

Laura Crawford

From: Stephen McCullough [REDACTED]
Sent: 19 March 2026 15:27
To: Planning; Richard Heaney
Cc: Karen Powrie; Stephen McCullough
Subject: 65 Beach Road - further objections
Attachments: 65 Beach Road Objection Letter 19th March 2026.docx

Laura and Richard,

Please find attached our further objections to the redevelopment plans re 65 Beach Road. We note Planning Office is recommending the current plans as acceptable, a decision we continue to astounded and baffled by. We are requesting to attend and be heard at the Meeting discussing this proposal - please confirm that the relevant Meeting is next week, Wednesday 25th March.

Thank you.
Stephen

19 March 2026

Dear Sirs

Location: 65 and 65A Beach Road, Portballintrae

Application Reference: LA01/2024/0699/F (4 apartments)

Planning Portal Reference: PP - 13090395

We are the Legal Owner/Occupier of Apartment3, 63 Bead Road, Portballintrae, BT57 8RT.

Embedded links in document link in the main to Google Maps.

We reference our **previous objections** submitted to your office and 10th September 2024 and 7th October 2025, reflected in the comments section of the relevant Application dated 28th October 2025 and 27th October 2025 respectively.

Following those submissions we have had sight of documents uploaded onto the NI Planning Portal on 17th and 20th February 2026 which provide other supporting documentation ("[SD 17/2](#)") and details of correspondence between your office and the Applicant's representative ("[COR20/2](#)"). The tight deadline for neighbourhood reconsult 5th March 2026 runs right up against the date for submission of the Planning Committee Report.

The Draft Planning Committee Report published on the Northern Ireland Planning Portal on 18th March 2026 ("[DPCR](#)") references Relevant History. This includes C/2007/1218/ F in respect of 63 Beach Road and related town houses, which was approved on 29/08/2008. This redevelopment was completed in 2018 and despite being asked, the Planning Office has been unable to provide us with any documentation to understand what is relevant from this historical application. From our previous discussions with Builder / Developer of 63 Beach Road many of the **relevant decisions made in respect of that property have not been consistently applied in respect of this Application.**

We note that the DPCR makes reference to Neighbours Consultations and includes some of the [issues raised](#). However we consider that some of the issues raised in our letters referred to above have not been fully highlighted or even mentioned.

- **Visual impact of the proposed development**

Originally proposed large open balconies have morphed into a **projection** surrounded by effectively three walls and a roof (ie continued architectural design creep). Whilst the ridge height and eaves have been matched with No 63, the squared front projection is of a significantly dissimilar height and size. The pitched roof and window height of the 2nd floor level is at a higher level than that of No 63. This **dissimilarity is reflected throughout the whole frontage of the building** ([REF 08 REV1](#), [SD17/2 -2.1](#)). The front of the proposed development therefore **does not mimic the scale, form and proportions of the adjoining property** (SD17/2 – 2.1) (direct contravention of planning policy).

The application maintains that balconies and terraces are a common feature of the immediate streetscape. **We continue to assert that this is not the case** in respect of the sheer size (1.8m abutting x 3.9m length x near full height of property) of the front projections of the 3 apartments. We remain baffled by Planning Office apparent acceptance of this highly visible and obvious construction on the streetscape of Beach Road!

The nearest property on Beach Road with open fronted balconies is '[The Anchorage](#)' over **100m away; is set well back from the road with balconies built into the structure of the building and only at the first floor level**. The DPCR ([8.8](#)) seems to try to provide a comparison to seaward facing elevations of [69 Beach Road](#) and the [Beach Apartments](#), neither of which remotely resemble what is proposed in no 65.

Perhaps consideration should be given rather to the **dissimilarities**. No 69 is a terrace built above a small existing entrance porch and Beach Apartments have a small frontal extension, possible to walk out on, but not much more. **Neither have the size or the visual impact of the proposed front extension included in this Application.**

It is the **streetscape** and ultimately the residents of Portballintrae and it's visitors that are impacted by this front elevation which we continue to assert is **not in keeping with the character** of the area, **nor sympathetic** to the surrounding buildings.

Whilst we recognise change, it should not be at the **expense of character**. Portballintrae is a small village and this is its charm.

SD17/12, in its support of front balconies references what they consider as [two similar beach front locations](#). Citing that there have been numerous recent approvals throughout the Causeway Borough, the examples given are both before 2021 and both in Portstewart, a small Town. Not Portballintrae and definitely not in this location; hence we view these references as being disingenuous at best.

We note **concerns** raise by your office in respect of the retention of the **front balcony to apartment 4 (COR20/2)** when there is already sufficient private amenity provided by a balcony to the rear. There are no similar structures at the level of those of apartment 4 along Beach Road, including those of "The Anchorage" where the inbuilt extension only includes the first floor level.

The respondent notes ' In this instance the proposal benefits from an advantageous location offering uninterrupted views across the coastline'. This is true, but at what point does it become acceptable to not only impact the **visual impact** of the streetscape but also the visual impact and views of current residents in the immediate proximity? Again, we are baffled by the Planning Office apparent approach on this matter.

We recognise the attempts of the proposed application to limit direct site lines into our apartment but this has resulted in **a substantial solid structure which sits well in front of the established building line.**

The following link provides a current visual view of Beach Road

<https://www.causewaycoastalroute.com/portballintrae>

This shows how the properties along the streetscape blend and the lack of balconies and in curtilage parking on this particular stretch of Beach Road. This should be a helpful visual as we voice our continued **objection**.

- **Overlooking from the proposed apartment affecting amenity and privacy**

We **disagree** with the applicant's comment that "the outdoor space to the rear of no 63 has a primary function of access to storage units"(SD 17/2 -1.8). This **statement is baseless and incorrect information on the part of the applicants!**

This outdoor amenity as suggested is 'relatively small ' thus increasing its value to those who use it. It is the only outdoor amenity space afforded to apartments 2 and 3 and is used by us for much more than access. It is used for our access, storage, outdoor sheltered seating, BBQ cooking and eating and entertaining.

The rear return creates **significant impact concerns relating to layout , scale, proportions, dominance and massing** in respect of No 63 and neighbouring No 67. The significant development proposed to the rear **is not in keeping** with the surrounding built form (No 63) whose rear return was limited in size and height to the then existing building.

The massing is **held only 1.85m** from the party wall. In respect of No 63 we were informed by the Builder/ Developer that that the rear return had to be set at least **3m** from the adjoining property. As mentioned, Planning Office has not provided the details of these conversations and decisions relating to redevelopment of our property which commenced 2026. It remains disconcerting to ourselves that such details are not publicly available now given that No 65 plans are so considerably different compared to what was permitted only a few years back re No 63 redevelopment.

We previously noted the proximity of the rear balcony of Apartment 4 to the dormer window of the master bedroom of No 63, Apartment 3. We have significant concerns in respect of noise levels arising from this balcony.

- **Exacerbation of exiting traffic/ parking issues in Portballintrae**
- **The narrowing of Beach Road simply to accommodate one car parking space at the front of 65**
- **4 spaces for 4 apartments is inadequate**

Parking is an issue with this development. Despite their claims otherwise, currently vehicular access to the rear of No 65 has always been possible with space available for 2 vehicles. Admittedly access space to parking is tight. The proposal therefore only provides an additional 2 places to what is currently available whilst potentially adding to the number of

cars and **exacerbating parking issues** on the street. Historical usage of this property has been as a holiday let with only a couple of cars.

We continue to **object** to the siting of and in curtilage parking space directly off the pavement and the road. This is **not in keeping** with and **out of character** with other buildings nearby on Beach Road. No other property between the public car park and roundabout at Bayview Hotel (400m away) to our knowledge parks in a manner proposed for No 65 G/F apartment sitting at right angle to Beach Road, within 2m-3m of Beach Road, and accessed through sliding gates and in such public view. None !!

Furthermore this has a significant impact for the ground floor residents of No 63 who will now have a car parked against their party wall. Any parking in the front of buildings which front Beach Road are in all cases **set some distance back** from the pavement and the road. We contend that this is totally out of place on the streetscape and not what visitors to Portballintrae, an area of outstanding natural beauty, want to see.

Access to and exit from this parking space will disrupt traffic flow along a busy and congested road, which has been narrowed by these plans.

The visibility splay in respect of the lane access junction seems to **take no account** of cars parked in-front of Nos 67 -71.

- **Inner wall of the Extension has a proposed “buff brick” finish**

Your office acknowledges that approximately 25 sqm of buff brick will be visible from No 63. Reference is made to the visibility of this “buff brick” from windows of No.63. Whether an open aspect is retained from the dormer window or the proximity to a 2nd floor stairwell window is not, in our opinion, the issue. **No consideration** has been given to its visibility from our communal amenity area and the neighbouring properties (10 townhouses) of the Atlantic View development of which No 63 forms a part.

We object to the use of this alternative material as it is out of keeping with the rendered finish used in all other respects.

- **Promoting a more accessible environment**

Our **objection** letter dated 7th October 2025 made reference to **PPS 3** which seeks to promote a more **accessible environment** including the needs of those with **disabilities**. This has not been reflected in the issued raises. We would ask how this has been addressed in this application?

As a final comment, in view of the very obvious issues arising in No 65 redevelopment plans which remain at odds with Planning Policy guidelines re blending with the streetscape and general environment, massing concerns which pit No 65 construction – the front for aesthetics and the rear for sheer size and dominance - at complete disproportion to its adjoining neighbouring property. And where our property was itself prevented from

redeveloping its site as 4 apartments with at least 5 refusals from Planning Office – the details of which are not made available to us. Also, as said previously by your Office, No 65 would be better served with redevelopment as 3 apartments, which would then blend consistently with adjoining no 63. Frankly, given all the issues raised by numerous neighbours and interested parties, we fail to grasp how a redevelopment plan so obviously at odds with, and different to its Portballintrae neighbours is now being recommended by Planning Office as acceptable at this location.

Karen Powrie & Stephen McCullough