

**PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD  
WEDNESDAY 26 NOVEMBER 2025**

**Table of Key Adoptions**

<b>No.</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Summary of Decisions</b>
1.	Apologies	<b><i>Councillor Storey</i></b>
2.	Declarations of Interest	<b><i>Alderman Callan, Scott Councillors Kane, Nicholl, McQuillan</i></b>
3.	Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting held Wednesday 22 October 2025	<b><i>Confirmed as a correct record</i></b>
4.	Order of Items and Confirmation of Registered Speakers	
4.1	LA01/2023/0008/F, Major, Lands Approximately 1.86km WSW of 175 Gelvin Road, in the townlands of Brishey and Curraghlane, approx 4.8km E of Dungiven	<b><i>Agree and Deferred</i></b>
4.3	LA01/2023/0418/F, Referral, 70m SE of 23 Ballymacrea Road, Portrush	<b><i>Agree and Deferred</i></b>
4.2	LA01/2024/0061/F, Referral, Agricultural lands 12metres North West of 18 Harbour Road, Ballintoy	<b><i>Deferred for a Site Visit</i></b>
4.5	LA01/2024/1283/O Referral, Lands between No.'s 30 and 36 Dunboe Road, Castlerock	<b><i>Deferred for a Site Visit</i></b>
4.4	LA01/2021/0777/O, Referral, Land immediately adjacent to 124B Dunlade Road Greysteel	<b><i>Deferred for a site visit</i></b>
	<b>CHANGE ORDER OF BUSINESS</b>	
	<b>'IN COMMITTEE '(Item 5 – 5.2 inclusive)</b>	
5.	Confidential Items:	
5.1	Addendum – Confidential Legal Update	<b><i>That the Planning Committee follow the legal advice and authorise officers to proceed as advised. If proceedings are issued</i></b>

		<b><i>the matter will be brought back to the Committee to review.</i></b>
<b>5.2</b>	Update on Legal Issues	
<b>5.2.1</b>	LA01/2019/0922/F, Lands Opp entrance to 59 Maghermore Road, Dungiven, BT47 4SW in the townlands of Carnanbane and Maghermore, Approx 4km south of Dungiven	<b><i>Noted</i></b>
<b>6.</b>	Schedule of applications:	
<b>6.1</b>	LA01/2025/0577/F, Major, Ballylinny Cottages, 7a Causeway Road, Bushmills	<b><i>Agree and Approved</i></b>
<b>6.2</b>	LA01/2025/0898/O, Major, The Showgrounds, 64 Ballycastle Road, Coleraine	<b><i>Agree and Grant</i></b>
<b>6.3</b>	LA01/2022/1529/F, Council, Site 10m North of 34 Strand Park, Cloughmills	<b><i>Deferred for a site visit</i></b>
<b>6.4</b>	LA01/2023/0615/F, Referral, 40 Strand Road, Portstewart	<b><i>Disagree and Approved Delegate Conditions and Informatives</i></b>
<b>6.5</b>	LA01/2024/0743/O, Referral, Site Adj to 57 Dunlade Road, Greysteel	<b><i>That Planning Committee defer consideration, pending submission of the PAC decisions cited and further information on the ceili house.</i></b>
<b>6.6</b>	LA01/2024/0814/F, Planning Agreement, Unit 2, Riverside Retail Centre, Dunhill Road, Coleraine	<b><i>Agree and Approved</i></b>
<b>7.</b>	Correspondence	
<b>7.1</b>	Dfl to Chief Executives Letter 21 Oct 25	<b><i>Noted</i></b>
<b>7.2</b>	DfIPG Letter to Ms Denise Dickson CCGBC re Update - Second Homes and Short Term Lets 23.10.25	<b><i>Noted</i></b>
<b>7.3</b>	Letter to Heads of Planning re Avian Influenza Prevention Zone - 05.11.25	<b><i>Noted</i></b>
<b>7.4</b>	Letter to councils regarding DPPNs	<b><i>Noted</i></b>
<b>8.</b>	Reports for Decision	
<b>8.1</b>	Advance Notice of List - BT Kiosks (x6)	<b><i>That Planning Committee agree Option 1: Support the proposed listings</i></b>

<b>9.</b>	Reports for Noting	
<b>9.1</b>	Finance Report Period 1_6 2025_26	<b><i>Noted</i></b>
<b>9.2</b>	Quarterly LDP Update	<b><i>Noted</i></b>
<b>10.</b>	Any Other Relevant Business (in accordance with Standing Order 12 (o))	<b><i>None</i></b>

**MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING  
COMMITTEE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CIVIC HEADQUARTERS AND  
VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE  
ON WEDNESDAY 26 NOVEMBER 2025 AT 10.30AM**

**Chair:** Councillor Kane (C) (Items 1-6.2, 6.4-10)  
Alderman Coyle, Vice Chair (Item 6.3)

**Committee Members:** Alderman Boyle (C), Callan (R), Hunter (R), S McKillop (R),  
Scott (C)  
Councillors, C Archibald (C), Kennedy (C), McGurk (R),  
McMullan (C), McQuillan (R), Nicholl (R), Watton (C)

**Non Committee Members  
In Attendance:** Alderman Stewart (10.45am-10.49am)

**Officers Present:** D Dickson, Head of Planning (C)  
M Jones, Council Solicitor, Corporate and Regulatory (R)  
S Mathers, Development Management (major applications)  
and Enforcement Manager (C)  
S Mulhern, Development Plan Manager (R/C)  
J Lundy, Development Management (local applications)  
Manager (C)  
E Hudson, Senior Planning Officer (R/C)  
R Beringer, Senior Planning Officer (C)  
M Wilson, Senior Planning Officer (R/C)  
S McKinley, Planning Officer (R)  
J McIntrye, Planning Officer (C)  
I Owens, Committee & Member Services Officer (R/C)  
S Duggan, Committee & Member Services Officer (C/R)

**In Attendance:** C Fegan BL (Item 6.1)  
L Boyd, ICT Officer (C/R)

Press 3 no. (R)  
Public 26 no. including Speakers

**Key: R = Remote in attendance C= Chamber in attendance**

## Registered Speakers

Item No	Name
LA01/2023/0008/F	Catriona McReynolds Thomas Bell Conor Fegan (C) Andrew Banbury Patrica McGrath (R) John Whiteford
LA01/2025/0577/F	Dermot Monaghan (R) Graeme Montgomery (R)
LA01/2023/0615/F	Murray Bell (C) (R) David Donaldson (C) Maurice Bradley MLA (C)
LA01/2024/0743/O	Alan Boyle (R)
LA01/2024/0061/F	Conor McGarry
LA01/2023/0418/F	David Dalzell Colin Mayrs David Alexander (R)
LA01/2021/0777/O	Mark Cairns (R)
LA01/2024/1283/O	Maurice Bradley MLA (C)
LA01/2024/0814/F	Eamonn Loughrey (C)

The Head of Planning undertook a roll call.

The Chair reminded Planning Committee of their obligations under the Local Government Code of Conduct and Remote Meetings Protocol.

### 1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were recorded for Councillor Storey.

It was advised the Councillor McMullan would join the meeting later in the day.

### 2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Declarations of interest were recorded for:

- Councillor McQuillan in Item 5.4, LA01/2022/1529/F, Council, Site 10m North of 34 Strand Park, Cloughmills. Councillor McQuillan left the meeting during consideration of this Item and did not vote.

- Alderman Scott in Item 5.6, LA01/2024/0743/O, Referral, Site Adj to 57 Dunlade Road, Greysteel. Alderman Scott stated Alan Robinson MLA had written in support of the Application and that he worked in the Office. Alderman Scott left the meeting during consideration of this Item and did not vote.
- The Chair, Councillor Kane in Item 5.4 LA01/2022/1529/F, Council, Site 10m North of 34 Strand Park, Cloughmills. Councillor Kane vacated the Chair, left the meeting during consideration of this Item and did not vote.
- Councillor Nicholl in Item 5.9 LA01/2021/0777/O, Referral, Land immediately adjacent to 124B Dunlade Road Greysteel. Councillor Nicholl left the meeting during consideration of this Item and did not vote.
- At 11.46am, during early consideration Alderman Callan declared an interest in Item 5.4 LA01/2022/1529/F, Council, Site 10m North of 34 Strand Park, Cloughmills. Alderman Callan left the meeting during consideration of this Item and did not vote.

### **3. MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD WEDNESDAY 22 OCTOBER 2025**

Copy, previously circulated.

Proposed by Councillor Watton

Seconded by Councillor Kennedy

– That the Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held Wednesday 22 October 2025 are signed as a correct record.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

12 Members voted For; 0 Members voted Against, 1 Member Abstained.

The Chair declared the motion carried.

**RESOLVED** - That the Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held Wednesday 22 October 2025 are signed as a correct record.

Alderman Coyle stated he was not at the meeting and abstained from the vote.

### **4. ORDER OF ITEMS AND CONFIRMATION OF REGISTERED SPEAKERS**

The Head of Planning stated Agenda Item 9.1 would be taken at the start of the meeting.

The Head of Planning advised there were requests for the following Agenda Items 5.1 a deferral, 5.7 a site visit, 5.8 and 5.10.

**4.1 LA01/2023/0008/F, Major, Lands Approximately 1.86km WSW of 175 Gelvin Road, in the townlands of Brishey and Curraghlane, approx 4.8km E of Dungiven (5.1)**

The Head of Planning stated there had been 1,500 letters of objection received this morning, Members did not have all the information in front of them and stated a verbal recommendation to defer.

Proposed by Councillor Kennedy

Seconded by Alderman Scott

- That Planning Committee agree with the verbal recommendation to defer the application.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

13 Members voted For; 0 Members voted Against, 0 Members Abstained.

The Chair declared the motion carried and application deferred.

**RESOLVED** - That Planning Committee agree with the verbal recommendation to defer the application.

Alderman Callan enquired whether the Application would be brought back in January. The Head of Planning advised it was unlikely as further environmental information would normally take 3 months due to provision within the Regulations.

**4.2 LA01/2023/0418/F, Referral, 70m SE of 23 Ballymacrea Road, Portrush (5.8)**

The Head of Planning presented the Recommendation.

**Addendum 3 Recommendation**

That members note the image of the ruinous structure. That the application is deferred for one month to allow the change of description and readvertisement.

Proposed by Alderman Boyle

Seconded by Alderman Coyle

- That members note the image of the ruinous structure. That the application is deferred for one month to allow the change of description and readvertisement.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

13 Members voted For; 0 Members voted Against, 0 Members Abstained.

The Chair declared the motion carried and application deferred.

**RESOLVED** - That members note the image of the ruinous structure. That the application is deferred for one month to allow the change of description and readvertisement.

**4.3 LA01/2024/0061/F, Referral, Agricultural lands 12metres North West of 18 Harbour Road, Ballintoy (5.7)**

Proposed by Councillor Kennedy

Seconded by Councillor C Archibald

- That Planning Committee defer LA01/2024/0061/F, Referral, Agricultural lands 12metres North West of 18 Harbour Road, Ballintoy for a site visit. Page 4 states access to a laneway that leads to holiday cottages. Glamping Pods are '2 sides of the one coin' and would like to look at it to see what the issues are.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

13 Members voted For; 0 Members voted Against, 0 Members Abstained.

The Chair declared the motion carried and application deferred for a site visit.

**RESOLVED** - That Planning Committee defer LA01/2024/0061/F, Referral, Agricultural lands 12metres North West of 18 Harbour Road, Ballintoy for a site visit. Page 4 states access to a laneway that leads to holiday cottages. Glamping Pods are '2 sides of the one coin' and would like to look at it to see what the issues are.

**4.4 LA01/2024/1283/O Referral, Lands between No.'s 30 and 36 Dunboe Road, Castlerock (5.10)**

Proposed by Alderman Boyle

Seconded by Councillor Kane

- That Planning Committee defer LA01/2024/1283/O Referral, Lands between No.'s 30 and 36 Dunboe Road, Castlerock (5.10) for a site visit in order to obtain a closer look at it before making a decision.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

13 Members voted For; 0 Members voted Against, 0 Members Abstained.

The Chair declared the motion carried and application deferred for a site visit.

**RESOLVED** - That Planning Committee defer LA01/2024/1283/O Referral, Lands between No.'s 30 and 36 Dunboe Road, Castlerock (5.10) for a site visit in order to obtain a closer look at it before making a decision.

**4.5 LA01/2021/0777/O, Referral, Land immediately adjacent to 124B Dunlade Road Greysteel 5.9**

\* **Having declared an interest, Councillor Nicholl did not vote on the application.**

Proposed by Councillor McGurk

Seconded by Councillor C Archibald

- That Planning Committee defer LA01/2021/0777/O, Referral, Land immediately adjacent to 124B Dunlade Road Greysteel for a site visit as it is subject to the cluster policy and want to assess the site myself in reality.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

12 Members voted For; 0 Members voted Against, 0 Members Abstained.

The Chair declared the motion carried and application deferred for a site visit.

## **CHANGE ORDER OF BUSINESS**

### **MOTION TO PROCEED 'IN COMMITTEE'**

Proposed by Alderman Scott

Seconded by Alderman Boyle and

**AGREED** – That Planning Committee move *'In Committee'*.

- \* **Members of the Press and Public left the meeting from 10.50am-10.53am.**

## **5. Confidential Items:**

### **5.1 Addendum - Confidential Legal Update**

Confidential report by virtue of paragraph(s) 5 of Part 1 of Schedule 6 of the Local Government Act (Northern Ireland) 2014 was previously circulated and presented by Council Solicitor, Corporate and Regulatory.

Conor Fegan BL was invited to present on his Advice and answered questions from Planning Committee Members.

**It is recommended** that the Planning Committee follow the legal advice and authorise officers to proceed as advised. If proceedings are issued the matter will be brought back to the Committee to review.

Proposed by Councillor Kennedy

Seconded by Alderman Coyle

- that the Planning Committee follow the legal advice and authorise officers to proceed as advised. If proceedings are issued the matter will be brought back to the Committee to review.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

11 Members voted For; 0 Members voted Against, 2 Members Abstained.

The Chair declared the motion carried.

**RESOLVED** - that the Planning Committee follow the legal advice and authorise officers to proceed as advised. If proceedings are issued the matter will be brought back to the Committee to review.

\* **Conor Fegan, BL left The Chamber at 11:05am.**

## **5.2 Update on Legal Issues**

### **5.2.1 LA01/2019/0922/F, Lands Opp entrance to 59 Maghermore Road, Dungiven, BT47 4SW in the townlands of Carnanbane and Maghermore, Approx 4km south of Dungiven**

Solicitor, Corporate and Regulatory stated 'Save Benbradagh' have served an Order 53 and stated the copy would be circulated to Planning Committee Members and updates provided in due course. In response to Councillor McGurk, Council Solicitor outlined Council's previous position and clarified Council would not be joined in proceedings.

Planning Committee NOTED the verbal update.

### **MOTION TO PROCEED 'IN PUBLIC'**

Proposed by Councillor Watton  
Seconded by Alderman Scott and

**AGREED** – That Planning Committee move '*In Public*'.

\* **Members of the Press and Public were readmitted to the meeting at 11.08am.**

## **6. SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS**

### **6.1 LA01/2025/0577/F, Major, Ballylinny Cottages, 7a Causeway Road, Bushmills**

Report, Speaking Rights Template Dermot Monaghan/Graeme Montgomery and presentation were previously circulated and presented by Development Management and Enforcement Manager.

#### **Major Application to be determined by Planning Committee**

**App No:** LA01/2025/0577/F

**App Type:** Full Planning

**Proposal:** Erection of 11no holiday units (in lieu of previously approved units); extensions to barn style building to provide entrance lobby and swimming pool; erection of ancillary shed; amendments to existing accesses; and provision of parking spaces, landscaping and associated site works.

## Recommendation

That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to **APPROVE** planning permission subject to the conditions set out in section 10.

Development Management and Enforcement Manager presented via powerpoint presentation:

- This full permission proposal comprises the main elements of 11 additional holiday units, an extension to a building to provide a pool and a small ancillary shed. The proposal will increase the number of holiday units from 10 to 21.
- In terms of the Northern Area Plan 2016, the site is located in the open countryside within the Distinctive Landscape Setting of the Giant's Causeway World Heritage Site. Additionally, the site is within the Causeway Coast AONB. The Northern Area Plan does not contain specific policies on tourism development, rather directing to regional policies in PPS 16.
- This is a major planning application so it was preceded by a PAN. The application was accompanied by the submission of a community consultation report. In addition, as a major application, it was accompanied by a Design and Access Statement.
- Planning History- There have been a series of planning permissions for holiday accommodation at this location, dating back to 1994 when an initial 6 units were approved. Since that time, other permissions have been implemented in part. These circumstances have resulted in permission being live for a further 6 units which can be constructed at any time. Accordingly, the proposal is for a net increase of 5 units.
- Principle Of Development- Within the Distinctive Landscape Setting area, Policy COU 4 restricts development to specific circumstances. One of these allows "extensions to buildings that are appropriate in scale and design and represent not more than 20% of the cubic content of existing buildings". The Policy is not prescriptive as to whether the 20% figure applies to a single building or group of buildings on the site. This Policy does not permit new buildings. Therefore, the principle of extensions to buildings is acceptable.
- Application Of Policy COU 4- Taking an approach which considers both the existing and approved buildings, which is not set out within Policy COU4, the proposed additional units can be accommodated within the 20% volume test. The additional units are not being provided in additional buildings relative to those approved. Rather, they are being provided through a reconfiguration and extension arrangement. While the ancillary shed is a

new building and therefore contrary to Policy COU 4, it is small at 29sqm and does not have any significant planning consequences.

- LVIA- Given the location within the Distinctive Landscape Setting, a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment was submitted. This considers the proposal from several vantage points and concludes, broadly, the site can absorb the development without detrimental landscape effects. Photomontages have been provided showing both the approved development and the proposed development. It is difficult to discern any significant change between these.
- Design- The holiday units are comprised within 1.5 storey buildings. The design of these is simple, reflects the existing and is appropriate to the character of the area.
- Access And Parking- The site is to be accessed using the two existing access points to Causeway Road. Both of these require improvement. A total of 36 car parking spaces are being provided. The use of appropriate surface treatments improve the quality of the scheme.
- Conclusion- Proposal is considered acceptable and the recommendation is to approve.

The Chair invited D Monaghan and G Montgomery to present in support of the application.

D Monaghan introduced himself from MBA Planning along with G Montgomery whom, he stated, was the Project Architect. D Monaghan stated the comprehensive report covered all issues at Ballylinny cottages for 10 plus ancillary facilities. Ballylinny had been acquired by HPB investment, established in 1983 and was in 13 European countries, this, the first in N Ireland. There were live 6 additional holiday units, previous approval for 11 and an extension for a swimming pool. The proposal smaller, 1 bed and not materially larger, it would be successfully absorbed in the landscape.

The Chair invited questions for the Speaker, there were none put.

The Chair invited questions for the Officer, there were none put.

The Chair put the recommendation to the floor.

Proposed by Councillor Watton

Seconded by Alderman Scott

- That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in

sections 7 and 8 and resolves to **APPROVE** planning permission subject to the conditions set out in section 10.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

12 Members voted For; 0 Members voted Against, 1 Member Abstained.

The Chair declared the motion carried and application approved.

**RESOLVED** - That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to **APPROVE** planning permission subject to the conditions set out in section 10.

## 6.2 **LA01/2025/0898/O, Major, The Showgrounds, 64 Ballycastle Road, Coleraine**

Report and presentation were previously circulated and presented by Development Management and Enforcement Manager.

### **Major Application to be determined by Planning Committee**

**No:** LA01/2025/0898/O

**App Type:** Outline

**Proposal:** Redevelopment of the Showgrounds to include demolitions of existing stands/buildings, refurbishment/extension to the existing Jack Doherty Stand and provision of new replacement seated stands (achieving 6000-8000 total capacity) accommodating replacement club house, team changing facilities, commercial space and adjustments to existing main pitch. Provision of new community changing hub/changing facilities with associated 3G training pitch. Improved road accesses, car parking/circulation, hard and soft landscaping (Renewal of LA01/2021/1217/O).

### **Recommendation**

That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to **Grant** Outline planning permission subject to the conditions set out in section 10.

Development Management and Enforcement Manager presented via power point as follows:

- This outline proposal comprises the main elements of a new club house and separate pavilion building, the refurbishment of an existing stand, three new stands and a 3G training pitch surface. The proposal will increase the capacity of the existing stadia from approximately 4500 to 8000. This is a renewal of a previous outline proposal, approved in August 2022. The 3G training pitch, one of the elements of the initial scheme has been implemented after approval of reserved matters in October 2023.

- In terms of the Northern Area Plan 2016, the site is located within the settlement development limit of Coleraine outside the town centre on land identified as an existing major area of open space. The Northern Area Plan does not contain specific policies on open space, sport and outdoor recreation, rather directing to regional policies in PPS 8.
- As this is an in-time renewal of a major application, it did not require new pre-application community consultation. The application was accompanied by a Design and Access Statement.
- Principle Of Development- As the proposal seeks to protect and enhance the existing sporting use of the established site, this is acceptable.
- Design- While an outline application, the Design and Access Statement provides an indicative scheme. This shows that the scale of buildings and structures are acceptable having regard to the character of the area. The proposal includes creation of an area of public space with quality finishes and landscaping next Ballycastle Road.
- Amenity- While the principle of development is acceptable, given the proximity of dwellings and the intensification of use, both noise and odour reports are required at reserved matters stage. In addition, details are required for floodlighting.
- Access And Parking- The site is to be accessed using the two existing access points to Ballycastle Road. The indicative scheme shows the availability of some parking on the site. Transport Assessment accompanied the application which modelled traffic impacts on the road network. This was found acceptable to DfI Roads. Given its location next the bus and train station, the site is well served by public transport. A condition requires submission of an Events Management Plan to agree transport aspect measures.
- Other Issues- Issues of potential ground contamination and sewage/ storm water disposal are regulated by planning condition.
- Conclusion- Proposal is considered acceptable and the recommendation is to approve.

Councillor Watton referred to an error throughout the report, where *Bushmills Road* was stated, it should have said *Ballycastle Road*. Councillor Watton sought clarification of the stands and whether they were covered.

The Development Management and Enforcement Manager referred to indicative drawings, which had illustrated one stand that was covered and on another it was unclear, however as it was an Outline Application he advised the Reserved Matters application would have the detail.

The Chair, Councillor Kane referred to the Executive Summary and request made for Swift Bricks. The Development Management and Enforcement Manager clarified that was a matter for them to opt to do so.

Proposed by Councillor Kennedy

Seconded by Councillor Watton

- That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to **Grant** Outline planning permission subject to the conditions set out in section 10.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

13 Members voted For; 0 Members voted Against, 0 Members Abstained.

The Chair declared the motion carried and application approved.

**RESOLVED** - That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to **Grant** Outline planning permission subject to the conditions set out in section 10.

The Chair declared a recess at 11.34am.

- \* **The meeting reconvened at 11.45am.**
- \* **Having declared an interest, Councillor McQuillan did not rejoin the meeting.**
- \* **Having declared an Interest, the Chair vacated the Chair and did not rejoin the meeting.**  
**Alderman Coyle, Vice Chair, assumed the Chair.**

### **6.3 LA01/2022/159/F, Council, Site 10m North of 34 Strand Park, Cloughmills**

- \* **Alderman Callan stated a Declaration of Interest and left the meeting. Cllr McQuillan also declared an interest.**

Report, Addendum 1, 2, 3, 4 and site visit note and presentation were previously circulated and presented by Senior Planning Officer E Hudson.

#### **Council Application to be determined by Planning Committee**

**App No:** LA01/2022/1529/F

**App Type:** Full

**Proposal:** Proposed development of four No town houses and four pair of semi-detached dwellings - 12 No units in total and associated parking (Amended plans)

#### **Recommendation**

That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for

the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to **REFUSE** planning permission as set out in section 10.

Senior Planning Officer presented as follows:

- (Slide) Planning Application LA01/2022/1529/f. This is a full application for 4 town houses and four pair of semi detached dwellings – 12 in total. 10 m north of 34 Strand Park, Cloughmills.
- (Slide) This is the red line boundary of the site. The site is located in the SDL of Cloughmills which is a large village as designated in the NAP. The site currently comprises a disused playpark and all weather pitch with residual grass areas surrounding it.
- (Slide) Aerial overview of the park – one part equipped play park and the other an all weather pitch. Planning histories would indicate that the play park dates back to the late 1970's. The site is surrounded by residential development and is accessed off Strand Park it is easily accessible from surrounding residential development and catered for wide age range including younger and older children.
- (Slide) This is an extract from the NAP. The land is zoned as a Major area of existing open space. As such Policy OS 1 of PPS 8 applies. Policy states that development which would result in the loss of open space will not be permitted. The only exceptions to this are:
  - Where re-development would bring substantial community benefits that decisively outweigh the loss of open space; or
  - Where it is demonstrated that the loss of open space will have no significant detrimental impact on the amenity, character, biodiversity of an area and where :  
In cases of an area of open space of 2 hectares or less alternative provision is made by the developer which is at least as accessible to current users and at least equivalent in terms of size, usefulness, attractiveness, safety and quality;
- The Proposal does not meet any of these exceptions and the principle of development is contrary to OS 1 of PPS 8.

Supporting information was submitted outlining:

- That policy does not have to be slavishly applied, adequate open space in the village and that the Council has identified the land as surplus to requirements.
- The supporting info also referred to a planning application for social housing approved on an area of open space and that this would set a precedent.

This relates to planning permission granted for 8 social housing units by Triangle Housing in 2010.

- Annex C of PPS 8 states that in relation to Housing Executive land within existing older estates there can often be substantial community benefit in permitting the appropriate redevelopment of part of open space provision. In this case the development for social housing was considered to meet the exception. This application is for a private developer. In addition the previous approval retained a percentage of the site for public open space. Also this area of open space was not an equipped children's play area as the application is rather an incidental area of open space common in housing developments which provide visual relief and informal play areas.
- Supporting info also refers to the biodiversity park located in the village which incorporates community buildings, riverside walkway allotments and play area. Applying the National Playing fields association minimum standard as set out in PPS 8 generates a demand for 1.05 ha of childrens play area – this includes equipped play areas as well as casual and informal play areas. The level of public open space in Cloughmills has diminished since the publication of the NAP. The only play area available is the biodiversity park which lies in the southern portion of the village not easily accessible for the northern portion of the village. At 0.065 hectares it is substantially below the minimum standard of the NPFA guidance and also only 20% of the size of the play area on the application site.
- There are a number of areas zoned for housing in the NAP which are not developed and which have no planning permissions – including Zonings CSH 3, 5, 6, 7. As such, there are a number of sites where housing could be brought forward which would be in accordance with the development plan.

#### Photos

- (Slide) Google street view images. Policy OS 1 of PPS 8 is clear that there is a presumption against the loss of open space irrespective of its physical condition and appearance. It would appear that the park has not been maintained over the years which has led to the deterioration of the park. This is not a reason in itself to permit redevelopment to an alternative use.
- (Slide) Layout of proposed housing development. Notwithstanding the principle of development is considered unacceptable. The layout is considered to meet the requirements of the relevant policy namely PPS 7, Addendum to PPS 7, Creating Places and DCAN 8. The detail of this consideration is outlined in the committee report. There is adequate amenity space provided, density is in keeping with surrounding development, adequate separation to protect privacy and adequate parking

provision. No concerns in relation to compliance with PPS 7, Creating Places.

- 6 Letters of objection received, 5 of which are from the same address. Issues raised include:
- Overlooking, loss of light, impact on biodiversity, flooding, loss of open space/play park and impact on water/sewage.
- No consultees issues.
- Refusal is recommended as outlined in Part 10 of your committee report.

In response to Councillor Kennedy, Senior Planning Officer clarified Council was the landowner and referred to the Area Plan on a slide. Councillor Kennedy stated it was a shame Council owned land to leave it like that he stated was ridiculous and a terrible looking site.

In response to Councillor Watton, Senior Planning Officer confirmed the land was disused, it had been left to deteriorate, in 2009 it had been used. Senior Planning Officer clarified that Policy did say that was not a reason to redevelop and the Policy applied.

Councillor Watton asked whether there were plans to develop the site? He further asked whether the proposal was private or social housing?

The Head of Planning stated that was a matter for Council, Leisure and Development and Land and Property, the focus was on the Planning Application.

In response to Councillor Watton, Senior Planning Officer clarified the application was private housing.

Councillor Watton asked for a site visit, referred to a disused Council site, in the middle of a village, the level of open space was an understatement.

Proposed by Councillor Watton

Seconded by Councillor Kennedy

- That Planning Committee defer LA01/2022/159/F, Council, Site 10m North of 34 Strand Park, Cloughmills for a site visit.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

10 Members voted For; 0 Members voted Against, 0 Members Abstained.

The Chair declared the motion carried and application deferred for a site visit.

**RESOLVED** - That Planning Committee defer LA01/2022/159/F, Council, Site 10m North of 34 Strand Park, Cloughmills for a site visit.

\* **Alderman Callan and Councillor McQuillan rejoined the meeting at 12.02pm.**

- \* **Alderman Coyle vacated The Chair.**  
**Councillor Kane assumed the Chair.**

#### **6.4 LA01/2023/0615/F, Referral, 40 Strand Road, Portstewart**

Report, Speaking Rights Template Murray Bell/David Donaldson, Speaking Rights Template David Donaldson, Speaking Rights Template Murray Bell, Speaking Rights Template Maurice Bradley MLA, Letter of Objection Amanda McLean and presentation were previously circulated and presented by Senior Planning Officer M Wilson.

#### **Referral Application to be determined by Planning Committee**

**App No:** LA01/2023/0615/F  
**App Type:** Full Planning  
**Proposal:** Erection of proposed 2 storey replacement dwelling, including attic rooms, integral garage and detached artists studio as ancillary to dwelling, including extension to curtilage and all associated works/landscaping.

#### **Recommendation**

That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to **Refuse** planning permission for the reasons set out in section 10.

#### **Addendum Recommendation**

That the Committee note the contents of this Addendum and agree with the recommendation to defer the application to allow the completion of the neighbour notification and assessment of the amended plans and Planning Statement.

#### **Addendum 2 Recommendation**

That the Committee note the contents of this Addendum and agree with the recommendation to Refuse the application in accordance with Sections 1 and 9 of the Planning Committee Report for the reasons set out in Section 10.

#### **Addendum 3 Recommendation**

That the Committee note the contents of this Addendum and agree with the recommendation to defer the application to allow for neighbour notification and consideration of the revised proposal.

#### **Addendum 4 Recommendation**

That the Committee note the contents of this Addendum and agree with the recommendation to Refuse the application in accordance with Sections 1 and 9 of the Planning Committee Report for the reasons set out in Section 10.

Senior Planning Officer presented as follows:

- Full planning permission is sought for Erection of proposed 2 storey replacement dwelling, integral garage and detached artist's studio as ancillary to dwelling, and all associated works/landscaping.

- This application was originally presented to the March meeting of the Planning Committee. It was then deferred and following the submission of amended plans was deferred again at the April meeting to enable assessment and neighbour notification to take place.
- This is a local application and is being presented to Committee as it has been referred to the Committee for decision. You have the planning committee report, a site visit report and 4 addendum in front of you. There is also a verbal addendum following a further objection which was received yesterday, 25th November 2025.
- The first addendum sought a deferral to allow consideration and notification on amended plans.
- Addendum 2 set out the consideration and assessment of those amended plans and the objections.
- Addendum 3 sought deferral of the application to allow consideration of the further revisions submitted following the previous recommendation by this Committee to seek a compromise on the proposal and, concurrently for the Committee to carry out a site visit which was carried out in October. Addendum 4 then considers the latest submission by the Agent, how this compares to the previous submissions, its assessment against the policy requirements, and the further representations received.
- So by way of verbal addendum – a further objection was received yesterday and this objection raises several matters of concern – firstly raising concern at the Agents request that the objections submitted by Nos 38 & 36 Strand Road are now obsolete as he has been informed these properties have been sold; the objector is concerned that this is an attempt to question the legitimacy of the objections and an implication that a change of ownership somehow diminishes the validity of the concerns raised. The objection goes on to state that the objector remains the owner of No.38 and wants this clarified to the Committee.
- The objector continues that irrespective of ownership, planning objections are not limited to neighbouring properties and any member of the public can submit a representation regardless of where they live and its incorrect and misleading to suggest the validity of objections turns on ownership. This matter is also dealt with under Paragraph 3.3 of Addendum 4
- Moving onto the presentation:
- (Slide) This is the red line of the application site, and the application site is located within the settlement limit of Portstewart as defined in the NAP 2016

at 40 Strand Road, Portstewart. (Slide) The site is within Northern Area Plan designation PTL 06, Dominican Walk, a Local Landscape Policy Area and is subject to the policy requirements of this LLPA and Policy ENV 01 of the NAP. This is a satellite image showing the site in relation to the Strand Road and cliff path and the neighbouring development. It should be noted that the dwelling sits below Strand Road. You will note in this image that the yellow line and circle indicate the siting of the adjacent historic approval which has been partially implemented. This was discussed at the site visit and how it is sited at bottom of the cliff, back from the path and partially screened by the wall which runs along the back of the path and limited the views into the site during the site visit. This slide also shows the site within the LLPA designation.

- (Slide) this next slide shows the site plan of the existing dwelling on site. And then this next slide shows [SLIDE] shows the proposed site plan and the footprint of the proposal on the site – you will note it is proposed to move the dwelling slightly further forward on the site and closer to no.38 than the existing. It also shows the proposed artist studio which is a separate building. This drawing also shows the wall detail and raising of levels next to the cliff path which has been raised by an objector.
- (Slide) so just moving onto a photograph of the existing dwelling on site, this shows the existing single storey bungalow which has a long frontage when considering the integral garage and conservatory but displays a typical and traditional gable width & height associated with a single storey dwelling. You will also note the low level wall and how the garden and steps run down from the front of the dwelling to the back of the path.
- Notwithstanding there is a dwelling on the site, the site lies within the settlement of Portstewart so the principle of developing the site is acceptable. I also wish to reemphasise that at no point was the agent ever told it was only a like for like replacement that would be acceptable. However, as this site lies within the LLPA PTL 06 it is subject to the policy constraint that
- No further development is appropriate, other than the replacement of existing buildings of comparable footprint and height.”
- Therefore any proposal will need to be of a comparable footprint and height to meet this principle requirement and that point was relayed to the Agent over 2 years ago now.
- (Slide) – so this next slide shows the last iteration of the dwelling that was presented to the Committee in September which was recommended for deferral to seek a compromise and for the site visit to be carried out.

- (Slide) this is the revised proposal that was submitted following the deferral at the September committee and you will again note this is substantially larger than what it seeks to replace, spread over 2 floors and a larger footprint to the existing. It also brings in fenestration, roof and detailing changes which will slightly alter the appearance. So you can see the proposed elevations are not comparable to the existing single storey dwelling – To Members to note, this application was initially presented to Members in March with a recommendation to refuse and amendments have since been made twice revising the proposal which has been limited in terms of addressing the Policy consideration. The consideration of the latest submission is set out in Addendum 4 for your information, with contrasting images showing the differences between this current submission and the previous.
- (Slide) These next slides illustrate a comparison between the scheme previously presented to Members in September and the proposal now under consideration – to help with identifying the changes to the overall bulk, scale and massing, these are identified by coloured ovals and this is also within Addendum 4. This slide showing the west and south elevations and then this (Slide) the east and northern elevations.
- (Slide) – these next 2 slides just illustrate the proposed floor plans of the dwelling; this is the ground floor plan with day to day living accommodation & integral double garage; [SLIDE] the first floor plan which is mainly bed accommodation with balconies.
- Just like the earlier slides, and to give Members a full appreciation and understanding of the changes like was done with comparison in elevations, this [slide] shows a comparison of the floor plan previously at Committee relative to the previous iteration to that proposal and the slight changes to narrowing the overall frontage length by reducing the dwelling in at either gable, and a slight reduction in overall width on the south elevation.
- So taking that previously revised floor plan which was presented to the September meeting, and comparing it to the proposal now under consideration, you will note that there are again limited changes with these predominately internal layout changes and is addressed in Paragraph 3.5 of Addendum 4.
- I think something we can agree on, is that balancing the 2 previous schemes presented to committee and what is presently under consideration by Committee are comparable in both footprint and height. However the policy requires the proposal to be comparable to footprint and height of the building to be replaced and therefore the position remains that the current

proposal to replace a single storey building with this proposal cannot be considered comparable to the existing as required by policy.

- So just moving onto some photos of the site: [SLIDE] – this shows the site in context for the access which is taken from Strand Road and you can see the dwellings sit below the level of Strand Road,
- (Slide) And again a view from the north of the site looking back towards the Strand, illustrating how the existing dwelling sits within the site and the surrounding context with dwellings to the North and the apartment development to the south.
- (Slide) – this next slide shows the relationship between the dwellings at No.40, which is to be replaced, and No.38
- (Slide) so moving down onto the Cliff Path/Dominican Walk where the main critical views are, this is a slide showing the existing dwelling when looking north, towards Dominican College, and you will note the wall surrounding Rock Castle which was originally a listed building and now has apartments – this wall also limits views of those walking the path into the site.
- (Slide) – This is now a view from the path looking south and again you will see the site at No.40 with the surrounding development and how this sits within its environment.
- (Slide) – this final slide just illustrates the existing dwelling to the No.38 and the relationship, and you will note the patio doors accessing out to the external area of no. 38. The proposal proposes to bring this gable closer to no.38 and significantly increase the overall bulk and massing to no.38 which is considered unacceptable.
- (Slide) this next slide shows the existing montage and an illustrative montage which includes development that has not been constructed as you will note from the 2 images. You will note how much more prominent the proposal is compared to the existing. Again another contextual elevation which shows the proposal has a footprint much wider than the developments either side which is exacerbated by the raising of levels at the front of the dwelling and relocating the dwelling's position closer to the path, and the proposed wall to the back of the cliff path which is higher than the existing wall to the front of rock castle, which will also add and contribute to the impact on the coast path and the overall dominance of the proposal.
- (Slide) – then moving onto the final slide, as the policy requires the replacement of existing buildings to be of a comparable footprint and height, this illustrates the existing dwelling which is outlined in red with the

proposal. so you can see scale, massing and dominance of the existing compared then to the proposed and how much more significant the overall scale, height and massing are.

- You should also note the comparison on the left hand side of the slide is the northern elevation of the proposal which abuts No. 38 and the overall increase and impact this elevation may potentially have on the existing amenity of no. 38 relative to the existing.
- As the proposal is within the settlement limit it is required to meet the requirements of PPS7 and the Addendum to PPS 7– this assessment is set out in Paragraph 8.12-8.33 and Addendum 2, and it is concluded that the proposal fails to meet the relevant criteria due to the size and scale of the proposal and its impact on the neighbouring dwellings, particularly no.38 as illustrated in this photo.
- There have been 4 objectors to the proposal and the issues raised are set out in Paragraph 5.1 of your report and then considered within the report and under the section Other Matters paragraphs 8.38-8.45 and within the verbal Addendum, and Addendum 2 & 4.
- As the proposal fails to provide a quality residential environment and if approved would be contrary to criterion (b) of Policy LC1 of Planning Policy Statement 7 Addendum and Policy QD 1 of Planning Policy Statement 7 criteria (a), (g) and (h)
- There are no objections from consultees. While the agent has submitted what they consider to be comparable replacement dwellings, these are not within the LLPA designation PTL06 and therefore cannot be compared and are distinguishable from the subject application.
- Refusal is recommended.

The Chair invited questions for the Officer, there were no questions put.

The Chair invited D Donaldson and M Bell to speak in support of the application.

D Donaldson stated the application submitted in 2023, had been substantially reduced and thanked committee for their interest and the site visit. D Donaldson stated there was a difference of opinion between the applicant and officer on how the site would be developed. The view 2-storey would not comply with the character of the area, the dilapidated single storey bungalow was out of context. He stated the revised proposal had been reduced further, an integral garage, the roof line broken up. The prevailing policy SPPS would there be demonstrable

harm on the LLPA? He proposed there would be no impact on the shoreline or grassed areas.

D Donaldson stated it was not dominant ENV1. In context it was the only single storey building in the LLPA. 2, 2 ½ and 3 storey dwellings adjacent, flat roof in the context of 13 Apartments, 2 town Houses in the same LLPA, 2 semi's no. 38 and no. 36. The overriding character was mixed buildings, on the land side coastal path, situated between Rock Castle and no. 30, the backdrop, Strand Road. The wider context further development settlement residential amenity – no higher than no. 38 7m-7m gable excess no. 34 and no. 36, a secondary bedroom window on the gable could be obscured.

D Donaldson stated that having viewed, were members convinced the 2-storey house would result in demonstrable harm? D Donaldson stated Planning Committee can approve because:

- 1 – Not contrary to ENV1;
- 2 – 2 storey dwelling would not result in demonstrable harm to the LLPA;
- 3 – it would not significantly adversely affect residential amenity.

The Chair sought clarification of the comparable footprint and size, what was the square foot compared to the proposed? Following the response, the Chair sought clarification of the height.

M Bell referred to the diagram existing 240m<sup>2</sup> there had been a misunderstanding of the footprint. Proposed 290m<sup>2</sup> included internal garage. M Bell referred to drawing 10F, the red hatched line overlaid. D Donaldson stated height was equivalent to the chimney existing, single storey building.

The Chair enquired whether the application had been deferred previously for an office meeting?

The Head of Planning advised the application had been deferred 1) for a site visit and 2) to open up further discussion on potential compromise.

D Donaldson stated it has been revised and they did have initial discussions. Officers were too far apart on what would be a compromise. It was too good a site not to accept, it was no higher either side, the proposal complied and respected the character of the LLPA.

The Chair invited Maurice Bradley MLA to speak in support of the proposal.

M Bradley MLA stated support for the application which he stated had been submitted in 2023 had been significantly reduced in scale, he stated there was a difference of opinion on how the site could be developed. M Bradley stated he had been to look at it and it was in keeping. The application was a 2-storey house

that would not harm the local character of the area. The properties to the north and south were higher, the applicant had reduced the footprint, increased the integral garage, dormers over no. 38, the roof line had been opened up and softened. M Bradley stated Members will have observed the single storey out of character due to its height, massing and scale, taking into account the existing montages of Rock Castle and no. 38 was comparable in height north, and south comparable, it would not cause harm nor affect the residential amenity and should be approved.

There were no questions put to the speaker.

The Chair invited questions for the Senior Planning Officer.

Alderman Coyle asked whether there was a willingness for discussion he referred to possibilities around the integral garage.

Senior Planning Officer clarified there was a single integral garage in the existing dwelling. The proposed garage faced towards the cliff. The room below was accessed from the other side. Senior Planning Officer stated that from what he was hearing from the Agent they had come to a point where the difference of opinion was apart. The application did not meet the policy test; there would be demonstrable harm; and it was a matter for Members.

The Chair put the recommendation to the floor.

Proposed by Councillor Watton

Seconded by Alderman Callan

- That the Committee has taken into consideration and disagrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to **Approve** planning permission for the following reasons:
  - Conscious, looking at maps, and at the site visit, the application is not out of place, the only thing out of place is the existing bungalow;
  - Rock Castle is huge compared to the footprint of this one and the other 2 developments similarly beside it;
  - There is a row of 2-storey and 3-storey dwellings and the replacement dwelling is not out of place, there will be no adverse effect, it is no higher than no. 38, there are no environmental issues, it will fit on the site comfortably;
  - The application scale has been reduced, principle of development, statutory Agencies have no objections. Consistency comes into view, as Rock Castle has been passed and cannot see how to refuse the development which is not out of place at all.
  - There is a 2-storey development, the single storey dwelling looks out of place;
  - Set in context, the development of Portstewart, it does not harm the features of the LLPA.

The Chair declared the vote would be Recorded.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

8 Members voted For; 4 Members voted Against, 1 Member Abstained.

The Chair declared the motion carried and application approved.

**RESOLVED** – That Conditions and Informatives would be delegated to Officers.

**RESOLVED** – That the Committee has taken into consideration and disagrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to **Approve** planning permission for the following reasons:

- Conscious, looking at maps, and at the site visit, the application is not out of place, the only thing out of place is the existing bungalow;
- Rock Castle is huge compared to the footprint of this one and the other 2 developments similarly beside it;
- There is a row of 2-storey and 3-storey dwellings and the replacement dwelling is not out of place, there will be no adverse effect, it is no higher than no. 38, there are no environmental issues, it will fit on the site comfortably;
- The application scale has been reduced, principle of development, statutory Agencies have no objections. Consistency comes into view, as Rock Castle has been passed and cannot see how to refuse the development which is not out of place at all.
- There is a 2-storey development, the single storey dwelling looks out of place;
- Set in context, the development of Portstewart, it does not harm the features of the LLPA.

Recorded Vote Table

For <b>(8)</b>	Alderman Callan, S McKillop
	Councillors C Archibald, Kennedy, McGurk, C McQuillan, Nicholl, Watton
Against <b>(4)</b>	Alderman Boyle, Coyle, Hunter
	Councillor Kane
Abstain <b>(1)</b>	Alderman Scott

**RESOLVED** – That Conditions and Informatives are delegated to Officers.

\* **Having declared an interest, Alderman Scott left the meeting at 12.39pm.**

## 6.5 LA01/2024/0743/O, Referral, Site Adj to 57 Dunlade Road, Greysteel

Report, and Speaking Rights Template Murray Bell/David Donaldson, Speaking Rights Template David Donaldson, Speaking Rights Template Murray Bell, Speaking Rights Template Maurice Bradley MLA, Letter of Objection Amanda McLean and presentation were previously circulated and presented by Senior Planning Officer J Lundy.

### **Referral Application to be determined by Planning Committee**

**No:** LA01/2024/0743/O

**App Type:** Outline Planning

**Proposal:** Proposed Site for Dwelling in a Cluster

### **Recommendation**

That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to **REFUSE** outline planning permission for the reasons set out in section 10.

Senior Planning Officer presented via power point presentation as follows:

- The application is for Outline Permission, described as “Proposed Site for Dwelling in a Cluster”.
- This is a local application and is being presented to Committee as it has been referred to the Planning Committee for decision. In your packs you have the Planning Committee Report and site visit note. Members asked at the site visit about the clearance levels for the NIE lines that traverse the site. NIE in the consultation response stated that the minimum statutory clearances from the overhead line are 3.4m and will be required to be clearly shown on the plans.
- An erratum has also been circulated amending paragraphs 8.8 and 8.9 of the Planning Committee Report and Refusal reason 2.
- It should also be noted by way of a verbal erratum, that in Para 5.2 in your Committee Report it states no objection from DfI Roads – however, as set out in Para 8.25 of the Planning Committee Report, DfI Roads consider the proposal fails to meet the requirements of PPS3. While the agent considers this matter has been addressed, an email sent by the case officer in February 2025 outlines that this matter remains unresolved and the refusal reason remains.
- Further information was also submitted by Alan Robinson MLA. This has been circulated to members and sets out the background to the applicant

and the reasons why the agent believes the application qualifies as a cluster CTY 2a dwelling. The note advises that the site at the edge of the 3 dwellings is linear in form and beyond that is a mature hedgerow beyond which there cannot be development. That the established cluster is defined by the grouping of buildings around the historic dwelling known as Mary Kanes cottage. A local ceili house, the original dwelling was restored such was its significance. The email also advises that supporting letters have been submitted to confirm this. The email also advises that the site complies with CTY 13 as it is not prominent and has established boundaries. The site infills the gap created by the 3 dwellings. That the proposal complies with CTY 14 and respects the development and that ribbon does not exist and that the visibility splays can be provided. I will cover these points raised through the presentation.

- (Slide)– The site, indicated in red is located outside any Settlement Development Limit and is located in the rural area and is not subject to any specific zonings or designations as set out in the NAP 2016. The site is located to the south of 3 roadside dwellings. Across the road is an agricultural field and to the south of those 2 dwellings.
- (Slide)– this next slide shows a contextual plan with the site indicated in pink and the additional linear development along Dunlade Road indicated in a pale yellow. You will note this plan indicates that there is no development to the South of the application site.
- (Slide)– And again then, this is a satellite image with the site identified by the red star and you will note from the image development fronting Dunlade Road and that there is no development directly to the South of the site.
- The application has been submitted as an application for a cluster. Policy CTY 2a allows for a dwelling in a cluster if all 6 criteria are met. As set out in the Planning Committee Report and erratum the proposal meets the 1st 2 criteria in that there are more than 4 dwellings outside of a farm and that the group appears as a visual entity. The proposal fails the 3rd, 4th and 5th criteria in that there is no focal point such as a social community building or is located at a cross roads.
- (Slide) in relation to the 3rd criteria. Within the supporting information the agent advises that the dwelling located at No.58 is a Historic Dwelling, recognised locally and previously used as a ceili house and now as a meeting point. Further information was submitted in the form of letters of support which note it was a local Ceili house. Planning History of this dwelling refs: B/2009/0376/F and B/2012/0090/F approved a replacement dwelling at this location. The Ceili house no longer exists. The replacement is not a social or community building today and functions as a dwelling

house. Though 6 letters have been submitted by the applicant stating that it was a ceili house in the past and is now a meeting point, no clarification of a meeting point has been given and little weight is attributed to this. Therefore, there is no focal point such a social or community building at this location and the proposal fails criteria 3.

- The site as you can see is not bound by development on 2 sides, there is only development to the north. The proposal fails the 4th criteria.
- The site cannot be absorbed into the existing cluster through rounding off or consolidation and will visually intrude into the open countryside by continuing development along the Dunlade Road and failing the 5th criteria of CTY 2a.
- The proposal is at the outline stage and the development could be controlled at RM stage to ensure it meets with the final bullet point and not adversely impact on residential development.
- (Slide)– – now turning to some pictures of the site, this is a view looking north on Dunlade Road and the site you can see is at the end of this tree line to the west or left of the slide. The visibility splays have not been demonstrated and require 2.4 by 90m this would most likely result in the removal of the mature hedge row and trees.
- (Slide)– this next slide is a view looking south along Dunlade Road, which shows the ribbon of 3 dwellings along the road, with the site which continues development towards the trees you see.
- (Slide)– this is just a closer photo showing where the development ends and the site beyond.
- (Slide)– these final photos just show the site itself and you will note how open the site is, and the views into it and the requirement for further landscaping to help integrate any dwelling into the site. Given the openness of the site, and lack of boundary treatment and roadside vegetation, the site is contrary to CTY 13 Integration into the Countryside as set out in Paras 8.16 – 8.20 of your PCR.
- The Agent also states that this is an infill opportunity under Policy CTY8 Ribbon Development. Policy CTY 8 states that planning permission will be refused for a building which creates or adds to a ribbon of development. Policy CTY 8 ribbon development as an exception allows for development of a small gap within a SCBUF. The site is not a small gap but a bookend to 3 dwellings. Approval of this site would continue this ribbon of development

by adding at least a fourth dwelling/building, the proposal is contrary to CTY8 as it adds to a ribbon of development.

- As the proposal is contrary to CTY 8, it is also contrary to CTY 14 as Ribbon Development is considered unacceptable in relation to rural character, as set out and considered in Paras 8.21-8.24.
- Please see the extract from the Rural Design Guide that show the sites in purple that are unacceptable as they add to a ribbon of development and also fail the cluster Policy in that they are not bound by development on 2 sides. Appeal reference 2019/A0214 is relevant the appeal was on the Brisland Road, Greysteel. The commissioner agreed with the Council that the proposal meet the first 3 criteria of CTY 2 a but it failed to meet policy CTY 2a in that it was not bound by development on two sides and that due to the lack of enclosure by development would fail to round off and consolidate the cluster. The appeal was dismissed as the proposal failed to meet criteria 4 and 5 of CTY 2a.
- The proposal is contrary to the SPPS, PPS 3 and Planning Policy Statement 21 policies CTY 1, policy CTY2a, CTY 8, CTY 13 and CTY 14 for the reasons set out in Section 10 of the PCR. The application is recommended for refusal.

Councillor Watton asked for a slide to be illustrated again regarding what he thought was a car park behind the wall or fence and a dwelling.

Senior Planning Officer clarified it was approved in 2009-2012 as a replacement dwelling and hard standing, letters of support had stated it was a ceili house, it had been replaced and now a meeting point, there were 6 letters, no addresses.

Councillor Nicholl referred to the NIE 3.4m overhead lines and whether these were acceptable or not?

Senior Planning officer stated they were unaware of the height, however, usually careful citing under any Reserved Matters application and the fact the site did extend further back, it may have scope.

The Chair invited A Boyle to present in support of the application.

A Boyle stated the application was an Infill and a Cluster, the site was surrounded by natural hedge, framed no's 58 and no 60 South and West.

Bounded 3 out of 4 sides, the 4<sup>th</sup> match existing development in the area, infill sites can be staggered and set back.

Long range birds eye line development. the agent referred to PAC decisions relating to policies CTY8 and 2A PAC 2021/A0044 2023, 2021/A0096 June 2022

Boundary shed, liner form with mature hedge to south. Mature hedging means no further expansion. Similar dimension 28m frontage to other dwellings in area. The Ceili cottage 50m+ away.

Cluster visual entity Mary Kates Cottage important for the fabric of rural living  
Reference to a cross roads is a misprint, the dwelling would be acceptable under Building on Tradition.

Integrates with adjacent development. Visibility splay can be achieved 1 small shrub relocating access. PAC 0016/2019 is relevant. No detrimental damage  
No objections. No. 57 original family home. Left to the applicant,

Further PAC decisions quoted:

2016/A0184 accepts boundary

2014/A0017 accepted

2024/A0017 cluster hedges trees acceptable boundary.

The Chair referred to the cited PAC decisions and enquired whether they had all been communicated to Planning Officers.

In response, A Boyle clarified some had, and some not at all.

Councillor McGurk stated the speaker had mentioned being bounded on 3 sides by development, advised she could see 1 side.

A Boyle stated Northern, 3 dwellings, south, staggered 2 across the road, East Road. West boundary was open. All houses Dunlade Road bounded North, South, long range views continuous line.

Councillor McGurk referred to the property on the other side of the road, was substantially further up the road, queried the distance from the site and dwelling further up the road.

A Boyle clarified 8m.

Councillor Nicholl stated the PAC decisions had not been seen and in light of this, they should be forwarded for consideration and the application deferred along with the NIE cable being explored.

Alderman Boyle concurred, stating it would be useful to also have information on the ceili house.

Proposed by Councillor Nicholl

Seconded by Alderman Boyle

- That Planning Committee defer consideration, pending submission of the PAC decisions cited and further information on the ceili house.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

12 Members voted For; 0 Members voted Against, 0 Members Abstained.  
The Chair declared the motion carried and application deferred.

**RESOLVED** - That Planning Committee defer consideration, pending submission of the PAC decisions cited and further information on the ceili house.

\* **Alderman Scott rejoined the meeting at 1.05pm.**

#### **6.6 LA01/2024/0814/F, Planning Agreement, Unit 2, Riverside Retail Centre, Dunhill Road, Coleraine**

Report, Speaking Rights Template Eamon Loughrey and presentation were previously circulated and presented by Senior Planning Officer R Beringer.

#### **Planning Agreement to be determined by Planning Committee**

**App No:** LA01/2024/0814/F

**App Type:** Full

**Proposal:** Change of use from non food bulky retail unit to retail unit for the sale of convenience goods (Groceries)

#### **Recommendation**

That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to **Approve** planning permission subject to the conditions set out in section 10.

Senior Planning Officer presented as follows:

- This application is a local application being presented to the Committee as the recommendation is subject to a planning agreement.
- A variation of Condition (Section 54) application was initially submitted and previously presented to the Planning Committee, seeking permission to sell convenience goods within Unit 2. It was later identified that this proposal did not constitute a valid planning application. This proposal is a new standalone permission for the change of use.
- (Slide 1) The site, as outlined in red, is located within the development limit for Coleraine. It is not subject to any specific zonings or designations as set out in the Northern Area Plan 2016. The site is located within the Riverside Centre, lying outside of the town centre area of Coleraine. For retail purposes, it is an out of centre site.
- (Slide 2) The layout shows the location of Unit 2 within the Riverside Centre.
- (Slide 3) Elevations of the existing units 1 & 2, with this application relating to Unit 2 only.

- (Slide 4) Image of the unit, with Unit 2 identified.
- The prospective tenant is Food Warehouse which is part of the Iceland Foods Group. Iceland currently have a store at Railway Road in the town centre. The Planning Agreement would ensure that the Iceland store remains trading for a minimum of 5 years, retaining consumer choice within the town centre. The retailer has not indicated any intention to close the store and it could well operate indefinitely.
- The Committee Report refers to consultation which has been undertaken with DfI Roads. DfI Roads have responded advising they have no issues of concern regarding this application.
- The application has been assessed in relation to the relevant policy considerations. The recommendation is to approve the change of use application which is subject to a Planning Agreement, and that Members are content for Officials to proceed with same.

Alderman Scott referred to the advertisement date of 19 November-3 December and enquired how it would affect the ability to make a decision? That if an objection came in, would it have to come back to Planning Committee?

Senior Planning Officer advised the recommendation could proceed with the Planning Agreement, subject to the expiration.

The Head of Planning clarified any further material planning issues raised as a result, would come back to Planning Committee.

The Chair invited E Loughrey to present in support of the application.

E Loughrey stated he had been at the Planning Committee Meeting last month and was available to answer questions. The application was for the food warehouse, Iceland. They would keep the store on Railway Road for at least 5 years, there would be 2 benefits to Coleraine, a long term benefit and a food warehouse, 40-50 jobs, security for the existing staff, and an investment of £1.5m.

Councillor Watton referred to 50 jobs at Riverside and what the timescale would be?

E Loughrey clarified the fit out would commence January, there had been a blip in procedure and be open for the Summer.

Proposed by Alderman Scott

Seconded by Councillor Watton

- That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to **Approve** planning permission subject to the conditions set out in section 10.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

13 Members voted For; 0 Members voted Against, 0 Members Abstained.

The Chair declared the motion carried and application approved.

**RESOLVED** - That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to **Approve** planning permission subject to the conditions set out in section 10.

**The Chair declared a recess at 1.14pm until 2.00pm.**

S Duggan, Committee and Member Services Officer left The Chamber.

I Owens, Committee and Member Services Officer arrived in The Chamber.

**The meeting resumed at 2.00pm.**

## **7. Correspondence**

The Chair presented Items 7.1 – 7.4 inclusive as read.

### **7.1 Dfl to Chief Executives Letter 21 Oct 25**

Copy, previously circulated was presented as read.

Correspondence re Revisions to the Regional Policy Framework for the two-tier Planning System – highlighting the importance of considering the SPPS, and any revisions to it, during plan-making and decision-taking processes.

Planning Committee NOTED the correspondence.

### **7.2 DfIPG Letter to Ms Denise Dickson CCGBC re Update - Second Homes and Short Term Lets 23.10.25**

Copy, previously circulated, presented as read.

Correspondence re update on the work of cross departmental group to finalise Terms of Reference to enable the Department for Communities to commission outreach.

Planning Committee NOTED the correspondence.

**7.3 Letter to Heads of Planning re Avian Influenza Prevention Zone - 05.11.25**

Copy, previously circulated, presented as read.

Correspondence advising of permitted development rights to permit the erection of buildings necessary for the housing of poultry and other captive birds to protect them from avian influenza.

Planning Committee NOTED the correspondence.

**7.4 Letter to councils regarding DPPNs**

Copy, previously circulated, presented as read.

Correspondence re update on review of DPPN 2, Statement of Community Involvement, DPPN3, Timetable, and DPPN5, Preferred Options Paper, which has now been updated with a copy previously circulated.

Planning Committee NOTED the correspondence.

**8. Reports for Decision**

**8.1 Advance Notice of List - BT Kiosks (x6)**

Report, previously circulated, was presented by the Development Plan Manager.

**Purpose of Report**

To present the Department for Communities (DfC) advance Notice of Listings.

**Background**

DfC wrote to the Council on 24<sup>th</sup> October 2025 (see Appendix 1 attached) seeking comment (by 5<sup>th</sup> December 2025) on the proposed listing of 6no. K6 (traditional red) telephone kiosks within the Borough under Section 80 (1) of The Planning Act (Northern Ireland) 2011.

The proposed kiosk listings are as follows:

<b>DfC Reference</b>	<b>Address of K6 Type Kiosk</b>
HB04/03/009	Main St Stranocum, Ballymoney, BT53 8PQ

HB05/01/038	Waterfoot PO, Main St, Glenariff, BT44 0QR
HB05/03/048	Torr Rd, Ballycastle, BT54 6RB
HBO5/06/009	Moycraig Rd, Dervock, Ballymoney, BT53 8EB
HB/05/06/010	Orby Drive, Liscolman, Ballymoney, BT53 8EB
HB/05/15/029	Boyles Shop, North Street, Ballycastle, BT54 6BN

The Listing Report for each kiosk is set out in Appendix 2.

### **Options**

Option 1: Agree to support the proposed listings: or

Option 2: Agree to oppose the proposed listings.

### **Recommendation**

It is recommended that the Planning Committee agree to either Option 1 or Option 2 and agree to the Head of Planning responding to DfC on behalf of the Council.

At the request of Alderman S McKillop the Development Plan Manager confirmed that only 6 of the 15 kiosks were being considered in this proposal with a further 9 being considered at a later date.

Alderman Coyle spoke of the raw materials including the cast iron and glass and at his request the Development Plan Manager confirmed that the telephony equipment was not in situ in these kiosks.

\* **Councillor McMullan joined the meeting in the Chamber at 2.08 pm**

Proposed by Alderman S McKillop

Seconded by Alderman Boyle

-To recommend that Planning Committee agree Option 1: Support the proposed listings.

12 Members voted For; 0 Members voted Against, 0 Members Abstained.

The Chair declared the motion carried.

**RESOLVED** -That Planning Committee agree Option 1: Support the proposed listings.

## **9. Reports for Noting**

### **9.1 Finance Report Period 1\_6 2025\_26**

Report, previously circulated was presented by the Head of Planning.

## **Purpose**

This Report is to provide Members with an update on the financial position of the Planning Department for the Period 1-6 of 2025/26 business year.

## **Details**

Planning is showing a variance of over £118k favourable position at end of Period 6 based on draft Management Accounts.

The favourable position at the end of Period 6 is due to favourable position in relation to income from planning application fees and property certificate income of over £70k.

This favourable position in relation to application fee and property certificate income is supported by a favourable position of over £17k in salaries and wages and a favourable position in advertisement costs of over £6k.

There are no other areas of concern at this time in relation to other expenditure codes.

## **Recommendation**

**It is recommended** that the Planning Committee considers and notes the content of this report for the Period 1-6 of 2025/26 financial year.

Planning Committee NOTED the report.

## **9.2 Quarterly LDP Update**

Report, previously circulated, was presented by the Head of Planning.

### **Purpose of Report**

To provide an update on preparation of the Council's Local Development Plan (LDP).

### **Background**

Under the Planning Act (Northern Ireland) 2011 and the Planning (Local Development Plan) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2015 the Council has a statutory duty to prepare an LDP for its Borough, that will, when adopted, replace the current Northern Area Plan (NAP) 2016.

### **Studies to inform the LDP Preparation**

Members will be aware of the work of the Council's Development Plan team that brought us to the current stage of draft Plan Strategy preparation.

### **Housing Study**

At the request of Members, the Council engaged Ulster University (UU) to carry out independent housing research on the new dwelling requirements in the Borough. An LDP Steering Group (Planning Committee) Workshop was

held on 17<sup>th</sup> November 2025 to discuss. The Study will now inform the LDP preparation.

### **Retail & Leisure Capacity Study**

The Strategic Planning Policy Statement for NI (SPPS) sets out that councils must ensure that both LDPs and planning decisions are informed by robust and up to date evidence in relation to retail need and capacity.

The Council engaged Nexus Planning to undertake Retail & Commercial Leisure Capacity Study for the Borough. The final draft has been received and is in the process of being signed off. The Study will then be presented for agreement at the Planning Committee.

### **Recommendation**

**IT IS RECOMMENDED** that the Planning Committee note the content of this Report.

Planning Committee NOTED the report.

### **10. Any Other Relevant Business (in accordance with Standing Order 12 (o))**

There were no Other Relevant Business

This being all the business the meeting closed at 2.15 pm

The Chair wished the Head of Planning well in her forthcoming planned absence.

---

Chair