

**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](mailto:planning@causewaycoastandglens.gov.uk).

<b>Planning Reference</b>	LA01/2024/0688/F
<b>Name</b>	Johann Muldoon, Aidan Bradley, Judith Wilson
<b>Contact Details</b>	Tel:  Email:
<b>Support or Objection – please tick relevant box</b>	Support <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  Objection <input type="checkbox"/>
<p><b>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).</b></p> <p>We respectfully request speaking rights in accordance with the established procedures of Causeway Coast and Glens Borough Council to represent our clients, Mabel and Aidan, particularly given the level of objection and the material planning history associated with this application.</p> <p>This case must be understood in the context of its planning history:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2016 Approval (LA01/2016/0956/F): A replacement dwelling of similar scale, massing and design was approved. Overlooking and amenity were considered and accepted.</li> <li>• 2024 NMC Application: Refused on procedural grounds only – relating to extent of change, not harm.</li> <li>• 2025 Refusal: A marked departure now citing overlooking, loss of privacy and dominance. Our position is clear: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The as-built dwelling remains fundamentally aligned with the 2016 approval</li> <li>• No materially different overlooking</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

- No new harmful vantage points
- Same topographical relationships

This represents a 'no material harm' scenario.

The key question is:

'What has materially changed since 2016 to justify refusal?'

Policy context, site context, and built form remain substantially unchanged.

While concerns are noted, these relate to relationships already assessed and accepted in 2016. The planning test must remain demonstrable harm, not perceived concern.

This case carries exceptional circumstances:

- Efforts have been made to regularise matters

This is relevant to proportionality in decision-making.

The development reflects the 2016 approval, creates no additional harm, and sits within the established context. The refusal represents an unexplained shift not supported by evidence.

We respectfully request:

1. Speaking rights are granted
2. Weight is given to the 2016 approval baseline
3. The application is reconsidered in light of no material harm and proportionality