



**PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD
WEDNESDAY 25 MARCH 2026**

Table of Key Adoptions

No.	Item	Summary of Decisions
1.	Apologies	<i>Alderman Boyle, S McKillop, Councillor Nicholl</i>
2.	Declarations of Interest	<i>Councillors McQuillan, Storey</i>
3.	Minutes of Previous Planning Committee Meetings	
3.1	Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting held Wednesday 25 February 2026	<i>Confirmed as a correct record</i>
4.	Order of Items and Confirmation of Registered Speakers	
4.1	LA01/2024/0977/F (Referral) Land South of 1&2 Hillcrest Cottages and Circa 30m North West of 22 Loguestown Road, Portrush	<i>Deferred</i>
4.2	LA01/2025/0631/F (Objection) Land between No.5 York Avenue and No.9 York Avenue, Portstewart	<i>Deferred for site visit</i>
4.3	LA01/2024/0702/O (Referral) 115m South East of 223 Garryduff Road, Dunloy and LA01/2024/0703/O (Referral) 56m South East of 223 Garryduff Road, Dunloy	<i>Deferred for site visit</i>
5.	Schedule of applications	
5.1	LA01/2022/1529/F (Council) Site 10m North of 34 Strand Park, Cloughmills	<i>Agree and refuse</i>
5.2	LA01/2025/1171/F (Council) The Vale Centre, Clooney Road, Vale Business Park, Greysteel	<i>Agree and approve</i>
5.3	LA01/2023/1142/F (Objection) 42 Dhu Varren, Portrush	<i>Agree and approve</i>

5.4	LA01/2024/0688/F (Objection) 8 Cedar Avenue, Ballycastle	<i>Deferred for site visit</i>
5.5	LA01/2024/0699/F (Objection) 65 & 65a Beach Road, Portballintrae	<i>Agree and Approve</i>
5.6	LA01/2024/0762/F (Objection) 26 Union Street, Coleraine	<i>Agree and Approve</i>
5.7	LA01/2024/1119/O (Referral) Land between No. 44 and 44a Ballybrakes Road, Ballymoney	<i>Deferred due to technical issues</i>
5.8	LA01/2022/0927/O (Referral) Approximately 25m South East of 219 Seacon Road, Ballymoney	<i>Deferred for consultation between Officers and Agent</i>
6.	Correspondence	
6.1	Dfl – Independent Inspectors Project & Council's Response	<i>Noted</i>
6.2	Dfl – Second Review of the Implementation of the Planning Act (NI) 2011 – Council's Response	<i>Noted</i>
6.3	NIHE – Rural Strategy – Questionnaire Response	<i>Noted</i>
6.4	NIEA – Planning Improvement	<i>Noted</i>
7.	Reports for Decision	
7.1	TPO Confirmation – Land to the rear of ASDA	<i>That Planning Committee agree Option 1: Resolve to confirm the TPO, with modifications, as detailed at paragraph 3.16 above.</i>
8.	Reports for Noting	
8.1	Finance Report Period 1 – 10 2025/26	<i>Noted</i>
9.	Any Other Relevant Business (in accordance with Standing Order 12 (o))	<i>Nil</i>

**MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING
COMMITTEE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CIVIC HEADQUARTERS AND
VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE
ON WEDNESDAY 25 MARCH 2026 AT 10.30AM**

Chair: Alderman Coyle (C) (Items 1 – 5.6) Councillor Kane (C)
(Items 5.7 - 9)

Committee Members: Alderman Hunter (R), Scott (R), Councillors Anderson
(C), C Archibald (C), Kennedy (C), McGurk (R),
McMullan (C), McQuillan (R), Storey (C), Watton (C)

Officers Present: M Quinn, Director of Corporate Services (C)
J Mills, Acting Senior Council Solicitor (R)
J Lundy, Development Management (local applications)
Manager (C)
S Mulhern, Development Plan Manager (R)
R Beringer, Senior Planning Officer (C)
E Hudson, Senior Planning Officer (C)
M McErlain, Senior Planning Officer (C)
R McGrath, Senior Planning Officer (C)
J McMath, Senior Planning Officer (R)
R Heaney, Planning Officer (R)
S McKinley, Planning Officer (R)
E Wray, Planning Assistant (R)
U Harper, Committee & Member Services Officer (R/C)
J Keen, Committee & Member Services Officer (C/R)

In Attendance: L Boyd, IT Technical Support Assistant (C/R)
C McTaggart, IT Technical Support Assistant (C/R)

Press 3 no. (R)
Public 30 no. including Speakers

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

Registered Speakers

Item No	Name
LA01/2023/1142/F	P McAdam S Caithness
LA01/2025/0699/F	S McCullough T Stokes D Burrows

LA01/2024/0762/F	A Olphert
LA01/2022/0927/O	J Martin

The Director of Corporate Services undertook a roll call.

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

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were recorded for Alderman Boyle, Alderman McKillop and Councillor Nicholl.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Declarations of interest were recorded for:

Councillor McQuillan in Item 5.1 - LA01/2022/1529/F (Council) Site 10m North of 34 Strand Park, Cloughmills. Councillor McQuillan disconnected from the meeting during consideration of this Item and did not vote.

Councillor Storey declared an interest during discussion of Item 5.8 LA01/2022/0927/O (Referral) Approximately 25m South East of 219 Seacon Road, Ballymoney. Councillor Storey left the meeting after declaring an interest in this Item and did not vote.

3. Minutes of Previous Planning Committee Meetings

3.1 Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting held Wednesday 25 February 2026

Copy, previously circulated.

Proposed by Councillor Watton

Seconded by Councillor Kennedy

– That the Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held Wednesday 25 February 2026 are signed as a correct record.

The Vice Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

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

The Vice Chair declared the motion carried.

RESOLVED - That the Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held Wednesday 25 February 2026 are signed as a correct record.

4. ORDER OF ITEMS AND CONFIRMATION OF REGISTERED SPEAKERS

4.1 LA01/2024/0977/F (Referral) Land South of 1&2 Hillcrest Cottages and Circa 30m North West of 22 Loguestown Road, Portrush

The Development Management (local applications) Manager provided the following information:

Following publication of the Planning Committee Schedule for March 2026 a further amended P1 form was received by the Planning Department 19th March 2026 which amended the description of the proposal to read “Retrospective application for retention of restoration works to ruinous wall stead including refurbishment work to roof, external walls, doors and windows. Building to be used for storage purposes for equipment/materials for maintaining the surrounding land within the building’s curtilage.”

The amended description will necessitate re-assessment of the proposal against the relevant planning policies set out within the SPPS, PPS21 and other relevant policies. Additionally, the proposal will require further re-advertisement and neighbour notification to be carried out to inform interested parties of the change to the proposal and afford the opportunity to provide comment on the revised proposal.

The recommendation is that the Committee note the contents of this Addendum and agree with the recommendation to defer the application to allow for the expiry of the statutory advertisement and neighbour notification periods and further assessment of the proposal.

Proposed by Councillor Watton

Seconded by Councillor Anderson

- That the Planning Committee note the contents of this Addendum and agree with the recommendation to defer the application to allow for the expiry of the statutory advertisement and neighbour notification periods and further assessment of the proposal.

The Vice Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

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

The Vice Chair declared the motion carried.

RESOLVED - That the Planning Committee note the contents of this Addendum and agree with the recommendation to defer the application to allow for the expiry of the statutory advertisement and neighbour notification periods and further assessment of the proposal.

4.2 LA01/2025/0631/F (Objection) Land between No.5 York Avenue and No.9 York Avenue, Portstewart

Councillor Storey requested that this Item be deferred for one month. He stated that he was aware of issues regarding people not having time to raise concerns. When clarification was sought by the Vice Chair at the relevant point later in the meeting, Councillor Storey advised that his reason for requesting a deferral was to allow a site visit to see the context of the application.

Proposed by Councillor Storey

Seconded by Councillor Watton

- That the Planning Committee defer consideration of application LA01/2025/0631/F (Objection) Land between No.5 York Avenue and No.9 York Avenue, Portstewart for one month to allow a site visit to see the context of the application.

The Vice Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

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

The Vice Chair declared the motion carried.

RESOLVED - That the Planning Committee defer consideration of application LA01/2025/0631/F (Objection) Land between No.5 York Avenue and No.9 York Avenue, Portstewart for one month to allow a site visit to see the context of the application.

At the time of clarification of the reason for the site visit later in the meeting, Alderman Hunter stated that now that the reason for the deferral is a site visit, she wanted to change her vote to For.

The Chair confirmed Alderman Hunter changing her vote from Abstain to For would be recorded.

4.3 LA01/2024/0702/O (Referral) 115m South East of 223 Garryduff Road, Dunloy and LA01/2024/0703/O (Referral) 56m South East of 223 Garryduff Road, Dunloy

Councillor Kennedy requested that these two Items be deferred to allow for a site visit, to show consistency with recent similar applications that went to judicial review and which had site visits.

Proposed by Councillor Kennedy

Seconded by Councillor Storey

- That the Planning Committee defer consideration of application LA01/2024/0702/O (Referral) 115m South East of 223 Garryduff Road,

Dunloy and application LA01/2024/0703/O (Referral) 56m South East of 223 Garryduff Road, Dunloy to allow a site visit to show consistency with recent similar applications.

The Vice Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

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

The Vice Chair declared the motion carried.

RESOLVED - That the Planning Committee defer consideration of application LA01/2024/0702/O (Referral) 115m South East of 223 Garryduff Road, Dunloy and application LA01/2024/0703/O (Referral) 56m South East of 223 Garryduff Road, Dunloy to allow a site visit to show consistency with recent similar applications.

* **Councillor McQuillan disconnected from the meeting at 10.42am.**

5. SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS

5.1 LA01/2022/1529/F (Council) Site 10m North of 34 Strand Park, Cloughmills

Report 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.

Addendum Recommendation

That the Committee note the contents of this Addendum, 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.

Addendum 2 Recommendation

That the Committee note the contents of this Addendum, 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 via PowerPoint presentation as follows:

- *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. 10m north of 34 Strand Park, Cloughmills.*
- *Site visit took place in January. Addendum to Committee report. Deferred to allow planning dept to go back to L&D to consider alternatives for site as outlined in addendum 2.*
- *(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 northern area plan (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 g 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 information 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 children's 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 zoning community social housing 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.*

Councillor Kennedy queried whether the application should be put on hold pending the outcome of the Leisure and Development Committee's consideration of the use of the land.

Senior Planning Officer, E Hudson stated that the Planning Committee referred this application to the Leisure and Development Committee in January 2026, and the Leisure and Development Committee response is provided in the addendum. The Leisure and Development Committee has stated that its process is on hold pending the outcome of the planning application.

Councillor McMullan proposed that the Planning Committee write to the Leisure and Development Committee for an answer and defer the application for a month. This was seconded by Councillor Kennedy.

Councillor Storey emphasised the need for a coordinated approach. He stated that the playpark has been problematic for a number of years and that a resolution is needed for the sake of residents. He stated that there was a public

meeting at which the lack of play facilities was raised. He asked whether the principle of building on the site would be acceptable if the OS1 issue were resolved.

Senior Planning Officer, E Hudson stated that OS1 allows for exceptions such as, for example, alternative provision by the developer. She stated that any alternative provision would need to be definite in order for it to be taken into consideration, so it would need to have planning permission already granted and be in the process of being developed.

Councillor Watton stated that the site is an eyesore and that a resolution is needed. He stated that the biodiversity park is a short walk for residents from the other side of town and that the Leisure and Development Committee need to make a suitable proposal.

The Development Management (local applications) Manager stated that the Leisure and Development process is outside the Planning process. She stated that the application was submitted in 2022 and that a decision should be made based on the Planning Policy. She stated that a future application could be considered if the circumstances were to change, such as with an alternative play space provided in Cloughmills.

Councillor McMullan queried how the situation had got to this stage given that the Council owns the site, and he asked how long the Leisure and Development process would take.

The Development Management (local applications) Manager stated that the Leisure and Development process is separate to the Planning process. She stated that the Leisure and Development process is on hold pending the outcome of the Planning application. She stated that the sale of the site is not a Planning matter.

Councillor McMullan stated that he wished to reconsider his proposal to defer the application. He proposed that the Committee accept the recommendation to refuse. He stated that an application could be considered if another open space becomes available. He requested clarification on who had made the application.

Senior Planning Officer, E Hudson stated that Council owns the land, and that the application is from a private developer.

It was decided that the meeting should go In Committee to allow the Acting Senior Council Solicitor to brief the Committee.

MOTION TO PROCEED 'IN COMMITTEE'

Proposed by Councillor Storey
Seconded by Councillor Kennedy and

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

* **Members of the Press and Public left the meeting at 11:13am**

The Acting Senior Council Solicitor briefed the Committee on the different processes involved in respect of the Planning application and the sale of the site.

Councillor Storey emphasised the need for Council to work collectively to resolve the issue.

Councillor McMullan stated that the Council's assets management policy needs to be revised. The Acting Senior Council Solicitor advised that the process for asset realisation has changed so this kind of situation should not arise again.

MOTION TO PROCEED 'IN PUBLIC'

Proposed by Councillor McMullan
Seconded by Councillor Kennedy and

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

* **The Press and Public were readmitted to the meeting at 11:39am.**

* **Alderman Callan joined the meeting remotely at 11.39am during consideration of this Item and did not vote.**

Proposed by Councillor Kennedy
Seconded by Councillor McMullan
- That Planning 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.

The Vice Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.
9 Members voted For; 0 Members voted Against, 1 Member Abstained.
The Vice Chair declared the motion carried and application refused.

RESOLVED - That Planning 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.

- * **The Vice Chair declared a recess at 11.43am.**
- * **The meeting resumed at 11.51am.**

5.2 LA01/2025/1171/F (Council) The Vale Centre, Clooney Road, Vale Business Park, Greysteel

Report and presentation were previously circulated and presented by the Development Management (local applications) Manager.

Council Application to be determined by Planning Committee

App No: LA01/2025/1171/F

App Type: Full

Proposal: Change of use from an existing open green space to an outdoor dog activity park.

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 full planning permission subject to the reasons set out in section 10.

Development Management (local applications) Manager presented via PowerPoint as follows:

- *Full Planning Permission is sought for a change of use from an existing open green space to an outdoor activity park.*
- *The site is between two sports pitches. It is located within the settlement development limit of Greysteel and is zoned as an area of major open space within the Northern Area Plan.*
- *The proposal is for 2 confined areas to provide a controlled safe and managed environment for dog exercise, socialisation and behaviour training. A 2m post and chain link fence is to be erected around the perimeter, a shipping container is to be used as an office with solar panels on the roof. Each space has an array of obstacles.*
- *An aerial shot of the Vale Enterprise Site and the redline of the site.*
- *Photo of the site.*

- *There have been no objections received and no objections from Environmental Health or DFI Roads.*
- *The proposal has bene considered acceptable and in accordance with the relevant planning policies and Policy OS 1 of PPS 8. In that the use does not results in the loss of existing open space and that it is complementary to the recreational use of land.*
- *Approval has been recommended.*

There were no questions put to the Officer.

Proposed by Councillor Anderson

Seconded by Councillor Kennedy

- That the Committee 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 full planning permission subject to the reasons set out in section 10.

The Vice Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

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

The Vice Chair declared the motion carried and application approved.

RESOLVED - That the Committee 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 full planning permission subject to the reasons set out in section 10.

5.3 LA01/2023/1142/F (Objection) 42 Dhu Varren, Portrush

Report, presentation, erratum, site visit note, speaking rights templates were previously circulated and presented by Senior Planning Officer, R Beringer.

Objection Application to be determined by Planning Committee

App No: LA01/2023/1142/F

App Type: Full

Proposal: Replacement dwelling and garage.

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 as set out in section 10.

Addendum Recommendation

It is recommended that the Committee note the contents of this Addendum and agree to Approve planning permission as per the conditions set out in section 10 of the Planning Committee report January 2026.

Addendum 2 Recommendation

It is recommended that the Committee note the contents of this Addendum and agree to Approve planning permission as per the conditions set out in section 10 of the Planning Committee report January 2026.

Erratum Recommendation

That the Committee note the contents of this Erratum and agree with the recommendation to approve the application in accordance with Paragraph 1.0 of the Planning Committee report.

Senior Planning Officer presented via PowerPoint presentation as follows:

- *LA01/2023/1142/F is a full application for a proposed replacement dwelling and garage. (at No. 42 Dhu Varren, Portrush)*
- *A Committee Report, 2 addenda, an erratum and a site visit note accompany this application.*
- *The application was previously brought to the January Planning Committee and deferred to allow for further notification. Amended plans were received and notification has been carried out. The content of further representations received has been considered in the Addenda.*
- *The application was presented to the February Planning Committee and deferred for a site visit which took place on Monday.*
- *An erratum has been prepared which amends the wording of one of the recommended conditions.*
- *At the site visit on Monday, I was asked about the number of objections that have been received. To date, there have been 15 no. in total, from 6 no. addresses.*
- *This application is a local application, being presented to the Committee as an objection item with a recommendation to approve. The objection points are set out in Section 5 of the Committee Report, and mainly relate to scale, massing, design, overshadowing, overlooking, parking,*

dominance and the proposed garage/outbuilding. These points and others have been considered within the Planning Committee Report and the accompanying Addenda.

- *(Slide 2 - SLP) The site, as outlined in red, is located within the settlement development limit for Portrush. It is not subject to any specific zonings or designations as set out in the Northern Area Plan 2016. The site is located at 42 Dhu Varren and currently comprises an existing semi-detached dwelling with detached rear garage. Access to the garage is from Blackrock Park at the rear of the property.*
- *(Slide 3 – Site Plan) The proposed site plan shows the footprint of the proposed replacement dwelling in the context of the adjacent properties and includes the proposed amenity arrangements. The proposal will be detached from the existing adjoining property at No. 40. A proposed detached garage with garden room is sited at the lower end of the existing rear garden, with access from Blackrock Road.*
- *(Slide 4) Proposed elevations of the replacement dwelling. The dwelling is designed with the appearance of a 2.5 storey dwelling to the Dhu Varren elevation, with an eaves height to match that of No. 40, and a three storey rear return to the Blackrock Road elevation. This is in keeping with the character of the surrounding area.*
- *(Slide 5) Proposed elevations and floor plans of the proposed garage. This replaces an existing detached single garage presently on the site. A garage door accesses onto Blackrock Park with parking shown for 2 cars on the ground floor. There is an artists studio/garden room above.*
- *Moving to some photographs of the site:*
- *(Slide 6) Site viewed from Dhu Varren, with the existing dwelling forming a pair of semi-detached dwellings with No. 40.*
- *(Slide 7) View of the site from the rear, on Blackrock Road. The dwelling to be replaced relative to the neighbouring properties.*
- *(Slide 8) View from within the site facing towards No. 38, with the rear of No. 40 and its associated terraces and balconies visible.*
- *(Slide 9) View from within the site facing towards No. 44.*

- *(Slide 10) View of the rear part of the site in the context of Blackrock Road and the recently constructed property.*
- *There have been no objections raised by consultees.*
- *During the processing of the application, the scheme was amended. The proposal as presented is considered acceptable. The scale, massing and design are considered acceptable on this site, and the proposal does not result in any unacceptable overlooking, overshadowing or loss of light. Appropriate boundary treatments and terrace/balcony screens are incorporated into the design to address concerns raised during processing. A condition is attached in respect of same. Adequate private amenity space and parking are provided.*
- *The proposed replacement garage is sited at the lower end of the rear garden. The scale, massing and design are considered acceptable in the context of the surrounding area. The level of accommodation provided is considered ancillary to the main dwelling and is acceptable. A condition is proposed restricting the use for ancillary purposes only.*
- *The application has been assessed in relation to the relevant policy considerations, and the proposed replacement dwelling and garage are considered acceptable. The recommendation is for approval.*

There were no questions put to the Officer.

The Vice Chair invited P McAdam to speak in objection to the application.

P McAdam stated that while he welcomed the development of No.42, the site visit will have shown the situation regarding rear gardens, as the surrounding area consists of either no garage structures or single-storey garages, meaning a two-storey structure would appear incongruous, visually disruptive and out of character. P McAdam stated that if anomalies continue to be allowed, there will be a detriment to the area. P McAdam asked the Committee to defer the application and request that the applicant redesigns the plans to have a single storey garage and to have the roof height matched with that of No.40. P McAdam stated that if these changes are made, he would be in a position to support the application.

In response to a question, P McAdam stated that his main issue is the double-storey garage.

The Vice Chair invited S Caithness to speak in support of the application.

S Caithness stated that the application was originally made in 2023 by another agent and that he has been the agent since June 2024. S Caithness stated that the scheme was then redesigned to be in keeping with the area and this design has now been recommended for approval. S Caithness stated that the application proposes to separate the semi-detached dwellings so that each will be detached. S Caithness stated that there was no issue with the consultees and that the height is relatable to the neighbour's house. S Caithness stated that the design respects the character of the area and lies within policy. S Caithness stated that the garage is 1.5 storey, with parking at ground level and the roof hipped to reduce the scale so that it aligns with others on Blackrock Road. S Caithness stated there is no impact on amenity and no loss of light and the garage will be ancillary to the main residence. S Caithness stated that there are only four objectors to the scheme currently proposed and he requested approval in line with the recommendation.

Councillor Watton queried the need for the two-storey garage. S Caithness advised that the owner wants to have space for friends and family visiting, and that the garage will sit lower than the house so the impact will be minimal.

In response to a query, S Caithness stated that the applicant is happy with the condition that the use of the garage be ancillary to the main dwelling.

In response to a query regarding the roof height, S Caithness advised that there was a quick discussion following the January Planning Committee meeting regarding the roof but no official proposal was made. S Caithness stated that the ridge height can be looked at, but the Case Officers are content with the original proposal, which aligns with the building on the other side. S Caithness stated that there is no formal arrangement to amend the ridge height.

In response to a query, Senior Planning Officer R Beringer stated that condition 2 restricts the use of the garage for uses ancillary to the main dwelling, such as artist's studio, garden room or children's play. She stated that letting it out would potentially be a change of use and this use is not in the current application.

- * **Councillor McQuillan joined the meeting remotely at 12.04pm during consideration of this Item and abstained from the vote.**

Proposed by Councillor C Archibald

Seconded by Councillor McMullan

- That the Committee agree with the recommendation to approve the application in accordance with Paragraph 1.0 of the Planning Committee report.

The Vice Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.
11 Members voted For; 0 Members voted Against, 1 Member Abstained.
The Vice Chair declared the motion carried and application approved.

RESOLVED - That the Committee agree with the recommendation to approve the application in accordance with Paragraph 1.0 of the Planning Committee report.

5.4 LA01/2024/0688/F (Objection) 8 Cedar Avenue, Ballycastle

Report, presentation, objection, speaking rights templates were previously circulated and presented by Senior Planning Officer, E Hudson.

Objection Application to be determined by Planning Committee

App No: LA01/2024/0688/F

App Type: Full

Proposal: Retrospective application for proposed replacement dwelling as built for residential purposes - (change of house type from LA01/2016/0956/F

Recommendation

That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for recommendation set out in Section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to Refuse planning permission subject to 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 for the submission of revised proposals.

Addendum 2 Recommendation

That the Committee note the contents of this Addendum and agree with the new recommendation to Approve planning permission subject to the conditions below.

Conditions

1. This planning permission has effect from the date which the development hereby approved was carried out.

Reason: As required by Section 55 of the Planning Act (Northern Ireland) 2011.

2. The widening of the existing vehicular access shall be provided in accordance with Drawing No. 02 (Rev. 06) published 6th February 2026 and

DfI Roads FCD 1 form within three months from the issue date of this planning permission.

Reason: To ensure there is a satisfactory means of access in the interests of road safety and the convenience of road users.

3. The works to increase the height of the 1st floor balcony shall be carried out within 3 months from the date of this permission

Reason: To safeguard the privacy of adjacent properties.

4. The opaque finish shall be provided to the 1st floor windows and 1st and 2nd floor balconies as indicated in drawing No 03 (Rev 03) within 3 months from the date of this permission and shall be permanently retained.

Reason: To safeguard the privacy of adjacent properties.

5. The north-western wall of the 2nd floor rear roof terrace shall be increased in height as indicated in drawing No 03 (Rev 03) within 3 months from the date of this permission and shall be permanently retained.

Reason: To safeguard the privacy of adjacent properties.

6. The existing natural screenings of the site, along the north-eastern boundary as indicated on approved drawing No. 03 (Rev 03) shall be permanently retained unless necessary to prevent danger to the public in which case a full explanation along with a scheme for compensatory planting shall be submitted to and agreed in writing with the Council, prior to removal.

Reason: To safeguard the privacy of adjacent properties.

Senior Planning Officer presented via PowerPoint presentation as follows:

- *Planning Application LA01/2024/0688/F. This is a Retrospective application for proposed replacement dwelling as built for residential purposes - (change of house type from LA01/2016/0956/F).*
- *8 Cedar Avenue, Ballycastle.*
- *The application was originally placed on the Planning Committee schedule in October 2025 as a referral item and recommended for refusal. It was deferred before the meeting at the request of the agent to allow for amended plans to be submitted. Amended plans together with a*

supporting statement and personal statement from the applicant and 53 comments of support for the development were submitted in February and re-neighbour notification carried out. Following consideration of the amendments the Planning dept are content that amendments address our concerns – this is considered in Addendum 2 of your committee report. The application is now being presented as an objection item with a recommendation to approve planning permission with conditions.

- *Verbal addendum – from registered objector at No.8 Cedar Drive and No.6 Cedar Ave. Issues in relation to neighbour notification and short notice to prepare for Planning Committee.*
- *(Slide) This is the red line boundary of the site. The site is located in the SDL of Ballycastle and within an established residential area.*
- *(Slide) Site layout drawing. There is planning history on the site which is of relevance to this application.*
- *Planning permission originally granted in 2006 for a replacement dwelling. This was renewed in 2011 and again in 2016. The building constructed on site was not built in accordance with the approved plans. A non-material change application was submitted to rectify the changes made however this was refused and subsequently this application was submitted for retrospective planning permission.*
- *This application has received 27 letters of objection from 12 separate addresses. Issues raised are outlined in part 5.3 of the Committee report. They include:*
 - *Design/scale not in keeping with area;*
 - *Overlooking into adjoining neighbours;*
 - *Concern of proposed use;*
 - *Overdevelopment;*
 - *Blocks view*
- *(Slide) These are the details of the previous granted scheme. This slide is the front and rear return. In terms of design, scale and massing the proposal is largely similar to that previously approved. The first floor balcony and second floor roof terrace were previously approved. The changes from the approved scheme and the latest submission are outlined in part 8.7 of the committee report. To summarise these include:*
 - *Ground floor additional floorspace to the rear;*
 - *First floor. Cantilevered area of side elevation increased with additional rear window. Changes to rear balcony finishes.*

- *Second floor. Floor space increased. New high level windows. Bi fold doors added to roof terrace. Glass balustrade around part of roof terrace.*
- *Overall, the scale is similar to that previously approved. The frontage and gable depth and height are the same. The amended plans appear to show that it is sited closer to the rear boundary. It would appear there is a discrepancy in the scale of the approved plans and it is likely the distance from the rear boundary would be similar.*
- *(Slide) Floor plans of current proposals. Amended plans have shown a 1.8 m screen to part of the 1st floor balcony which is adjacent to the boundary with no. 6 Cedar Ave. Previously the balcony was enclosed by a 1.2 metre rail. It is now proposed to enclose the balcony with a 1.2m glazed balustrade and the 1.8 m screen on the corner with no. 6.*
- *On the roof terrace at second floor it is proposed to fit the current glass panel with an obscure film. It is also proposed to include a solid timber parapet above the wall at the boundary adjacent to no. 10 Cedar Ave.*
- *(Slide) Elevational details of the amendments proposed. Top side elevation is the one adjacent to no. 6. The long window on the side elevation has been obscured along with the increased screen panel of 1.8 m along the side of the balcony which should help to minimise the direct overlooking at close proximity into the rear of no. 6.*
- *The rear elevation shows the privacy screen along with the rear window on the cantilevered element also obscured. The first floor roof terrace will have an opaque film applied to the glazed element along with a solid timber parapet above the side elevation facing no. 10 Cedar Ave.*
- *(Slide) Previous floor plan.*
- *(Slide) This photo is from along Cedar Ave showing the frontage. The frontage width and set back from the road is similar to the previous approval. The design is contemporary however in terms of proportions scale and massing is similar to that previously approved and does not appear out of place in the street scene. It reflects the established building line along this part of Cedar Ave.*
- *(Slide) Another view along Cedar Ave.*

- *(Slide) Close up of rear elevation showing the 1st floor balcony and second floor roof terrace.*
- *(Slide) Another rear view which also shows the overhang element. It is proposed to obscure the rear window of this.*
- *(Slide) Showing the rear elevation together with adjacent property at no.6.*
- *(Slide) View from the rear of no. 6. Our concern with the previous scheme was the direct overlooking which could be achieved from the first floor balcony and roof terrace into the rear of No.6. The amended plans provide a 1.8 m privacy screen along the side and 1m across the back. This will help to prevent the direct side on view into the rear of no. 6 and direct it more to the rear. The glazed element of the upper roof terrace will be obscured.*
- *(Slide) This window to be obscured.*
- *(Slide) Another view from the first floor balcony towards no. 6 and coastguard cottages.*
- *(Slide) And from the upper roof terrace*
- *(Slide) From the rear of no.10. Red arrow marks the roof terrace which will have an additional parapet timber panel*
- *(Slide) A view from the roof terrace. Due to the close proximity of the roof terrace to the side and rear of no. 10 concerns were raised with regards to overlooking into the rear 1st floor window of no. 10 and into their rear garden. The additional of the parapet will aid in reducing this level of direct overlooking and help to maintain privacy.*
- *(Slide) View from the rear of no.8 Cedar Drive. The first floor balcony is screened by vegetation. The roof terrace is higher up although further removed than the properties on either side. The glazed element will be obscured. There is also a commercial unit – holiday let which runs along the immediate boundary with the application site this increases the separation distance from the rear elevation to the common boundary of the residential curtilage of no. 8 Cedar Drive. An element of overlooking is expected in an urban context and the test is whether it will result in significant loss of privacy. Taking these factors into account it is not considered the level of overlooking to no. 8 would so detrimental as to warrant a refusal.*

- *(Slide) A view from the roof terrace towards the rear of no.8*
- *(Slide) Towards the front of Cedar Ave.*
- *Recommendation is to approve planning permission with conditions as outlined in Addendum 2.*

Senior Planning Officer E Hudson clarified that the neighbour notifications were carried out by email. Senior Planning Officer E Hudson advised that the plans were uploaded to the Planning Portal but the date of when they were sent did not correspond with when they were uploaded, and this is being looked into by the Planning Portal.

Councillor Watton stated that he has experienced issues with the postal service delivering letters late, and he expressed concern that some objectors may not have had adequate time to prepare. He proposed deferring the application for a month.

Senior Planning Officer E Hudson advised that although notification letters are originally sent via post, if an objection is received by email then subsequent correspondence will be sent by email. Senior Planning Officer E Hudson stated that the statutory requirement for notification was met.

Councillor Watton proposed that the application be deferred to allow a site visit to see the context of the application. Councillor McMullan stated that a site meeting would be for the best.

Proposed by Councillor Watton

Seconded by Councillor McMullan

- That the Committee defer consideration of application LA01/2024/0688/F to allow for a site visit to see the context of the application.

The Vice Chair put the motion to the vote

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

The Vice Chair declared the application deferred.

RESOLVED - That Planning Committee defer consideration of application LA01/2024/0688/F to allow for a site visit to see the context of the application.

The Vice Chair declared a recess for lunch at 12:46pm

Committee and Member Services Officer, U Harper left the Chamber at 12:46pm.

The meeting resumed at 1:38pm

Committee and Member Services Officer, J Keen joined the Chamber at 1:38pm

The Director of Corporate Services undertook a roll call.

- * **Councillor Kane joined the meeting, in the Chamber, at 1:55pm, during consideration of the following item.**
- * **Councillor Storey joined the meeting, in the Chamber, at 2:01pm, during consideration of the following item.**
- * **Councillor McMullan joined the meeting, in the Chamber, at 2:01pm, during consideration of the following item.**

5.5 LA01/2024/0699/F (Objection) 65 & 65a Beach Road, Portballintrae

Report, presentation, addendum, erratum, objection, speaking rights templates were previously circulated and presented by Senior Planning Officer, R Beringer.

Objection Application to be determined by Planning Committee

App No: LA01/2024/0699/F

App Type: Full

Proposal: Demolition and erection of 4 no apartments, improvements to existing access and new site access, parking provision, and all ancillary works including 4 no. storage sheds and bin store.

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 as set out in section 10.

Addendum Recommendation

That the Committee note the contents of this Addendum and agree with the recommendation to approve planning permission as set out in paragraph 9.1 of the Planning Committee Report.

Erratum Recommendation

That the Committee note the contents of this Erratum and agree with the recommendation to approve the application in accordance with Paragraph 1.0 of the Planning Committee report.

Senior Planning Officer presented via PowerPoint presentation as follows:

- *LA01/2024/0699/F is a full application for the demolition and erection of 4 no apartments, improvements to existing access and new site access, parking provision and all ancillary works including bin store.*
- *A Committee Report, an addendum and an erratum accompany this application.*
- *This application is a local application being presented to the Committee as an objection item with a recommendation to approve. To date there have been 13 objections to the proposal from 9 separate addresses. The objection points are set out in Section 5 of the Committee Report (and mainly relate to the visual impact, scale/massing/design, overshadowing, overlooking, and parking and access arrangements). These points and others have been considered within the Planning Committee Report and Addendum.*
- *(Slide 2 - SLP) The site, as outlined in red, is located within the settlement development limit for Portballintrae, and within the Causeway Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The site is adjacent to the Bay Local Landscape Policy Area as identified in the Northern Area Plan 2016. The site is located at 65 & 65a Beach Road and currently comprises an existing semi-detached dwelling with informal yard and amenity space to the rear.*
- *(Slide 3 – Site Layout) The proposed site layout shows the footprint of the proposed apartments, with the new access to the side (shown in yellow), and parking for 3 cars. Amenity space and bin storage is also provided. A further parking space is provided to the front, for the ground floor apartment noted as Apt. 2.*
- *(Slide 4) These are proposed elevations of the front and rear, and sections through the site. There are 4no. apartments proposed for the development. One ground floor apartment, one duplex apartment over ground and first floor, one first floor and one second floor.*
- *(Slide 5) These are further elevations showing the side elevations facing both the attached property at No. 63 and the adjacent property at No. 67. and a section of the amenity area facing the rear of the proposed apartments.*

- *(Slide 6) This slide shows the existing and proposed elevations to the Beach Road elevation. The ridge height of the proposed development matches that of the attached property at No. 63 Beach Road. Similarly, the eaves height also aligns with that of the attached neighbouring property.*
- *(Slide 7) Here we have existing and proposed streetscape elevations of the application site. The top streetscape is the existing arrangement, and the bottom the proposed.*
- *Moving to some photographs of the site:*
- *(Slide 8) View of the site from Beach Road, in the context of the adjacent and adjoining properties, nos. 67 & 63 respectively.*
- *(Slide 9) View of the rear of the site and the neighbouring properties from Atlantic View.*
- *(Slide 10) View from within the rear of the application site of the existing dwelling and the neighbouring properties.*
- *(Slide 11) View of the existing informal yard area at the rear of the application site, looking towards No. 67 and No.73a Beach Road.*
- *(Slide 12) View of the existing site access arrangement.*
- *(Slide 13) View along Beach Road, looking towards the Car Park at Beach Road.*
- *The proposal is for the replacement of the existing dwelling with 4 no. apartments. The scheme has been amended during the processing of the application to address concerns raised by the Planning Department. The scheme originally included 4 no. storage sheds to the rear of the site, however these were removed during processing to address concerns in relation to the quality of the proposed communal amenity space.*
- *The design of the proposal as presented is considered to be in keeping with the character of the area and sympathetic in appearance to both adjacent, adjoining and surrounding properties. Objections raised the visual impact in relation to the streetscape and specifically the squared front projection. The squared front projection is visually similar in appearance to the squared bays of the attached property at No. 63. Balconies to seaward elevations are a feature within the immediate surrounding area. The front projection provides a balcony design featuring louvres which prevents any overlooking*

to neighbouring properties either side of the proposal. Privacy screens and walls to the rear balconies and terraces will prevent any unacceptable overlooking to neighbouring properties at the rear. Recommended conditions are provided in relation to louvres and screens.

- To the rear of the proposal development comprises a 3 storey rear return which drops down to 2 storeys. It is assessed that this can be provided without undue impact to surrounding visual or residential amenity. The scale and massing are considered acceptable given the existing arrangement of the rear returns on neighbouring sites and the orientation of the sites, with the rears facing south. It is considered that the proposal will not result in any unacceptable overshadowing to neighbouring properties.*
- Proposed materials and finishes are considered acceptable. Adequate communal and private amenity space is provided for all 4 apartments. The ground floor apartment to the front, Apartment 2, has an enclosed area to the front which provides amenity and in curtilage parking. Further incurtilage parking for 3 cars is provided to the rear of the site. Objections raised the issue of parking, and the proposed access arrangements at the front of the site. Consultation was carried out with DfI Roads as the competent authority and they have no objection to the proposed access arrangements. Based on the parking standards the proposal would have a shortfall, however consideration has been given to the existing arrangements on the site which serve the existing large dwelling. The proposal, which provides 4 in curtilage spaces, including a space to the front, is considered acceptable and an improvement over the existing arrangement on the site.*
- With the exception of NI Water, there have been no objections raised by Consultees. Objectors had raised the issue of foul sewage and the impact of the load on the sewer system. NI Water have recommended refusal subject to the applicant engaging with NI Water. Negative conditions are recommended to address this to ensure that an adequate means of sewage disposal is provided and to ensure protection of the aquatic environment.*
- The application has been assessed in relation to the relevant policy considerations, and the proposal is considered acceptable. The recommendation is for approval.*

In response to questions the Senior Planning Officer stated that there is one parking space at the front of the apartments and that the lane is to be widened to allow access to parking to the rear, this is part of the planning application.

The Vice Chair invited S McCullough to speak in objection to the application.

S McCullough stated that his speaking notes provide extensive details in objection to the application so he would provide a summary. S McCullough stated that he was speaking on behalf of himself and 3 of the neighbours. S McCullough stated that the objection focuses on 3 main aspects of the proposal – visual impact on the street scape, rear return and carparking and traffic flow. In relation to the visual impact and street scape S McCullough stated that the front extension does not mimic the scale, form and proportions of the neighbouring buildings. S McCullough stated that he believed the elevation was closer to 1 metre at the front. S McCullough stated that there is nothing of this size in Portballintrae and that comparisons should not be made to Portstewart as this is a different area. He further stated that light onto no 67 will be restricted due to massing, overshadowing and overdominance, that this property is currently open on 3 sides but will be closed off on 2 sides as a result of this proposal.

The Vice Chair advised S McCullough he had reached his 5 minute limit for speaking.

In response to questions about problems with parking S McCullough stated that there is currently space for parking at the rear and that this proposal sets out 3 parking spaces at the rear and 1 at the front. S McCullough stated that the Planning Department had previously stated that 3 apartments on this site would be better but have been convinced that 4 apartments can be accommodated. S McCullough stated there will be visual impact on the street scape and traffic flow will be disrupted. S McCullough stated that the space at the front where vehicles can drive in and out does not happen anywhere else on the street.

In response to further questions S McCullough stated that there are 3 parking spaces at the back for No 63.

In response to Councillor McGurk who queried the parking at the front of No 71 S McCullough stated that this end of the road leads into the car park and the road widens at these properties, this is part of the public road and not part of the owners property.

The Vice Chair invited T Stokes and D Burrows to speak in support of the application.

T Stokes stated

At the outset, I would like to emphasise that this is a modest, well-considered development that has been carefully designed in response to both the site context and relevant planning policy. Importantly, all technical matters raised

through consultation, including those highlighted in neighbour objections, have been thoroughly assessed by statutory consultees and your planning officers and found to be acceptable.

We acknowledge local concerns which we have carefully evaluated and considered throughout the processing of this planning application and have made changes throughout. I will briefly address the key issues raised.

In terms of scale, mass and design, the proposed building has been designed to sit comfortably within the established character of Beach Road. Its height, footprint, and overall massing are comparable to surrounding development and do not appear excessive or overbearing within the street scene.

The design of the proposal adopts a contemporary but respectful architectural approach, which closely aligns with the key design features associated with the attached apartment block No. 63, which in turn would provide a more balanced design between both properties.

Materials, proportions, and detailing, including the provision of sea-front balconies have been selected to remain consistent with the local vernacular and design characteristics expressed by a number of properties along Beach Road.

Concerns have been raised to reduce the number of apartments proposed as part of the application. The proposed apartments all exceed minimum space standards, each served by individual private amenity and a communal area, providing in excess of 40spm of amenity space per apartment, as such the application site is capable of absorbing the scheme as proposed and is not representative of the typical characteristics of overdevelopment.

The privacy and amenity of neighbouring properties has been a key consideration throughout the design process. Window placement associated with habitable rooms have been carefully arranged to prevent directly opposing views avoid unacceptable overlooking or loss of privacy. All raised terraces and balconies where applicable are defined by screens to ensure amenity of No. 67 and No. 63.

The windows to the rear of No. 63 have also been a key consideration to ensure that the proposed rear return does not create overshadowing to habitable rooms. As covered by the detailed planning officer report, any overshadowing to No. 63 would be limited to windows serving non-habitable rooms and the degree of impact is not considered significant.

The existing 11 bed property is not currently served by formal parking provision, which is largely accommodated on-street. The proposal includes the provision for 4 no. formalised car parking spaces within the curtilage of the site and as such is

a betterment on the existing arrangement. Modern cars cannot access the existing laneway.

The proposal delivers four new residential units in a sustainable location, making efficient use of land while adhering to policy requirements. There are no technical objections from consultees, and it has been concluded that the development is acceptable against all material planning considerations.

In summary, we would like to thank your officers who have diligently processed this application, and we would respectfully ask members to endorse their officer's recommendation to approve this scheme.

Also just to add, multiple properties on Beach Road have frontal parking.

Thank you for your time, David and myself are happy to answer any questions you may have.

There were no questions put to the speaker.

There were no further questions put to the Officer.

Proposed by Councillor McGurk

Seconded by Councillor C Archibald

- 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 as set out in section 10.

The Vice Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

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

The Vice 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 as set out in section 10.

* **Alderman Coyle vacated the Chair at 2:11pm.**

* **Councillor Kane assumed the Chair at 2:11pm.**

The Chair requested that apologies for Alderman S McKillop are recorded.

5.6 LA01/2024/0762/F (Objection) 26 Union Street, Coleraine

Report, presentation, addendum, erratum, speaking rights template were previously circulated and presented by Development Management (local applications) Manager.

Objection Application to be determined by Planning Committee

App No: LA01/2024/0762/F

App Type: Full

Proposal: Change of use from dwelling to House in Multiple Occupancy (HMO) including single storey rear extension.

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.

Addendum Recommendation

That the Committee note the contents of this Addendum, 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 as set out in section 10.

Erratum Recommendation

That the Committee note the contents of this Erratum and agree with the recommendation to approve the application in accordance with Paragraph 1.1 of the Planning Committee report.

Development Management (local applications) Manager presented via powerpoint presentation as follows:

- *Committee report accompanied by addendum and erratum*
- *The application seeks full planning permission for the change of use from a dwelling to a House in Multiple Occupancy including a single storey rear extension*
- *The site is located with the settlement development limit of Coleraine as provided for by the Northern Area Plan.*
- *The property is a two and a half storey mid terrace residential dwelling that forms part of the existing terrace.*

- *The property has a small paved stoned amenity space to the front providing pedestrian access onto Union Street. Immediately to the rear of the property is a small paved yard space which is currently used for bin storage and a second area of amenity space is located to the rear but separated from the property by a rear laneway.*
- *The northern side of union street is primarily residential and the southern side is mixed use comprising the Northern Regional College, community hall, car wash, residential and a car repair garage. The site is in close proximity to the train and bus station.*
- *The proposed change of use is from a 5 bedroom dwelling to a 7 bedroom House in Multiple Occupancy with small rear extension.*
- *The House in Multiple Occupancy comprises 1 open planned kitchen/dining/living space with utility room and 7 bedrooms all ensuite. The extension measures 2.7 x 2.2m and squares off the existing ground floor footprint.*
- *The relevant policy context is RDS, SPPS, NAP and PPS7A the proposal is considered to comply with policy in particular policy HOU4 of the Northern Area Plan*
- *The premises is suitable to accommodate the proposed number of occupants. The proposal comprises an open plan kitchen/dining/living room and provides 7 ensuite bedrooms all of which has been measured and evaluated under the House in Multiple Occupancy guidance standards and exceed the thresholds.*
- *The change of use will not result in an adverse impact on amenity of neighbouring properties and character of area in that the property remains in residential use and it would not be unusual for a large family to reside in such a property. Environmental Health and House in Multiple Occupancy unit have not raised any objection.*
- *External spaces are of a safe and secure design. The proposal facilitates a secure rear yard immediately adjacent to the property which accommodates both bins and bike stands (17.9 sq m). Two parking spaces are provided in the secondary area of amenity space across the lane in addition to a further 50 sq m of private amenity space. The amenity space provided is easily accessible and of a quality and quantity which is compliant with standards and the character of the area.*

- *The proposal will not result in adverse traffic impact or detract from the amenity of local residents. There are no parking standards for HMOs. The existing property does not currently have any in curtilage parking provision however the applicant proposes 2 parking spaces within the second rear yard consistent with other adjacent properties. A parking survey was submitted during the processing of the application and showed that on street available spaces were often twice that required to accommodate the intended number of occupants. It is important to note that shops and services are within walking distance, the Northern Regional College has a dedicated car parking and the bus and train stations are within walking distance. DFI Roads were consulted three times during the processing of the application and have not raised any objection. It is considered that there is sufficient capacity in the area to accommodate any additional demand generated by the proposal.*
- *No changes to landscaping are proposed.*
- *The proposal complies with policy HOU4 of NAP and policy AMP3 of PPS3.*
- *The proposed extension measures 2.7m x 2.2m and squares off the existing ground floor footprint. The extension complies with policy ext1 of PPS7A.*
- *To date 21 letters of objection have been received in relation to the proposal. The objections were from 15 different addresses. Objections were received from:*
 - *Three (4) neighbouring properties.*
 - *Six (6) other properties in Coleraine.*
 - *One (1) property in Portstewart.*
 - *One (1) property in Ahoghill.*
 - *One (1) property in Crumlin.*
 - *Two (2) properties in Belfast.*
- *The representations have been considered in detail in the Planning Committee Report and Addendum*
- *Having considered all material considerations, the proposed change of use to a House in Multiple Occupancy will not unacceptably affect amenity, environment or character of Union Street. Approval is recommended.*

In response to questions Development Management (local applications) Manager confirmed that the carpark for the Northern Regional College is not for public use; that this is car park takes away from the need for on street parking.

The Development Management (local applications) Manager confirmed the car parking survey was completed by the Agent and that car parking surveys are normally completed outside of the working day to reflect residential use.

In response to further questions the Development Management (local applications) Manager stated that No 54 Union Street currently has an application for a House in Multiple Occupancy and that no other properties currently have a licence for a House in Multiple Occupancy.

The Chair invited A Olphert to speak in support of the application.

A Olphert stated

Good afternoon, Councillors, and thank you for the opportunity to speak today.

This statement addresses the key material considerations, including the condition of the existing property, the proposed use, and the wider housing context.

The existing property is currently in a poor condition and has not been fully utilised. Without meaningful investment and refurbishment, it would remain underutilised and continue to detract from the surrounding area. This proposal represents an opportunity to bring the property back into active and beneficial residential use.

The proposal involves the conversion of the existing 5 bed dwelling into a 7-bed / 7-person HMO, providing high-quality, professionally managed accommodation within a sustainable town centre location. The increase from a smaller dwelling to a 7-person HMO has been carefully considered and is fully supported by the internal layout, which meets all required space standards and amenity provisions. The level of accommodation proposed is appropriate to the size and configuration of the building and does not result in overdevelopment.

The site benefits from close proximity to key local institutions, including Causeway Hospital, the Northern Regional College, and the University of Ulster Coleraine campus. These facilities generate consistent demand for well-located rental accommodation from students, staff, and associated workers.

A parking survey was submitted as part of the application, which demonstrates that there is adequate on-street parking available in the vicinity of the site, in line with Roads Service requirements.

Importantly, DfI Roads have reviewed the proposal and offer no objection, confirming that the development will not give rise to unacceptable impacts on the local road network or parking provision.

Given this highly accessible location, future occupants are likely to have reduced reliance on private vehicles, with easy access to local services, employment opportunities, and public transport. As such, the proposal will not result in unacceptable impacts on traffic, parking, or residential amenity.

There is well-established pressure on the local housing market, particularly for good-quality rental accommodation.

Properly managed and licensed HMOs form an important part of the housing mix and help meet this demand in a controlled and policy-compliant manner. This proposal will make efficient use of an existing building and provide accommodation for seven individuals within a single property.

Without this type of provision, demand would be displaced elsewhere, placing additional pressure on the wider housing supply.

It is also important to acknowledge concerns that have been raised more generally, including on social media, in relation to HMOs and wider issues such as illegal or unregulated occupation. However, these concerns are typically associated with unauthorised or unlicensed HMOs operating outside the regulatory system, rather than properly approved and licensed properties. This proposal represents a fully policy-compliant and regulated form of development, which will be subject to both planning control and HMO licensing requirements. As such, it should be clearly distinguished from the types of issues often referenced in those discussions.

This application should therefore be assessed on its own merits and in the context of its full compliance with the relevant planning and licensing framework.

In conclusion, this proposal represents the sustainable reuse of an existing property, delivering clear housing benefits while complying with relevant planning policy. It will bring an underutilised building back into productive use and provide high-quality, managed accommodation in a highly accessible and suitable location.

For these reasons, I respectfully ask that you support the officer's recommendation.

Thank you for your time, and I welcome any questions.

In response to questions A Olphert stated that it is a requirement for the car parking surveys to be completed outside of business hours for residential parking, that the Department for Infrastructure (Roads) have been consulted on several occasions and have not raised any concerns. A Olphert stated that it is

envisaged that the occupants will most likely be students and it is anticipated that they will not have cars.

In response to questions the Development Management (local applications) Manager advised that the safety and security concerns raised were in relation to high turnover rates, the movement of people, Union Street being an area of commercial and residential premises, overcrowding, waste management and maintenance. The Development Management (local applications) Manager advised that Houses in Multiple Occupancy are strictly regulated by the Environmental Health Department. The Development Management (local applications) Manager stated that there are no car parking spaces currently allocated but this proposal provides 2 additional spaces.

Councillor Anderson expressed concern that the Department for Infrastructure follow rigid guidelines for the working day being 9 – 5 as working patterns have evolved to include working from home, night shift and flexi hours.

The Chair stated these concerns can be raised with the Department for Infrastructure.

In response to further questions the Development Management (local applications) Manager stated that objections can be raised from a wide variety of locations depending on the application and that all objections are considered regardless of where they have come from. The Development Management (local applications) Manager confirmed that 3 of the 21 objections came from neighbours.

Proposed by Alderman Coyle

Seconded by Councillor Kennedy

- 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.

9 Members voted For; 3 Members voted Against, 1 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.

* **Councillor C Archibald left the meeting at 2:45pm.**

5.7 LA01/2024/1119/O (Referral) Land between No. 44 and 44a Ballybrakes Road, Ballymoney

Councillor Storey advised that he was unable to see the Planning Committee report on the website. Alderman Callan also stated that he couldn't see it.

Proposed by Alderman Coyle

Seconded by Councillor Kennedy

- That Planning Committee defer application LA01/2024/1119/O for 1 month to resolve a technical issue.

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 application LA01/2024/1119/O for 1 month to resolve a technical issue.

5.8 LA01/2022/0927/O (Referral) Approximately 25m South East of 219 Seacon Road, Ballymoney

Report, presentation and speaking rights template were previously circulated and presented by Senior Planning Officer, R McGrath.

Referral Application to be determined by Planning Committee

App No: LA01/2022/0927/O

App Type: Outline

Proposal: Proposed dwelling keeping within the neighbouring ridge height.

Recommendation

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

Senior Planning Officer presented via PowerPoint presentation as follows:-

- *(Slide 2) Item 5.12 is an application for outline planning permission for a dwelling adjacent to 219 Seacon Road Ballymoney.*
- *The application was referred to Planning committee following a recommendation to refuse.*

- *The site is located within the settlement limit of Ballymoney as identified within the Northern Area Plan (NAP) 2016. The area is predominantly residential and as you can see from the location plan, the pattern of development is low density with mainly detached houses on fairly generous plots.*
- *The application site occupies a prominent corner plot at the junction of the Seacon Road and Newbridge Road. This gives the site its triangular form as it is constrained to both sides by the converging roads.*
- *The location plan shows the site outlined in red, with the adjacent property at 219 outlined in blue, indicating it is within the applicant's ownership.*
- *219 Seacon Road currently operates as a children's daycare facility, having previously been a dwelling, until a change of use application in 2002. D/2002/06668/F.*
- *(Slide 3) The next slide shows an aerial view of the site with the red line superimposed. Members will note the extensive tree coverage of the site, with mature trees to the north, south and eastern boundaries.*
- *You can also see the extent of tree coverage in the surrounding area. Whilst the site itself is not covered by any specific designations, the land to the immediate south is within the Leslie Hill Historic Park and Garden and the Leslie Hill Local Landscape Policy Area.*
- *(Slide 4) The application is for a single dwelling within the side amenity area of 219. This slide shows an indicative block plan submitted in support of the application. The plan shows a linear dwelling with a small parking/turning area to the front, and amenity area to the side, and it indicates that boundary vegetation is to be retained.*
- *Officers raised initial concerns and queried if retention of the trees was physically possible given the proximity of the proposed dwelling to the trees.*
- *(Slide 5) If we have a look at some of the photographs of the site, you can see the site outlined in red with the mature trees which define the boundary. The trees to the left define the boundary onto Leslie Hill estate. You can see how the area is characterised by the mature trees which line the road and enhance the environmental quality of the area. This picture is taken from GSV from last September.*

- *(Slide 6) This shows the trees out of leaf when viewed from Newbridge Road.*
- *(Slide 7) Again, this shows the site in the opposite direction from Newbridge Road, you can see the nursery building through the trees to the left.*
- *(Slide 8) This shows the site frontage onto Seacon Road looking towards the junction with Newbridge Road.*
- *(Slide 9) Again, this shows the site in the opposite direction from Seacon Road, you can see the nurse and the entrance to the right.*
- *(Slide 10) These two show into the site from the Seacon Road side.*
- *(Slide 11) Following initial concerns about the proposed block plan, a tree survey of the site was undertaken which confirmed that 10 trees in total would need to be removed. This slide shows the tree survey plan, which reflects the crown spread of the trees. I've highlighted the trees which are to be removed in red.*
- *The application is assessed against policy QD1 of PPS7 and Policy ENV3 of the NAP 2016.*
- *Policy QD1 states that planning permission will only be granted for new residential development where the design and layout draws upon the positive aspects of the character and appearance of the surrounding area; and will not be permitted where they would result in unacceptable damage to the local character & environmental quality of the area. In addition, the development must conform to a range of criteria.*
- *Criterion a of QD1 requires the development to respect the surrounding context and be appropriate to the character and topography of the site in terms of layout, scale, proportions, massing and appearance of buildings, structures and landscaped and hard surfaced areas.*
- *Criterion b requires landscape features to be identified and, where appropriate, protected and integrated in a suitable manner into the overall design and layout of the development.*
- *Policy ENV 3 of the NAP states that development that would result in the loss of trees, hedges or other features that contribute to the character of the landscape or are of nature.*

- *Conservation value, will not be permitted unless provision is made for appropriate replacement planting and the creation of new features.*
- *When considered in the context of planning policy, the extensive loss of trees to both the southern and northern boundaries of the site would significantly alter the character and environmental quality of the area.*
- *The site is so constrained that it is not possible to retain the trees. This would result in the formation of a conspicuous gap within the tree line.*
- *The impact on the character and environmental quality of the area would be compounded by the contrived introduction of a dwelling within the gap. The siting of the dwelling so close to the roadside boundary on both Seacon and Newbridge Road would be incongruous and completely at odds with the leafy suburban character of the area. The constrained nature of the development would also mean that appropriate replacement planting is not possible.*
- *Tree groups in urban areas are not just important for visual amenity purposes but also have nature conservation value. They provide important habitat for a range of species and linear groups such as this, provide important wildlife corridors which are crucial for biodiversity by connecting fragmented habitats, allowing species to move safely and as such are protected under planning policy.*
- *Therefore, the proposal is contrary to Policy ENV 3 of NAP, and Policy QD 1, criteria 'a' and 'b', of PPS 7.*
- *Refusal is recommended.*

In response to questions the Senior Planning Officer stated that the Agent believes there will be 60% of the trees remaining if the proposed trees are removed to accommodate the development. The Senior Planning Officer stated that the policy does not make provision for the removal of trees. The Senior Planning Officer referred to a picture included in the power point presentation to show that the trees are a very well defined character of the area and that this is a significant grouping of trees that also provide an attractive entrance and exit to the area. The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that 10 trees will be removed – 3 removed for safety reasons and 7 removed for the development of the site. In response to further questions the Senior Planning Officer advised that the 3 trees to be removed for safety reasons would not need to be removed if the development did not proceed, that they could be heavily pruned and worked with.

In response to further questions the Senior Planning Officer advised that removing a tree here or there is not an issue but this is a significant belt of trees that is to be removed, that the gap will be evident and will draw attention to the new development. The Senior Planning Officer advised that the distance from the boundary to the dwelling is 2.5m and this is not enough distance to allow for a smaller tree scape to be considered as there needs to be enough space to allow for the ground spread of roots so they do not cause issues to the structure of the dwelling and to ensure there is no issues with lighting.

The Senior Planning Officer advised that there does not need to be a Tree Preservation Order in place that the policy is enough to protect trees.

In response to questions about trees being removed before work begins the Senior Planning Officer advised this would be a matter for the PSNI as an environmental crime.

In response to questions the Senior Planning Officer used a picture within the Power Point presentation to confirm the location of Lesleyhill. The Senior Planning Officer advised that these trees stand at 20m in height and are a significant landscape feature, that the policy is to protect the trees and that the impact of removing the trees is significant in this instance.

The Chair invited J Martin to speak in support of the application.

J Martin stated some vegetation will remain on the site, 3 trees will need to be removed due to being near the road and due to their size and that additional planting can be a condition of the planning application at the reserved matters stage. J Martin stated that it is almost 5 metres from the dwelling to the boundary and most vegetation is at the top end of the site. J Martin cited criteria B referring to the significance of the trees on the site and stated that the majority of trees will be retained and the character of the area will be respected as will the surrounding character and topography. J Martin stated that "shoehorned" by definition is that something is too big but this proposal is similar to the established site. J Martin stated that a planning application at 215 Seacon Road had been approved. J Martin stated that the existing pattern of development is being respected with this application.

Councillor Storey declared an interest at this point because reference had been made to his property.

* **Having declared an interest Councillor Storey left the meeting at 3:12pm.**

In response to questions J Martin stated that a tree survey and ground spread had predicted the root area of the trees. J Martin stated that 3 trees are dying, there is evidence of dead wood. J Martin stated that additional planting can be used, that there can be appropriate trees planted that stop at the foundation of the dwelling. J Martin stated that Geotech membrane along the root area can protect the roots and this will be used. J Martin stated that 6 trees at the back of the site and 2 trees at the front need to be removed and that at reserved matters stage an innovative design can be used to maintain the trees.

In response to questions regarding having had a conversation with the Planning Department J Martin stated that the Planning Department were always against this application and don't like the trees on the Newbridge Road being removed.

In response to comments from the Agent the Senior Planning Officer provided clarity on the timeline of the planning application. The Senior Planning Officer advised that the Planning Department queried the space on the site and requested a tree survey which confirmed that 10 trees need to be removed, this confirmed concerns raised by the Planning Department and refusal is recommended.

In response to question the Senior Planning Officer advised the space allocated for 2 cars to park on site is to allow for space to turn.

The Chair expressed frustration that it appears that there has not been the required discussions between the Planning Department and the Agent before this application was brought to the Planning Committee for consideration and how this has happened on previous occasions.

Alderman Callan and Councillor Anderson concurred with the sentiments expressed by the Chair.

In response to the comments the Senior Planning Officer advised that the Planning Officers had met with the Agent, that there is a presumption of development particularly in an urban area. The recommendation for refusal is due to the root spread needing a buffer, the need for a modest footprint of development and the development assets of the site need protected.

The Chair appealed to the Officers and Agents to seek resolutions to reduce the number of applications coming to the Planning Committee and stated that applications are considered based on policy.

Alderman Callan echoed the comments of the Chair and further stated that the way the Planning Department engages with Agents needs revisited, and that better engagement and discussions leads to better decisions.

Proposed by Alderman Callan
Seconded by Councillor Anderson

- That Planning Committee defer application LA01/2022/0927/O for 1 month to allow for a meeting between Planning Officers and the Agent to consider a resolution and the application returns to the Planning Committee if no resolution is found.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.
11 Members voted For; 0 Members voted Against, 0 Members Abstained.
The Chair declared the motion carried and application deferred.

RESOLVED - That Planning Committee defer application LA01/2022/0927/O for 1 month to allow for a meeting between Planning Officers and the Agent to consider a resolution and the application returns to the Planning Committee if no resolution is found.

The Chair declared a recess at 3:36pm

The meeting reconvened at 3:46pm

The Director of Corporate Services undertook a roll call.

6. CORRESPONDENCE

The Chair presented Items 6.1 – 6.4 inclusive as read.

6.1 DfI – Independent Inspectors Project & Council’s Response

Copy, previously circulated was presented as read.

Correspondence re: Independent Inspectors – Update and Officer Engagement with Councils

In response to questions regarding Elected Members having opportunity to engage with this project the Development Plan Manager advised that she would provide an update on the outworking of this project once they have been received by the Planning Department.

Planning Committee NOTED the correspondence.

6.2 DfI – Second Review of the Implementation of the Planning Act (NI) 2011 – Council’s Response

Copy, previously circulated, presented as read.

Correspondence re: Second Review of the Implementation of the Planning Act (NI) 2011.

Planning Committee NOTED the correspondence.

6.3 NIHE – Rural Strategy – Questionnaire Response

Copy, previously circulated, presented as read.

Correspondence re: NIHE – Rural Strategy – Questionnaire Response

Planning Committee NOTED the correspondence.

6.4 NIEA – Planning Improvement

Copy, previously circulated, presented as read.

Correspondence re: NIEA Planning Improvement Plan and Initial Steps to Provide an Update on Consultation Timeframes

Planning Committee NOTED the correspondence.

7. REPORTS FOR DECISION

7.1 TPO Confirmation – Land to the rear of ASDA

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

Purpose of Report

To present the TPO confirmation with modification for Lands to the rear of ASDA, Ring Road, Coleraine.

Following a review of the existing TPO on the site, a Provisional TPO was served on site, documentation was posted to interested parties and adjoining neighbours, and copies of the Order were attached to protected trees in obvious locations within the site - on 22nd January 2026.

No representations were received within the 28-day statutory period.

A total of 31no. individual trees and 9no. tree groups of trees were surveyed, of which 10no. trees and 2no. tree groups are considered worthy or suitable for TPO protection.

Options

Option 1: Resolve to confirm the TPO, with modifications, as detailed at paragraph 3.16 above.

Option 2: Resolve not to confirm the TPO.

Recommendation

It Is Recommended that Members agree to either Option 1 or 2 above.

Proposed by Councillor McMullan

Seconded by Alderman Coyle

- That Planning Committee agree Option 1: Resolve to confirm the TPO, with modifications, as detailed at paragraph 3.16 above.

The Chair put the motion to the vote

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

The Chair declared the motion carried.

RESOLVED - That Planning Committee agree Option 1: Resolve to confirm the TPO, with modifications, as detailed at paragraph 3.16 above.

In response to questions the Development Plan Manager advised that the other trees can remain on site and do not require approval to be cut down.

8. REPORTS FOR NOTING

8.1 Finance Report Period 1 – 10 2025/26

Report, previously circulated was presented as read by the Chair.

Purpose of Report

This Report is to provide Members with an update on the financial position of the Planning Department for the Period 1-10 of 2025/26 business year.

Details

Planning is showing a variance of over £442k favourable position at end of Period 10 based on draft Management Accounts.

The favourable position at the end of Period 10 is due to a favourable position in relation to income from planning application fee and property certificate income of around £345K.

This favourable position is supported by a favourable position of around £10K in salaries and wages and a favourable position in advertisement costs of around £12K Programme Management Costs £15k, Development Plan £11k and Other Professional Costs £11k.

There are no 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 1-10 of 2025/26 financial year.

Alderman Callan requested a breakdown on the income generated through the Planning Department to better understand what is coming into the system.

The Development Management (local applications) Manager stated that there is a requirement to publish the statistics provided by the Department of Infrastructure.

Alderman Callan requested that the information be provided to Elected Members and stated it did not have to be made public.

The Chair advised that Planning Officers would look into it for the next meeting.

In response to Councillor McMullan the Director of Corporate Services stated that there is a new Estates strategy in place and that a Strategic Assets Manager has been appointed. The Director of Corporate Services advised that the Senior Management Team have greater oversight of assets and that assets are now managed by the Land and Property section within Council.

9. Any Other Relevant Business (in accordance with Standing Order 12 (o))

There were no items of Any Other Relevant Business.

This being all the business the meeting closed at 3:58pm

Chair