

**SITE VISIT REPORT: Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2026**

*Committee Members: Alderman, Boyle, Callan, Coyle, Hunter, Scott, S McKillop (Chair) and Stewart (Vice-Chair); Councillors Anderson, C Archibald, Kennedy, McGurk, McMullan, McQuillan, Nicholl, Storey and Watton*

**Application: LA01/2025/0530/F**

**App Type: Full**

**Proposal: Full retrospective Planning Application for the retention of agricultural building for agricultural storage & concrete hardstanding**

**Present: Ald Hunter Cllrs Kennedy, Watton.**

**Apologies: Ald Boyle**

**Officials: R Heaney**

**Comments:** The site visit began at 127 Glenhead Road, the applicants dwelling (the subject shed is located behind the dwelling).

The officer began by outlining that the principle of development was unacceptable under Policy CTY 12 of PPS 21 as the applicant has not demonstrated that the farm business is active and established for the required 6 years. It was explained that the Farm Business ID associated with the development had only been granted in 2024 and that it is a category 3 Farm Business.

It was explained that the applicant's farm business was registered with the lands immediately surrounding the shed totalling 0.8ha. It was explained that initially photographs of the inside of the shed submitted by the Agent showed the shed mostly empty with a few items that could be associated with agricultural activity. Since the application was deferred at Planning Committee it was explained that a further supporting statement was received showing many more items in the shed, informing that the number of sheep now held by the applicant had increased from 10 to 19, that the applicant was keen to expand further, and that they had taken on additional lands, located on the Glenhead and Baranailt Roads, from their father totalling 1.5ha.

It was explained that the officer had checked with DAERA and that one of the additional fields was claimed by a farm business which was not the applicants and the other was not claimed by any farm business.

The officer explained that aside from the photo there was no additional evidence regarding where the additional items in the shed came from and who owns them. It was further explained that no explanation or further evidence had been provided regarding the additional 9 sheep the applicant now says he holds.

The visit then moved up the lane to the shed. The gate was open, but the interior of the shed could not be accessed.

The officer explained that there was no issue with the proposal in terms of CTY 13 or 14 given the rural context of the site and agricultural appearance of the shed.

Cllr Watton asked what would happen if permission was refused, would the applicant be forced to remove it.

The officer responded that it would be a matter for the Enforcement Section and that Enforcement action would recommence should permission be refused.

Cllr Watton asked how it would be considered if the shed was for domestic purposes, for storing cars etc. The officer responded that the application before us was for an agricultural shed. As such it must meet Policy CTY 12, and to do that it must be on a farm holding that has been active and established for at least 6 years.

The site visit concluded.

R Heaney

22.06.26