposed development reflects a logical and sustainable opportunity for infill housing along a well-established rural road network. The application site forms part of a former agricultural yard associated with No. 281 Moycraig Road, and has long been part of a built cluster of structures at this junction. While the site lies outside a settlement limit, it directly adjoins an existing dwelling and historically accommodated outbuilding buildings—demonstrating a pattern of rural development that can reasonably be said to support countryside living. The proposed two dwellings are not speculative in nature but intended to provide family housing within the applicant's landholding, adjacent to his existing homeplace. This presents a genuine need and a locational logic that aligns with the underlying principles of sustainable development outlined in the SPPS. The development is not isolated or detached from rural infrastructure, and in this case, is arguably more appropriate than directing housing pressure	

toward smaller settlements with limited capacity.

Refusal Reason 2:

Contrary to CTY 8 of PPS 21 – No substantial and continuously built-up frontage; would result in ribbon development.

The applicant contends that the Planning Authority has taken an overly restrictive interpretation of the definition of "*frontage*" and "substantial and continuously built-up frontage" in this case. The disused building to the west of the application site, while no longer in active use, is clearly visible from the public road, forms part of the visual streetscape, and is accessed from the same lane that serves the application site. It occupies a position and orientation consistent with a historic building line, and should therefore be included in the assessment of the existing frontage.

Furthermore, aerial photography from as recently as 2022 confirms the presence of multiple structures across the application site, reinforcing the argument that the site was not previously an open field or gap but instead part of a long-standing developed frontage. The removal of those structures for health and safety reasons should not now be held against the applicant where a natural gap has resulted. The site, bounded by No. 281 to the east and a former building to the west, is clearly capable of accommodating two modest dwellings in a form that respects the rural grain and does not give rise to ribboning.

Refusal Reason 3:

Contrary to CTY 14 of PPS 21 – Detrimental to rural character; creates suburban build-up.

The application site lies at a junction where a cluster of buildings—residential and agricultural—already defines the rural character. The proposed dwellings would not encroach upon open countryside but would instead sit comfortably within an existing node of rural development. The site is physically contained by existing development to the east and west, and benefits from natural enclosure and backdrop, ensuring visual integration with the landscape in accordance with CTY 13.

The proposal has been sensitively designed as an outline application, allowing for future design control to ensure that house types, massing, materials, and landscaping all complement the local vernacular. Far from introducing suburban sprawl, this development represents a measured and appropriate response to an evolving rural context. With careful design and appropriate landscaping, the proposed dwellings would consolidate rural character rather than erode it.