

**PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD
WEDNESDAY 27 MAY 2026**

Table of Key Adoptions

No.	Item	Summary of Decisions
1.	Apologies	<i>Alderman Scott, Councillor Storey</i>
2.	Declarations of Interest	<i>Nil</i>
3.	Minutes of Previous Planning Committee Meetings	
3.1	Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting held Wednesday 22 April 2026	<i>Confirmed as a correct record</i>
4.	Order of Items and Confirmation of Registered Speakers	
4.1	LA01/2024/0119/O (Referral) Lands to the West of St. Patrick's Culfeightrin Church, 89 Cushendall Road, Ballyvoy	<i>Deferred for a Site Visit</i>
4.2	LA01/2023/0755/O (Referral) 30m South East of 23 Gaults Road, Cushendall	<i>Deferred for a Site Visit</i>
5.	Presentation to Council	
5.1	Dfl – Independent Inspectors Programme	<i>Received</i>
6.	Schedule of applications	
6.1	LA01/2026/0314/S54 (Major) Lands at and adjacent to 34 Agherton Road, Portstewart	<i>Agree and Approve</i>
6.2	LA01/2025/0901/F (Council) 85a Mountsandel Road, Coleraine	<i>Agree and Approve</i>
6.3	LA01/2024/1322/F (Objection) Lands East of No. 1 Glentaisie Drive, Ballycastle and North of No. 39 Mill Street, Ballycastle	<i>Agree and Approve</i>
6.4	LA01/2024/0743/O (Referral) Site Adj to 57 Dunlade Road, Greysteel	<i>Deferred for further information to be provided</i>

		<i>and a decision to be made in 1 month</i>
6.5	LA01/2024/0977/F (Referral) Land South of 1&2 Hillcrest Cottages and Circa 30m North West of 22 Loguestown Road, Portrush	<i>Disagree and Approve</i>
6.6	LA01/2025/0530/F (Referral) Lands to the rear of No. 127 Glenhead Road, Limavady	<i>Deferred for a Site Visit</i>
6.7	LA01/2025/0342/O (Referral) 40m West of 18 Ballyhackett Lane, Castlerock	<i>Deferred for a Site Visit</i>
7.	Correspondence	
7.1	Dfl – Statutory Rule – Reverse Vending Machines	<i>Noted</i>
7.2	Dfl – Transforming Planning – Independent Inspectors Report	<i>Noted</i>
7.3	Dfl – Section 26 – Altahullion Windfarm	<i>Noted</i>
7.4	DCSDC – Notification – LDP Call for Evidence	<i>Noted</i>
8.	Reports for Decision	
8.1	Planning Business Plan 2026/27	<i>That Planning Committee APPROVE the Planning Department Business Plan 2026/27</i>
9.	Reports for Noting	
9.1	Finance Report Period 1 – 12 2025/26	<i>Noted</i>
9.2	Quarterly LDP Update	<i>Noted</i>
9.3	BT Payphones – Removal Notice • The Crescent, Coleraine • Clarehill Park, Aghadowey • Main Street, Limavady	<i>Noted</i>
11.	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 27 MAY 2026 AT 10.30AM**

Chair: Councillor Kane (C)

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

Officers Present: M Quinn, Director of Corporate Services (C)
S Mathers, Development Management Manager (C)
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 Heaney, Planning Officer (C)
S McKinley, Planning Officer (R)
L Hegarty, Town Planning Placement Student (R)
I Owens, Democratic Services Officer (R/C)
J Keen, Democratic Services Officer (C/R)

In Attendance: A Lennox, ICT Operations Manager (Interim) (C/R)
C Ballentine, ICT Officer (C/R)

N Jamieson, Department for Infrastructure Item 5
W Daly, Department for Infrastructure Item 5
L Addis, Department for Infrastructure Item 5
K McGreevy, Department for Infrastructure Item 5

Public 2 no. (C) 10 no. (R) including Speakers

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

Registered Speakers

Item No	Name
LA01/2024/1322/F	Mark Smyth
LA01/2024/0743/O	Alan Boyle
LA01/2023/0977/F	Mark Smyth

	David Alexander
LA01/2025/0530/F	Lee Kennedy Stephen Deehan
LA01/2025/0342/O	John Simpson

The Director of Corporate Services undertook a roll call.

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

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were recorded for Alderman Scott and Councillor Storey.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETINGS

3.1 Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting held Wednesday 22 April 2026

Copy, previously circulated.

Proposed by Councillor McMullan

Seconded by Councillor Kennedy

– That the Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held Wednesday 22 April 2026 are signed as a correct record.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

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

The Chair declared the motion carried.

RESOLVED - That the Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held Wednesday 22 April 2026 are signed as a correct record.

4. ORDER OF ITEMS AND CONFIRMATION OF REGISTERED SPEAKERS

4.1 LA01/2024/0119/O (Referral) Lands to the West of St. Patrick's Culfeightrin Church, 89 Cushendall Road, Ballyvoy.

Proposed by Councillor Kennedy

Seconded by Councillor Anderson

- That the Planning Committee defer application LA01/2024/0119/O (Referral) Lands to the West of St. Patrick's Culfeightrin Church, 89 Cushendall Road, Ballyvoy for a site visit to see the difference between the current and proposed dwellings as referred to in paragraph 8.8 of the Planning Committee report.

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.

RESOLVED - That the Planning Committee defer application LA01/2024/0119/O (Referral) Lands to the West of St. Patrick's Culfeightrin Church, 89 Cushendall Road, Ballyvoy for a site visit to see the difference between the current and proposed dwellings as referred to in paragraph 8.8 of the Planning Committee report.

4.2 LA01/2023/0755/O (Referral) 30m South East of 23 Gaults Road, Cushendall

Proposed by Councillor McMullan

Seconded by Councillor C Archibald

- That the Planning Committee defer application LA01/2023/0755/O (Referral) 30m South East of 23 Gaults Road, Cushendall as it would be beneficial for Planning Committee members to see the site.

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.

RESOLVED - That the Planning Committee defer application LA01/2023/0755/O (Referral) 30m South East of 23 Gaults Road, Cushendall as it would be beneficial for Planning Committee members to see the site.

5. PRESENTATION TO COUNCIL

5.1 DfI – Independent Inspectors Programme

The Chair invited N Jamieson, W Daly, L Addis and K McGreevy to present to the Planning Committee.

N Jamieson delivered a presentation, the key points of which were:

- There has been £3m Transformation funding secured up to March 2029. The focus is on improving a critical element of the planning system and there is strong support from stakeholders.
- The purpose of the programme is to enable the Department of Infrastructure to:

- appoint independent persons under the Planning Act (NI) 2011,
- provide an additional delivery route alongside the Planning Appeals Commission and support timely progression of regionally significant applications, called-in applications and Local Development Plan independent examinations.
- There will be no change in the role of local Councils.
- The programme is needed for the following reasons:
 - the current reliance on the Planning Appeals Commission as the sole “hear and report” provider,
 - the risk to confidence, investment and delivery due to increasing capacity pressures
 - delays in the process have impacted key planning outcomes.
- Progress to date includes the launching of the appointment process with independent inspectors expected to be appointed in June 2026.
- Governance, guidance and safeguards are in development.
- The model will work through:
 - a “Hear and Report” requirement being identified,
 - the business area liaising with the Planning Appeals Commission and the Independent Inspector Support Team
 - recommendations being prepared giving consideration to statutory requirements, capacity and timetabling
 - the Allocation Panel determining the appropriate allocation route.
- The Planning Appeals Commission will remain central to the system, this programme will add to capacity and the allocation of cases will depend on availability of work and the capacity of the Planning Appeals Commission.
- Changes for Councils include additional delivery route being used, Department for Infrastructure programme Officers supporting administration and greater emphasis being put on up-to-date Local Development Plan timetables.
- There will be no changes in local Councils core planning roles and responsibilities, planning appeals arrangements, legal tests and statutory procedures, public participation and transparency. Councils will be required to continue providing up-to-date Local Development Plan timetables to the Department for Infrastructure Plan Oversight Team and be available for case-specific logistics when required.
- Next steps are to complete the appointment process, finalise guidance, continue engagement with councils and stakeholders and allocations are expected to begin from Q2 in 2026/27.

6. SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS

6.1 LA01/2026/0314/S54 (Major) Lands at and adjacent to 34 Agherton Road, Portstewart

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

Major Application to be determined by Planning Committee

App No: LA01/2026/0314/S54

App Type: Full

Proposal: Section 54 application to vary Condition 15 (sewage disposal) from approved application LA01/2019/1217/F (holiday park 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.

Development Management Manager presented via PowerPoint presentation as follows:

- *Proposal comprises a variation of condition, condition 15, regarding the timing of when development can start relative to the agreement of sewage disposal arrangements. The approved scheme was for an extension of 74 static sites, 13 touring/ motorhome sites and retention of an existing area for tourers and motorhomes. This extends to either side of Agherton Road. It was approved in November 2022.*
- *While a major application, no Pre Application Notice was required as this is a variation of condition application. A Design and Access Statement was not required as the changes do not pertain to design issues.*
- *In terms of the Northern Area Plan 2016, the site is located in the open countryside. The Plan does not contain specific policy on tourism development and directs to regional policy.*
- *The existing condition 15 - Given constraints on NI Water sewerage infrastructure, the approved application prohibits development until the method of sewage disposal has been agreed with NI Water or a consent to discharge has been granted.*
- *The proposed condition 15 - The proposed condition changes the limitation on development to beyond the sub-floor construction stage. The reason for this is that it will allow additional time to address wastewater infrastructure capacity issues in the area and ensure agreed foul drainage solutions are put in place prior to carrying out any development beyond the implementation of the permission. NI Water has been consulted and has no objection. In practical terms, this will allow for a start of construction to be made to any of the approved buildings- site office, welfare building and laundrette. Condition 9 still remains in place to preclude occupation of*

caravan units until the approved wastewater network engineering solution has been delivered.

- *REPRESENTATIONS- None received.*
- *CONCLUSION- The proposed change to the wording of the condition is acceptable and the recommendation is to approve.*

In response to questions the Development Management Manager stated that the proposed condition changes the limitation on development to beyond the sub-floor construction stage.

Proposed by Councillor Kennedy

Seconded by Alderman Hunter

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

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

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

The Chair declared the motion carried and application approved.

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

6.2 LA01/2025/0901/F (Council) 85a Mountsandel Road, Coleraine

Report and presentation were previously circulated and presented by Senior Planning Officer, R Beringer.

Council Application to be determined by Planning Committee

App No: LA01/2025/0901/F

App Type: Full

Proposal: Retention of amendments to dwelling under Planning Approval
LA01/2022/0846/RM

Recommendation

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

Senior Planning Officer presented via PowerPoint as follows:

- *LA01/2025/0901/F is a full application for the retention of amendments to dwelling under LA01/2022/0846/RM*
- *A Committee Report accompanies this application.*
- *(Slide) This application is a local application being presented to the Committee as a council interest item with a recommendation to approve.*
- *(Slide) The site, as outlined in red, is located within the settlement development limit for Coleraine. It is not subject to any specific zonings or designations as set out in the Northern Area Plan 2016. Two trees on the site are protected under Tree Preservation Order LA01/2025/0020/TPO*
- *(Slide) The proposed site plan which shows the dwelling on the site in relation to its immediate neighbours along the Mountsandel Road, at Nos 85 and 87, along with existing and proposed boundary treatments and landscaping.*
- *(Slide) Here we have proposed floor plans for the dwelling with living accommodation on the ground floor, and bedroom accommodation & a games room on the upper floors.*
- *(Slide) Proposed elevations. The proposed dwelling is two and a half storey in height with rear return, including an integrated garage at ground floor.*
- *Moving to some photographs of the site:*
- *(Slide) View of the application site front garden and front elevation of the dwelling.*
- *(Slide) Northern elevation from No. 85 Mountsandel Road. The windows in this elevation serve a ground floor wc/store room in the rear return, an ensuite and a laundry room on the first floor, and an ensuite to the attic bedroom on the second floor. These windows are all obscure glazed. There are also 2 velux windows in the roof of the rear return, serving a games room.*
- *(Slide) Rear elevation and site boundary to No. 85 Mountsandel Road. The area of grass in the foreground is outside of the site boundary and part of the curtilage of No. 85. The application site boundary is identified by the concrete posts. Windows in this rear elevation serve the garage on the ground floor, and an ensuite and wardrobe on the first floor (these are obscure glazed).*
- *(Slide) View of the rear return and rear elevations of the dwelling. The image on the left hand side indicated the rear elevation, with part of the rear return. In the rear elevation you can see the dormer window to the second floor bedroom. The image to the right hand side shows a side on view of the rear return, which faces properties on Ratheane Avenue.*
- *(Slide) Southern elevation from No. 87 Mountsandel Road. The two windows at ground floor are to the kitchen and snug, and the two smaller windows at first floor serve ensuites.*

- *(Slide) Southern boundary adjoining Ratheane Avenue properties. There is hedgerow planting and boundary fencing proposed here.*
- *Looking at some views from the surrounding area:*
- *(Slide) View from Mountsandel Road, looking Northwest (towards Coleraine town Centre).*
- *(Slide) Again a view along the road looking south east (heading out of Coleraine) site access identified, site positioned back behind natural screening.*
- *(Slide) View from Ratheane Avenue, looking northeast.*
- *The principle of development was previously established under applications LA01/2021/0399/O and LA01/2022/0846/RM. The proposal is for the retention of amendments to the dwelling as approved under LA01/2022/0846/RM. The amendments relate to alterations to the dwelling scale and design including fenestration arrangements, changes to the boundary treatments and minor alterations to the driveway layout.*
- *There has been an increase of 1m to the ridge height of the main house, and an increase of 0.9m to the ridge height of the rear return. There is also a small increase of 0.5m to the frontage length. The dwelling has a similar overall design concept to that previously approved. Changes to the siting as a result of the increased footprint do not result in any significant visual difference to the pattern of development from that previously approved.*
- *The increased ridge heights, while maintaining the eaves heights previously approved, result in a steeper roof pitch and more dominant roof form. Due to the screening provided by the extensive planting within the neighbouring site at No. 85, the trees within the site itself, and the setback from the road, there is no negative impact on the character of the area. The differences in height are considered not to result in any unacceptably greater impact in terms of any loss of light or overshadowing than that previously approved. The proposal is considered acceptable.*
- *Design changes to the dwelling included alterations to the fenestration arrangements to some of the elevations. The alteration to ground floor room arrangements is considered not to change the nature of any overlooking. Boundary treatments proposed to site boundaries are sufficient that any views from ground floor windows would not be unacceptable. Conditions are recommended in relation to the boundary treatments.*
- *Alterations to window arrangements to the rear elevation and south facing side of the rear return elevation are considered acceptable and no unacceptable overlooking will occur from the re-configuration of these windows. The rear dormer window serving bedroom 4 on the second floor replaces two velux windows previously approved. This is considered acceptable and will not result in any unacceptable overlooking to any adjoining properties.*

- *There are no changes to the proposed arrangements in respect of private amenity space, previously found to be acceptable. Adequate provision has been made for private open space. Car parking and access arrangements are as previously approved. Consultation took place with DfI Roads due to the amended boundary treatments at the access. No objections were raised.*
- *Given the restrictive nature of the plot by way of the siting and scale of the dwelling and the relationship to neighbouring properties, recommended conditions are provided for the removal of permitted development for further openings and extensions.*
- *One comment was received in relation to boundary treatments along the southern site boundary to the rear of properties along Ratheane Avenue. The site plan proposes appropriate boundary treatments in the form of fencing and hedgerow planting along the site boundaries and conditions are recommended in relation to the provision of these.*
- *The application has been assessed in relation to the relevant policy considerations of PPS 3, 7 & APPS 7, and the retention of the design amendments to the dwelling are considered acceptable. The recommendation is for approval.*

In response to questions querying if the boundary will be extended the Senior Planning Officer cited Condition 5 of the proposed planning approval stating that a fence will be erected along the side boundary.

Proposed by Councillor Watton

Seconded by Councillor Anderson

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

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

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

The Chair declared the motion carried and application approved.

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

6.3 LA01/2024/1322/F (Objection) Lands East of No. 1 Glentaisie Drive, Ballycastle and North of No. 39 Mill Street, Ballycastle

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

Objection Application to be determined by Planning Committee

App No: LA01/2024/1322/F

App Type: Full

Proposal: Erection of 5no. detached dwellings at sites 1-5 Glentaisie Drive to include amendments to E/2009/0421/F (i.e. slightly reduced building footprints, omission of one ground floor window, increased private amenity space for each dwelling, increased Finished Floor Levels) to house types B and C and minor adjustments to access roads geometry and finished levels and site enabling works including drainage as constructed, NIE sub-station as installed

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 the planning application as set out in Section 9 and 10 of the Planning Committee report.

Senior Planning Officer presented via PowerPoint as follows:

- *(Slide) Planning Application LA01/2024/1322/F. This is a full application for the Erection of 5no. detached dwellings at sites 1-5 Glentaisie Drive to include amendments to previous application E/2009/0421/F (i.e. slightly reduced building footprints, omission of one ground floor window, increased private amenity space for each dwelling, increased Finished Floor Levels) to house types B and C and minor adjustments to access roads geometry and finished levels and site enabling works including drainage as constructed, NIE sub-station as installed.*
- *Addendum to report outlining additional objection received.*
- *(Slide) This is the red line boundary of the site. The site is located within the SDL of Ballycastle and just outside the town centre boundary.*
- *(Slide) Extract from the Northern Area Plan. The site is zoned for housing in the plan. Previous planning history for the site of a similar scheme which was approved in January 2011. Works for the site started outside the timeframe for that application hence why a new planning application was required. Part of the site, the access, is located with the Tow Valley upper Local Landscape Policy Area. Although some of the planting is more ornamental than would be seen in the wider Local Landscape Policy Area*

the context of the site is with a residential streetscape and as such the features of this Local Landscape Policy Area would not be negatively impacted.

- *(Slide) Aerial overview of the site in the context of surrounding development. Commercial area of Castle Street to the north and area of open space to the west.*
- *(Slide) Proposed layout. 4 house types of the same style and 5th one similar. All house types of a similar design and height. They are 1 ½ storey between 7 and 7.7 m ridge height.*
- *(Slide) Previous approved layout just to show how similar the 2 layouts are.*
- *(Slide) This application is being presented as an objection item to Committee. There are 6 objection and 1 petition with 24 signatures. Issues raised are outlined in part 5 of your committee report and include: visual amenity, highway safety and traffic generation, loss of light, density, subsidence, maintenance of landscaping.*
- *(Slide) This shows a section through the site which includes a property on Glentaisie Drive. Proposed dwelling on the right hand side of the slide. The site is at a lower level than the nearest property on Glentaisie Drive. This dwelling fronts the application site and there is a distance of approximately 19 metres between the front elevation of no. 70 Glentaisie Drive and the front of the dwelling at site 5. Given that this is a front to front separation distance, the orientation of the dwellings, landscaping between and the application site approx. 2.8 m lower than the existing dwelling it is considered acceptable and should not create a significant impact in terms of overlooking and over shadowing.*
- *(Slide) This is another section showing the relationship between the site and the dwellings along Mill Street. Part of this site was also zoned for housing under the same designation in the Area Plan. There is a significant difference between levels of these 2 sites approximately 10 metres. The retaining embankment formed part of the previous application and that along Mill Street and is in place.*
- *There is approximately 22 metres between the rear of the dwellings. A number of boundary treatments have been put in place to prevent any impact on privacy to the rear of properties along Mill Street. An existing close boarded fence runs along between the shared boundary. The proposed dwellings have areas of decking to the rear and an additional 1.8 m fence is to enclose the decking which will prevent overlooking when residents are using the rear decking area.*
- *(Slide) The house types for 4 of the dwellings on site. 1 ½ Storey. No rear 1st floor windows, just velux's which will reduce overlooking.*
- *(Slide) House type for site 5 located at the end of the development.*
- *(Slide) Photos – This is a view along the rear of the site. The foundations and floor level are in place. No 70 Glentaisie Drive in the distance.*

- *(Slide) Photo 2 – Looking up towards Glentaisie Drive which sits at a higher level*
- *Photo 3 – This is a long the rear boundary and you can see the tops of the roofs of dwellings along Mill Street.*
- *Photo 4 – Again over Mill Street and Ballycastle forest in the distance.*
- *Photo 5 Construcution.*
- *Photo 6 View of the access point. Residents have referred to issues of road safety and parking. Roads have been consulted and have no raised any objections. Issues appear to relate to existing parking issues not directly lined to this application. Parking is provided off within the curtilage of the dwellings and should not add to additional parking along Glentaisie Drive.*
- *The application has been assessed have regard to the NAP, SPPS, PPS 7, Addendum to PPS 7, PPS 2 and 3, Creating Places doc and other supplementary guidance together with letters of representation and consultee advice and our recommendation is to approve planning permission with conditions.*

In response to questions the Senior Planning Officer confirmed that a similar scheme was approved but the works started outside the required timeframe so the applicant was required to apply for planning permission again. The Senior Planning Officer referred to paragraph 4 of the Planning Committee report to highlight the differences between the current planning application and the previous planning application for this site.

The Chair invited M Smyth to speak in support of the planning application.

M Smyth stated that the planning history on the site has been considered by the Planning Department and that key considerations were included in the Planning Committee report. M Smyth stated that the site is zoned for housing, construction has commenced, storm drains and an NIE substation have been placed, access and landscaping have also been established. M Smyth stated that the planning application is compliant with planning policy and there are no consultee concerns.

In response to questions M Smyth stated that the dwellings are not social housing.

Proposed by Councillor Kennedy

Seconded by Councillor McMullan

- That the Committee note the contents of this Addendum and agree with the recommendation to Approve the planning application as set out in Section 9 and 10 of the Planning Committee report.

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 approved.

RESOLVED - That the Committee note the contents of this Addendum and agree with the recommendation to Approve the planning application as set out in Section 9 and 10 of the Planning Committee report.

The Chair declared a recess at 11:43am

The meeting resumed at 11:53am.

The Director of Corporate Services undertook a roll call.

6.4 LA01/2024/0743/O (Referral) Site Adj to 57 Dunlade Road, Greysteel

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

Referral Application to be determined by Planning Committee

App No: LA01/2024/0743/O

App Type: Outline

Proposal: Proposed Site for Dwelling in a Cluster

Recommendation

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

Addendum Recommendation

It is recommended that the Committee note the content of this addendum and agree to refuse planning permission as set out in the Planning Committee Report and Erratum.

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

- *The application is for Outline Permission, described as “Proposed Site for Dwelling in a Cluster”.*
- *Along with the Planning Committee Report there is a site visit note, erratum and addendum.*
- *The erratum amends paragraphs 8.8 and 8.9 of the Planning Committee Report and refusal reason 2.*

- *The application was deferred from the November Planning Committee to allow for the submission of :*
 - *The Planning Appeals Commission decisions referred to by the agent at the Committee.*
 - *Plans to include a block plan and section to demonstrate that the site can be developed with NIE clearances.*
 - *Further information on the Ceili house.*
- *The addendum details the Planning Appeals Commission decisions that were submitted by the agent. These are not considered comparable to the application or justify setting aside the planning policies. It is clear that the proposal fails 3 of the 6 criteria of Policy CTY2a in that it is not bound by development on 2 sides, would if approved extend into the Countryside and is not located at a focal point.*
- *No plans were submitted to demonstrate how the site could be developed with NIE clearances.*
- *The agent reasserted that Mary Kanes is a social space where everyone is welcome in an open friendly gathering. No further information or correspondence was received such as details from the residents of the dwelling, photos, invites etc. However, the site still fails to meet with Policy CTY2a on other grounds.*
- *As previously advised the proposal also fails Policy CTY8 in that the building would add to a ribbon of development by bookending the line of 3 dwellings.*
- *It should also be noted by way of a verbal erratum, that in Para 5.2 in your Committee Report it states no objection from DfI Roads – however, as set out in Para 8.25 of the Planning Committee Report, DfI Roads consider the proposal fails to meet the requirements of PPS3. While the agent considers this matter has been addressed, emails sent by the case officer outline that this matter remains unresolved and the refusal reason remains.*
- *Further information was also submitted by Alan Robinson MLA. This has been circulated to members and sets out the background to the applicant and the reasons why the agent believes the application qualifies as a cluster CTY2a dwelling. The note advises that the site at the edge of the 3 dwellings is linear in form and beyond that is a mature hedgerow beyond which there cannot be development. That the established cluster is defined by the grouping of buildings around the historic dwelling known as Mary Kanes cottage. A local ceili house, the original dwelling was restored such was its significance. The email also advises that supporting letters have been submitted to confirm this. The email also advises that the site complies with CTY13 as it is not prominent and has established boundaries. The site infills the gap created by the 3 dwellings. That the proposal complies with CTY14 and respects the development and that ribbon does not exist and that the visibility splays can be provided. I will cover these points raised through the presentation.*

- *(Slide) The site, indicated in red is located outside any Settlement Development Limit and is located in the rural area and is not subject to any specific zonings or designations as set out in the Northern Area Plan 2016. The site is located to the south of 3 roadside dwellings. Across the road is an agricultural field and to the south of those 2 dwellings.*
- *(Slide) This next slide shows a contextual plan with the site indicated in pink and the additional linear development along Dunlade Road indicated in a pale yellow. You will note this plan indicates that there is no development to the South of the application site.*
- *(Slide) And again then, this is a satellite image with the site identified by the red star and you will note from the image development fronting Dunlade Road and that there is no development directly to the South of the site. The application has been submitted as an application for a cluster. Policy CTY2a allows for a dwelling in a cluster if all 6 criteria are met. As set out in the Planning Committee Report and erratum the proposal meets the 1st 2 criteria in that there are more than 4 dwellings outside of a farm and that the group appears as a visual entity. The proposal fails the 3rd, 4th and 5th criteria in that there is no focal point such as a social community building or is located at a crossroads.*
- *(Slide) In relation to the 3rd criteria. Within the supporting information the agent advises that the dwelling located at No.58 is a Historic Dwelling, recognised locally and previously used as a ceili house and now as a meeting point. Further information was submitted in the form of letters of support which note it was a local Ceili house. Planning History of this dwelling refs: B/2009/0376/F and B/2012/0090/F approved a replacement dwelling at this location. The Ceili house no longer exists. The replacement is not a social or community building today and functions as a dwelling house. The proposal fails criteria 3.*
- *The site as you can see is not bound by development on 2 sides, there is only development to the north. The proposal fails the 4th criteria.*
- *The site cannot be absorbed into the existing cluster through rounding off or consolidation and will visually intrude into the open countryside by continuing development along the Dunlade Road and failing the 5th criteria of CTY2a.*
- *The proposal is at the outline stage and the development could be controlled at Reserved Matters stage to ensure it meets with the final bullet point and not adversely impact on residential development.*
- *The proposal fails to meet 3 of the 6 criteria of Policy CTY2a.*
- *Turning to some pictures of the site, this is a view looking north on Dunlade Road and the site you can see is at the end of this tree line to the west or left of the slide. The visibility splays have not been demonstrated and require 2.4 by 90m this would most likely result in the removal of the mature hedge row and trees.*

- *This next slide is a view looking south along Dunlade Road, which shows the ribbon of 3 dwellings along the road, with the site which continues development towards the trees.*
- *This is just a closer photo showing where the development ends and the site beyond.*
- *These final photos just show the site itself and you will note how open the site is, and the views into it and the requirement for further landscaping to help integrate any dwelling into the site. Given the openness of the site, and lack of boundary treatment and roadside vegetation, the site is contrary to CTY 13 Integration into the countryside as set out in Paras 8.16 – 8.20 of your Planning Committee Report.*
- *The Agent also states that this is an infill opportunity under Policy CTY8 Ribbon Development. Policy CTY8 states that planning permission will be refused for a building which creates or adds to a ribbon of development. Policy CTY8 ribbon development as an exception allows for development of a small gap within a substantial and continually built up frontage. The site is not a small gap but a bookend to 3 dwellings. Approval of this site would continue this ribbon of development by adding at least a fourth dwelling/building, the proposal is contrary to CTY8 which clearly states that development should be refused that adds to a ribbon of development.*
- *As the proposal is contrary to CTY8, it is also contrary to CTY14 as Ribbon Development is considered unacceptable in relation to rural character, as set out and considered in Paras 8.21-8.24.*
- *Please see the extract from the Rural Design Guide that show the sites in purple that are unacceptable as they add to a ribbon of development and also fail the cluster Policy in that they are not bound by development on 2 sides and would extend development out into the countryside. Appeal reference 2019/A0214 is relevant the appeal was on the Brisland Road, Greysteel. The commissioner agreed with the Council that the proposal met the first 3 criteria of CTY2a but it failed to meet policy CTY2a in that it was not bound by development on two sides and that due to the lack of enclosure by development would fail to round off and consolidate the cluster. The appeal was dismissed as the proposal failed to meet criteria 4 and 5 of CTY2a. This is also the case in the second appeal 2022/A0079.*
- *The agent has submitted a number of appeals that they believe are comparable, we have carefully reviewed all the appeals submitted and find none comparable to this site and none that would support setting aside the policies. This is clearly set out in the addendum that has been circulated.*
- *The proposal is contrary to the SPPS, PPS 3 and Planning Policy Statement 21 policies CTY 1, policy CTY2a, CTY 8, CTY 13 and CTY 14 for the reasons set out in Section 10 of the Planning Committee Report. The application is recommended for refusal.*

In response to questions the Development Management (local applications) Manager cited from CTY2a to provide a definition of a cluster. The Development Management (local applications) Manager provided further explanation regarding the criteria used to define a cluster in CTY2a as follows

- In relation to the criteria referring to a cluster containing 4 or more buildings, 3 of which must be dwellings the Development Management (local applications) Manager stated that there are 3 dwellings in a linear development on one side of the road and a further 2 dwellings on the opposite side of the road, it could be argued this is a cluster.
- In relation to visual entity the Development Management (local applications) Manager stated that as you drive along the road it needs to be seen as a visual entity.
- In relation to having a focal point the Development Management (local applications) Manager stated that there is no awareness of a focal point such as a community building or a cross roads.
- In relation to having a suitable degree of enclosure the Development Management (local applications) Manager stated that policy requires the site to be bound on 2 sides with other development in the cluster, this site is bound only on 1 side so does not meet the criteria.
- In relation to being absorbed into the existing cluster through rounding off or consolidation, this site is not rounding off the cluster, rather it is intruding into the countryside.

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

A Boyle stated that there is a genuine need for this dwelling for a local man returning home after a period of time spent in England. The applicant moved to London after his father's death and has returned to the area after his son's death. A Boyle stated that the site is bounded on 3 of the 4 sides which include established natural boundaries. A Boyle referred to Planning Appeals Commission cases 2016/A0184 and 2014/A0245 stating these were approved by the Commissioner and are comparable to this application. A Boyle stated that previously natural boundaries such as hedgerows have been accepted as boundaries. A Boyle stated that this site does not encroach into the countryside but rather it rounds off and consolidates the cluster of buildings. A Boyle stated that Mary Kane's cottage is the focal point of the cluster as it is used as a social central point for locals to gather. A Boyle stated that previous applications had been approved that didn't have a focal point, it is a matter of judgement for the Planning Committee.

In response to questions A Boyle stated that a local man now lives in Mary Kane's cottage and is keen to keep the social connections in place. It is an informal setting where locals can call into the cottage for tea/coffee, chatting, telling stories, playing music and playing cards. A Boyle stated that letters were

provided to prove the continuation of the tradition of the céilí house at Mary Kane's cottage. A Boyle stated that the applicant's brother owns a farm nearby, that the applicant works on the farm but not to the extent he qualifies for a dwelling on the farm.

In response to further questions A Boyle stated that the visual splays have been amended and that the Road Services have no objections. A Boyle confirmed that No 60 meets the boundary of the site and No 58 is opposite the site at approximately a 45-degree angle.

In response to questions the Development Management (local applications) Manager stated that the Roads Service had recommended approval of the access. The Development Management (local applications) Manager further stated that there has been nothing received by the Planning Department in relation to Mary Kane's cottage being used as a social setting.

In response to further questions the Development Management (local applications) Manager stated that drawings to show the amended visibility splays were requested by the Planning Department in 2024, early 2025 and in November 2025 and these have not yet been received. The Development Management (local applications) Manager stated that information relating to the Planning Appeals Commission decisions are laid out in the Addendum. She further stated that the criteria in CTY8 and CTY2a are not met in this planning application, there is ribbon development which is a fact and this site would add to it clearly contrary to policy, it is a fact there the site is only bound by development on one side and there is no development across the road. The Planning Appeals Commission decisions were considered under different policies so do not apply to this application.

Councillor McMullan considered the tragic personal circumstances of the applicant and referred to CTY6 where personal circumstances can be given consideration.

A Boyle concurred with the sentiments expressed by Councillor McMullan and stated further information can be provided if required.

Councillor Anderson stated that a lot of information had been shared at this meeting. He stated he could not see Addendum 4 on the website.

The Chair confirmed that Addendum 4 was attached the Planning Committee report at page 17.

Proposed by Councillor Anderson
Seconded by Councillor C Archibald

- That the Committee defer application LA01/2024/0743/O (Referral) Site Adj to 57 Dunlade Road, Greysteel for 1 month for further information to be submitted and a decision to be taken in 1 month

The Chair put the motion to the vote

10 Members voted For; 1 Members voted Against; 1 Members Abstained

The Chair declared the application deferred.

RESOLVED - That Planning Committee defer application LA01/2024/0743/O (Referral) Site Adj to 57 Dunlade Road, Greysteel for 1 month for further information to be submitted and a decision to be taken in 1 month

* **Councillor McGurk joined the meeting remotely at 12:46pm during consideration of the following item.**

* **Councillor Anderson left the meeting at 12:51pm during consideration of the following item**

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

Report, presentation, and speaking rights templates were previously circulated and presented by Senior Planning Officer, M McErlain.

Referral Application to be determined by Planning Committee

App No: LA01/2024/0977/F

App Type: Full

Proposal: Retrospective application for retention of restoration works to ruinous wallstead, completion of restoration and conversion works, to reinstate former cottage with associated landscaping and access.

Recommendation

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

Addendum Recommendation

It is recommended that the Committee note the contents of this Addendum and agree to refuse planning permission as per the following reason for refusal

The proposal is contrary to Paragraphs 6.73 and 6.74 of the SPSS and Policy CTY1 of PPS 21: Sustainable Development in the Countryside in that there are

no overriding reasons why the development is essential and could not be located within a settlement

Addendum 2 Recommendation

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.

Addendum 3 Recommendation

It is recommended that the Committee note the content of this addendum and agree to refuse planning permission as per the following reasons.

1. The proposal is contrary to paragraph 6.73 of the SPPS and Policy CTY 1 of PPS 21: Sustainable Development in the Countryside in that there are no overriding reasons why the development is essential and could not be located within a settlement
2. The proposal is contrary to Paragraph 6.73 of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement (SPPS) and Policy CTY4 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside in that the building is not suitable for conversion as it has not been demonstrated that the building is a locally important building and is substantially ruinous/not of permanent construction.

Senior Planning Officer presented via PowerPoint presentation as follows:

- *LA01/2024/0977/F is a full application for 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.*
- *This is a local application and is presented to the Planning Committee as a referred item following a recommendation to refuse planning permission.*
- *A site visit was carried out on this application on Friday 17th October 2025.*
- *1 objection has been received in relation to this application.*
- *The site is located in the rural area as defined in NAP2016 and is not located within any environmental designations. To the immediate north of the application site is Hillcrest View which comprises a small development of 6 cottages which were approved for tourist accommodation.*
- *The application site is a triangular plot to the western side of Loguestown Road and to the immediate South of Hillcrest Views Cottages. The site contains a structure within the southern portion of the site which is the*

subject of this application. The site is elevated above the Loguestown Road by approximately 1.5 metres.

- There is previous planning history on the site. Planning Application LA01/2017/0207/O was submitted for two storey replacement dwelling on the site. This application was withdrawn prior to a formal decision being made following a recommendation to refuse due the structure failing to meet the requirements of Policy CTY3.*
- As this application is located within the rural area it falls to be determined under paragraph 6.73 of the SPPS and Policy CTY1 of PPS21.*
- Prior to the restorations works being carried out which form part of this application, the subject structure was in a ruinous condition with no roof and large portions of the external walls collapsed. Consequently, any former use of the structure has been abandoned/extinguished.*
- The application was previously presented to members at the October 2025 Committee meeting where it was proposed to retain and complete the restoration works and reinstate the use as a cottage to the building. Following deliberations around the intended use proposed alternative description relating to retention of the works completed to date the application was deferred from the October 2025 Committee Meeting to allow the applicant/agent to submit an amended description and allow for a meeting with officers if necessary.*
- An amended description was received 3rd November 2025 to propose the “retrospective application for the retention of restoration works to ruinous wall stead including refurbishment work to roof, external walls, door and windows”, along with an amended plan detailing the existing finishes to the building to be retained.*
- Officials advised the agent that the proposed description did not indicate a proposed use for the building, required to assess against the relevant planning policies outlined within the SPPS and PPS21.*
- Subsequently a further amended description was received 19th March 2026 which proposes the “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”.*
- As the current proposal seeks to retain the restoration works and use the building on the site for storage purposes and the appropriate policy context under which to assess the proposal is Paragraph 6.73 of the SPPS and Policy CTY4 of PPS21.*
- Paragraph 6.73 of the SPPS introduced a stricter policy test for the conversion and re-use of buildings to that set out within Policy CTY4, advising that provision should be made for the sympathetic conversion and reuse of a ‘locally important building’, Paragraph 1.12 of the SPPS outlines*

that any conflict between the SPPS and any policy retained under the transitional arrangements must be resolved in the favour of the provisions of the SPPS. Consequently, the principle of development must be considered against the requirements of the SPPS.

- The structure which currently sits on the site has been substantially rebuilt with concrete blockwork constructed on top of the pre-existing ruinous walls. You can see from the images the significant amount of newly constructed walls has taken place. A new roof and roof trusses have been erected, and a temporary style door has been erected with wall openings blocked up by timber sheeting to give the appearance of window openings. Internally a new fireplace and chimney breast have been constructed.*
- As the restoration works completed to the derelict structure are the subject of this planning application assessment of the proposal must be considered against the structure present prior to the carrying out of the unauthorised refurbishment works. Given the ruinous condition of the structure, it does not represent a building of permanent construction nor is it considered to be a locally important building given its lack of architectural or historical merit. Consequently, the application fails to comply with SPPS paragraph 6.73 and CTY4, criteria A.*
- This assessment is consistent with appeal 2016/A0169 (Appendix 1) which was for the refurbishment and extension of existing derelict dwelling. The appeal was dismissed.*
- In terms of the intended use of the building, no justification or case of need has been provided outlining a site specific need for a building in this location. Members will note from the site inspection and from the photographs within the presentation that the lands within the curtilage of the building are relatively unmaintained, nor was the building used for storage purposes. Officials consider that the use of the building does not meet with one of the permitted forms of development in the rural area as set out under Paragraph 6.73 of the SPPS and Policy CTY1 of PPS21 and does not demonstrate a site-specific need in this location.*
- Views of the application site are restricted to short range views when approaching in both directions given the screening afforded the site by the existing mature vegetation to the southern/southwestern boundary and the existing Hillcrest View Cottages immediately north of the application site. Given the modest scale of the proposed development the proposal would not have a significantly greater visual impact than the pre-existing ruinous structure and, while the application site is raised above road level the proposed the proposal will not result in a building any more prominent than the existing structure on site. Given the retention of existing vegetation and the modest scale of the development it is considered that the proposal complies with Paragraph 6.70 of the SPPS and Policies CTY13 and 14.*

- *The objection received cites the loss of parking spaces within Hillcrest Cottages to facilitate access to the site, loss of revenue associated with a loss of parking and loss of safe playing space for children.*
- *A review of the planning history at Hillcrest Cottage indicates that the area where access is proposed to be taken is not dedicated parking for the existing cottages and that the proposed access will not impede on the parking provisions approved. As this is a private thoroughfare any issues arising would be a civil matter.*
- *The Planning Department note that the area identified as providing play space for children is required to facilitate vehicular access to No. 2 Hillcrest Cottages and the provision of the thoroughfare to the application site is not considered to significantly increase the risk to pedestrians to an unacceptable level. The comments of the objection are noted however, the Planning Department do not consider the issues raised to be fatal to the proposed application.*
- *Consultation was carried out with DFI Roads, NI Water, Historic Environment Division (HED), NIEA and Environmental Health. Majority of consultees raised no concerns with NI Water advising that there is no capacity within foul sewer to accept proposed development.*
- *In conclusion the proposal is contrary to Paragraph 6.73 of the SPPS and Policy CTY4 of PPS21 in that the structure within the application site to be restored and converted is not considered a locally important building and is not suitable for conversion given its previously ruinous standing.*
- *In addition, no overriding reasons have been forthcoming as to why the development is essential, therefore the proposal is contrary to CTY1. Refusal is recommended.*

In response to questions the Senior Planning Officer advised that the planning application had been amended from conversion to a dwelling to conversion to a storage shed. The Senior Planning Officer advised that applicants need to state the intended use of a building being converted so it can be assessed under the relevant policy; this application was assessed under CTY1.

In response to questions relating to paragraph 2.5 in Addendum 3 which refers to the site being derelict the Senior Planning Officer confirmed that the site is derelict and that it has not been demonstrated that the proposed development is essential in this location.

The Chair invited M Smyth to speak in support of the application.

On the Chair inviting D Alexander to speak in support of the application M Smyth stated that D Alexander had withdrawn his speaking rights.

M Smyth stated that this application was subject to a site visit in October 2025. M Smyth stated that it was agreed that the building was not to be used for living accommodation and amended plans were developed to reflect this. M Smyth stated that converting the building to a storage shed was the best way forward as the intended use of the building. M Smyth stated that restoration work has been completed on the building to restore the walls and roof, the enforcement case against the restoration works has been resolved.

In response to questions M Smyth confirmed that the intended use is storage as this is the simplest use that is acceptable and that the planning application is also requesting to retain the restoration works already completed.

In response to further questions M Smyth stated that the refurbishment works were completed without planning permission as the applicant did not think it was required as it was refurbishment work. M Smyth reiterated that the intended use is for storage of equipment needed to maintain the land and it cannot be relocated in a settlement as it is specific to this land.

In response to questions the Senior Planning Officer cited policy to provided examples of what is considered to be a locally important building. The Senior Planning Officer confirmed that older traditional outbuildings may be considered as locally important but on this site the building is in such a ruinous state that it cannot be reused. The Senior Planning Officer advised that the Planning Department do receive applications to covert old barns and outhouses and they are considered on their individual merits.

In response to further questions the Senior Planning Officer advised that following the Planning Committee in October 2025 the applicant submitted an amended application to retain the work completed to date and to state the intended use of the building as being for storage. The Senior Planning Officer stated that there needs to be a firm basis on which to assess the application and that the intended use of the building needs to be provided in order to assess it under the applicable policy – non use of a building would mean refusal would be recommended. The Senior Planning Officer advised that an office meeting had not occurred as the Agent was clear on what the requirements were.

In response to further questions the Senior Planning Officer stated that there is no significant historical significance attached to the building, that the list of buildings of historical significance in the policy is not exhaustive and reinforced that there needs to be merit to older buildings being converted.

In response to questions the Senior Planning Officer stated that if the planning application is refused the applicant has the right to appeal. If the applicant does appeal and the decision to refuse the application is upheld enforcement action is

most likely to occur, with the mostly likely outcome of that enforcement action to be that the building must be returned to its former state.

In response to questions the Senior Planning Officer stated that if the Planning Committee were to approve the application that it would be a condition that the building would be used for storage only.

Councillor McMullan considered that the ruinous building was a home at one point and that a home is of importance, and that there should be a condition for the building to be used as storage only.

The Chair allowed M Smyth to speak again. M Smyth stated that Andrew Bonar Law was a Prime Minister and this land was owned by the Bonar Law family which provides historical significance to the site.

Proposed by Councillor McMullan

Seconded by Councillor C Archibald

- That the Committee has taken into consideration and disagrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to APPROVE outline planning permission for the following reasons
- It now is an important building
- It has been brought back to a state to be used for storage
- It cannot be relocated in a settlement
- A condition is to be applied that the building can only be used for storage

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

8 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 disagrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to APPROVE outline planning permission for the following reasons

- It now is an important building
- It has been brought back to a state to be used for storage
- It cannot be relocated in a settlement
- A condition is to be applied that the building can only be used for storage

RESOLVED – That Conditions and Informatives are delegated to Officers.

The Chair declared a recess for lunch at 1:30pm

Democratic Services Officer, J Keen left the Chamber at 1:30pm.

The meeting resumed at 2:30pm

Democratic Services Officer, I Owens joined the Chamber at 2:30pm

The Director of Corporate Services undertook a roll call.

Alderman Boyle said that she would be leaving the meeting but wished to put on record her thanks to the Chair for how competently he Chaired the Committee and got to the core of issues raised.

* **Alderman Boyle left the meeting at 2.40 pm**

6.6 LA01/2025/0530/F (Referral) Lands to the rear of No. 127 Glenhead Road, Limavady

Report, presentation, addendum, erratum, site visit note, objection letters and speaking rights template were previously circulated and presented by Senior Planning Officer, R Heaney

Referral Application to be determined by Planning Committee

App No: LA01/2025/0530/F

App Type: Full

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

Recommendation

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

Senior Planning Officer, R Heaney, presented via PowerPoint presentation as follows:

- *LA01/2025/0530/F is a full planning application for the retention of an agricultural building for agricultural storage & concrete hardstanding. At lands to the rear of 127 Glenhead Road, Limavady.*
- *This is a local application and is presented to the Planning Committee as a referred item following a recommendation to refuse planning Permission.*
- *No objections have been received in relation to this application.*
- *The application site is located outside of any settlement development limits as identified in The Northern Area Plan (NAP) 2016 and is not subject to any specific environmental designations.*

- *The application site measures under 0.1ha and comprises an enclosed area of hardstanding, agricultural shed, and a section of a shared access lane. It is part of a holding, comprising the shed and a field, measuring 0.88ha.*
- *The site is located to the rear of the Applicants dwelling, with the shed and hardstanding bounded on 2 sides with a field under the Applicants control. The boundary to the lane is defined with agricultural gates and 2m panel fencing. The boundary with the Applicants dwelling is defined with 3m hedging and the western and southern boundaries with the Applicants field are defined with ranch and post and wire fencing, respectively.*
- *The proposed farm shed measures 14.3 metres by 9.1 metres. It is 4.2 metres to the eaves and 5.2 metres to the ridge. The finished floor level of the shed is set lower than Glenhead Road. The site is screened to the north and north east by Nos 127 & 135 Glenhead Road. There is a limited fleeting view of the shed from the north west.*
- *(Slide) You can see what the development looks like there*
- *(Slide) This is views on approach to the site. The first photo is on the approach from the east on the Glenhead Road. You can see the access to 135 Glenhead Road, a dwelling neighbouring the site and applicants dwelling. The applicants dwelling and the shed are well screened.*
- *(Slide) The second photo is taken from the shared lane looking south. The wall to the right is the boundary wall of the applicants dwelling.*
- *(Slide) The final photo on this slide shows the applicants dwelling and shed on approach to the site from the west on the Glenhead Road.*
- *The applicant has livestock comprising 10 lambs. The shed will not be used to house livestock and photographs of the inside of the shed submitted by the applicant shows it contained 1 tractor, 1 trailer, 1 sheep trough, 5 sheep hurdles, shelving, 1 spade, 1 shovel, 1 yard brush. The agent states the applicant is a newly established farmer and wishes to consolidate his farm holding and secure the efficiency and effectiveness of his farming operations by retaining the agricultural building situated on his farming lands.*
- *The local area is characterised by agricultural lands and detached residential development on relatively large plots.*
- *As this application has been submitted as an agricultural shed it falls to be determined primarily under CTY12 of PPS21. CTY12 allows for development on an active and established agricultural holding where it is necessary for the efficient use.*
- *Of that holding, is not harmful to character, integrates, will not harm natural or built heritage and will not result in detrimental impact on the amenity of residential dwellings outside of the holding.*
- *The applicant's Farm Business ID was allocated on 20th May 2024 and the farm holding was established at this time. It is a Category 3 ID. The farm business has not claimed payments through the Basic Payment Scheme or*

Agri Environmental Scheme in any of the last 6 years. Therefore, the business and holding have not been established for the required 6 year period.

- The applicant has submitted some receipts and invoices to demonstrate that the holding is active and established however they do not cover a period of at least 6 years, with the earliest being May 2024. The receipts are for things like animal feed, spot treatments, feeders, and sheep hurdles.*
- The applicant has 10 lambs, and a small area of agricultural land of approximately 0.8 of a ha. It is noted that the applicants dwelling has a large garage and that the shed contains limited contents. It has therefore not been demonstrated that the proposal is necessary for the efficient use of the agricultural holding.*
- In terms of character and integration it is considered that the proposal will not offend Policies CTY13 and CTY14 of PPS21.*
- Our reasons for recommending refusal are:*
- The proposal is contrary to Policies CTY1 of PPS21 and paragraph 6.73 of the SPPS.*
- It is also contrary to Policy CTY12 of PPS21 in that it has not demonstrated that the proposed building is located on an active and established agricultural holding or that the proposal is necessary for the efficient use of the agricultural holding.*

The Chair invited questions from Elected Members for the Officer.

Alderman Callan advised that he was minded to propose a site visit. The Chair advised that there was a scheduled speaker, however Alderman Callan felt that he wished to proceed immediately to his proposal and the Chair agreed.

Proposed by Alderman Callan

Seconded by Councillor Watton

- That application LA01/2025/0530/F (Referral) Lands to the rear of No. 127 Glenhead Road, Limavady is deferred for a site visit to further explore the points raised by Senior Planning Officer and to assist Elected Members in reaching a decision.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

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

The Chair declared the motion carried.

RESOLVED - That application LA01/2025/0530/F (Referral) Lands to the rear of No. 127 Glenhead Road, Limavady is deferred for a site visit to further explore the points raised by Senior Planning Officer and to assist Elected Members in reaching a decision.

6.7 LA01/2025/0342/O (Referral) 40m West of 18 Ballyhackett Lane, Castlerock

Report, presentation, written and verbal addendum, erratum, speaking rights template were previously circulated and presented by Senior Planning Officer, M McErlain.

Referral Application to be determined by Planning Committee

App No: LA01/2025/0342/O

App Type: Outline

Proposal: Construction of a dwelling with detached garage and including a new access and parking area

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.

Senior Planning Officer, M McErlain, presented via PowerPoint presentation as follows:

- *LA01/2025/0342/O is an Outline Planning Application for the construction of a dwelling with detached garage and including a new access and parking area at lands 40 Meters West of 18 Ballyhackett Lane, Castlerock.*
- *This is a local application and is presented to the Planning Committee as a referred item following a recommendation to refuse planning Permission.*
- *No objections have been received in relation to this application.*
- *The application site is located outside of any settlement development limits as identified in The Northern Area Plan (NAP) 2016 and is sited within the designated Binevenagh Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.*
- *The application site comprises the eastern portion of a larger agricultural field which fronts onto Ballyhackett Lane. The field undulates with gradual rises in a western and southern direction. The site is set at a high ground level with the Ballyhackett Lane rising steeply in a westerly direction from the adjacent No. 18.*
- *The site will be accessed via the creation of a new access onto Ballyhackett Lane.*
- *As this application has been submitted as a dwelling on a farm it falls to be determined under CTY1 and 10 of PPS21.*
- *Department of Agriculture and Rural Development have confirmed that the business is active and established for the required period, no development opportunities have been sold-off from the holding and the application site is considered to satisfactorily links with existing buildings on the farm holding.*

- *Officials are satisfied that the proposal meets with Policy CTY10.*
- *The application site comprises the eastern portion of a larger agricultural field. The northern and eastern site boundaries are defined only by post and wire fencing while the western site boundary is undefined to the remainder of the field. The southern boundary is defined by post and wire fencing and hedge line.*
- *The lack of any meaningful natural vegetation to site boundaries results in the application site appearing as overly open and exposed site when viewed on approach in both directions along Ballyhackett Rd, with the proposed dwelling ultimately unable to be integrated into the site and wider landscape.*
- *The application site is at an elevation position in the landscape, considerably higher than the existing development to the north-east, east and south east of the site which, has been set into the landform, utilizing the steeply rising slopes to their immediate rear to provide a strong backdrop to their development and avoiding appearing as overly prominent, skyline features.*
- *The prominent setting of the application site coupled with the lack of any meaningful natural vegetation to site boundaries result in the application site appearing as an overly prominent and exposed site.*
- *Even when viewed from further vantage points along Altikeeragh Rd, a dwelling on the application site will be a notable feature in the landscape, and while will not appear as a skyline feature given the rising distant backdrop, will still appear as a conspicuous feature in the landscape.*
- *Given the prominence and lack of integration afforded to the site the proposal is contrary to Paragraph 6.70 of the SPPS and policies CTY13 and 14.*
- *Additionally, given the setting of the application site within the Binevenagh Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty the proposal would result in an adverse impact on the character and visual amenity of the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and is also contrary to Paragraph 6.186 Policy NH6 of PPS2*
- *Given the proximity of the application site to a Scheduled Monument LDY006:014 (possible Motte) and a Rath (LDY006:013) consultation with Historic Environment Division was undertaken.*
- *Within their initial response Historic Environment Division advised that concerns in relation to the setting of the monuments could be overcome through appropriate design and siting within the application site.*
- *Initially Historic Environment Division advised that any dwelling should be sited in the northern portion of the site, contrary to the applicant's preferred siting within the southern portion of the as identified on the site location plan.*
- *Historic Environment Division were invited to attend today's meeting to answer questions members may have in regard to the potential impact on*

the identified monuments. In preparation for the meeting Historic Environment Division undertook a site inspection. Upon assessment Historic Environment Division have provided an updated position to their formal response and have advised that given the condition and legibility of the scheduled monument and the separation between it and this application site, Historic Environment Division assess that satisfactory integration into the wider setting of the scheduled monument may be achieved though the design details noted in points 1 and 3 of our response. Historic Environment Division (Historic Monuments) would not advise that the positioning within the southern half of the site should in itself be seen as a reason to consider this proposal as contrary to Policy BH 1 of PPS 6 in this case.

- *Given the comments from Historic Environment Division the Planning Department would now withdraw refusal reason 2 as set out at Section 10 of the Planning Committee Report and amend refusal reason 3 to remove reference to failure to respect features of importance to the heritage of the landscape.*
- *In addition to Department of Agriculture and Rural Development and Historic Environment Division Consultation was also carried out with DFI Roads, NIEA and Environmental Health who have raised no concerns.*
- *In Conclusion the proposal is contrary to Paragraphs 6.70 and 6.186 of the SPPS, Policies CTY13 and 14 of PPS21 and Policy NH6 of PPS2. Refusal is recommended.*

The Chair invited questions from Elected Members for the Officer.

At the request of Councillor Watton the Senior Planning Officer advised that the site proposed was the preferred site of the applicant and referred Elected Members to a site map previously circulated which had been submitted by the applicant.

Councillor Watton referred to multiple dwellings, garages and sheds in the vicinity and questioned whether the skyline was impacted.

The Chair invited J Simpson to speak in support of the application.
J Simpson was not available.

Proposed by Councillor Watton
Seconded by Councillor Kennedy

- That application LA01/2025/0342/O (Referral) 40m West of 18 Ballyhackett Lane, Castlerock is deferred for a site visit to explore integration and impact on skyline.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

9 Members voted For; 0 Members voted Against, 1 Member Abstained
The Chair declared the Motion carried.

RESOLVED – That application LA01/2025/0342/O (Referral) 40m West of 18 Ballyhackett Lane, Castlerock is deferred for a site visit to explore integration and impact on skyline.

- * **Councillor Nicholl left the meeting remotely at 3.10 pm**
- * **Alderman S McKillop joined the meeting in the Chamber at 3:15 pm**

7. CORRESPONDENCE

The Chair presented Items 7.1 – 7.3 inclusive as read.

7.1 Dfl – Statutory Rule – Reverse Vending Machines

Copy, previously circulated was presented as read.

Correspondence re: Planning: General Permitted Development – The Planning (General Permitted Development) (Amendment) Order (Northern Ireland) 2026

Planning Committee NOTED the correspondence.

7.2 Dfl – Transforming Planning – Independent Inspectors Report

Copy, previously circulated, presented as read.

Correspondence re: Transforming Planning – Independent Inspectors Project

Correspondence related to item 4.1 above.

Planning Committee NOTED the correspondence.

7.3 Dfl – Section 26 – Altahullion Windfarm

Copy, previously circulated, presented as read.

Correspondence re: Location: Located in the townlands of Drum & Glenconway, Co. Londonderry.

Planning Committee NOTED the correspondence.

7.4 DCSDC – Notification – LDP Call for Evidence

Copy, previously circulated, presented as read.

Correspondence re: Derry City & Strabane District Council LDP Local Policies
Plan Call For Sites open 27th April – 31st July 2026

Planning Committee NOTED the correspondence.

8. REPORTS FOR DECISION

8.1 Planning Business Plan 2026/27

Report, previously circulated, was presented by the Development Management Manager

Purpose

The purpose of the Planning Service Business Plan is to set out the key business focus for Planning over the next business year for consideration and agreement by Members.

Details

The Planning Department Business Plan 2026/27 sets out the key objectives for the business over the next business year. It takes account of the current position at end of 2025/26 and builds on this performance for the incoming year.

The key functions of the Planning service area are:

- Local Development Planning – creating a plan which will set out a clear vision of how the council area should look in the future by deciding what type and scale of development should be encouraged and where it should be located to create a sustainable environment; designation of conservation areas; issuing Building Preservation Notices and Tree Preservation Orders.
- Development Management – determining the vast majority of planning applications and other planning consents, including waste and minerals applications, conservation area consents, advertisement consents, certificates of lawful development, non-material changes, and discharge of conditions.
- Planning Enforcement – investigating alleged breaches of planning control and taking action where it is considered expedient to do so; issuing of Urgent Works Notices.

The business plan objectives are:

- To improve performance in relation to processing of planning applications
- Preparation of Council's draft Plan Strategy

- To manage finance, staff, information and other resources effectively within the corporate governance framework

The Planning Department financial budget for 2026/27 has been agreed at £1.95m supported by predicted income of £1.32m bringing the total expenditure to £3.27m. The Planning Department staff structure comprises of 51.74 FTE staff which accounts for 92% of the overall expenditure.

The Planning Service Business Plan is attached at Appendix 1, previously circulated.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Planning Committee APPROVE the Planning Department Business Plan 2026/27.

The Development Management Manager highlighted key elements in terms of the objectives contained in the business plan to Elected Members.

At the request of Alderman Callan the Development Management Manager advised as follows:-

In respect of staffing despite movement in the past the picture at present is settled with few vacancies unfilled and a Senior Planning Officer recently appointed.

Alderman Callan explored the use of exit interviews and asked if there were any vacant positions in the Planning Department at this time.

The Director of Corporate Services referred to difficulties recruiting technical staff, a matter which was also raised with Royal Town Planning Institute grouping and spoke of the lack of capacity to transfer workload from nominated Planning Officer during periods of absence.

Alderman Callan said it would be useful to have continued monitoring of applications during period of absence.

Regarding apprenticeships the Director of Corporate Services advised that there were a range of apprenticeships and placements throughout Council currently in Environmental Services and ICT and confirmed that there was a student currently placed in the Planning Department.

In relation to customer satisfaction and service improvement the Development Management Manager advised that key stakeholders regularly meet with the planning department which now incorporates measurable outcomes and referred

to other improvement processes and mechanisms including the Planning Protocol.

Alderman Callan said that customer survey feedback should be encouraged by users of the system which would be advantageous to Planning Department and suggested this be built into future business plans.

The Chair concurred saying that applicants and agents could be encouraged to participate to ensure reliability of data.

Proposed by Alderman Callan

Seconded by Alderman Coyle

- That Planning Committee APPROVE the Planning Department Business Plan 2026/27.

The Chair put the motion to the vote

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

The Chair declared the motion carried.

RESOLVED - That Planning Committee APPROVE the Planning Department Business Plan 2026/27.

9. REPORTS FOR NOTING

9.1 Finance Report Period 1 – 12 2025/26

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

Purpose

This Report is to provide Members with an update on the financial position of the Planning Department for the Period 1-12 of 2025/26 business year.

Details

Planning is showing a variance of over £463k favourable position at end of Period 12 based on draft Management Accounts.

The favourable position at the end of Period 12 is due to a favourable position in relation to income from planning application fee and property certificate income of around £329K.

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 £40k, Development Plan £46k and Other Professional Costs £16k.

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 1-12 of 2025/26 financial year.

RESOLVED - that the Planning Committee NOTE the report.

9.2 QUARTERLY LDP UPDATE

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

Background

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

Studies to inform the LDP Preparation

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

Housing Study

At the request of Members, Council engaged Ulster University (UU) to carry out independent housing research on the new dwelling requirements in the Borough. An LDP Steering Group (Planning Committee) Workshop was held on 17th November 2025 to discuss.

Subsequently, a Notice of Motion, requesting that the Council asks that the UU Housing Study Report be presented to a meeting of the Full Council, was supported at the 6th January 2026 Council Meeting. UU presented the Housing Study at a Deputation Workshop held on 3rd February 2026.

Retail & Leisure Capacity Study

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

The Council engaged Nexus Planning to undertake a Retail & Commercial Leisure Capacity Study for the Borough. The final Study and accompanying LDP Policy Briefing Note were presented and agreed at the 28th January 2026 Planning Committee.

The Study was made available to view on the Council's website on 4th February 2026. The LDP Policy Briefing Note will inform the LDP Town Centre & Retail Planning Policies.

The Study was presented, at the request of the Planning Committee Chair, at a pre-Leisure & Development Committee meeting held on 21st April 2026.

LDP Work Programme

In line with the Council's current published Local Development Plan (LDP) Timetable, the 6-month indicative LDP Work Programme (Jan-Jun 2026) was presented at the 28th January 2026 Planning Committee.

An LDP Member Workshop on the Draft Plan Strategy preparation was held on 11th March 2026.

Officials continue to update the robust evidence base required to inform the LDP preparation and, where necessary, further LDP workshops will be scheduled.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Planning Committee note the content of this Report.

The Development Plan Manager provided commentary on the Retail & Leisure Capacity Study and Housing Study.

The Chair spoke of how helpful the Retail and Leisure Capacity Study had been very helpful to Elected Members.

At the request of Alderman Callan, the Development Plan Manager advised that the Local Development Plan evidence base is being updated given the intervening period since the Draft Plan Strategy was presented back in 2022. Any updated policies will require the agreement of Members and must then be subjected to a sustainability appraisal. Where required, further member workshops will be convened. It is expected that an updated version of the draft Plan Strategy will be presented for agreement around the end of this calendar year to Elected Members by the end of 2026.

RESOLVED - that the Planning Committee NOTE the report.

9.3 BT PAYPHONES – REMOVAL NOTICE

- The Crescent, Coleraine
- Clarehill Park, Aghadowey
- Main Street, Limavady

Report, previously circulated was presented

Purpose of Report

To present a British Telecom (BT) consultation on the removal of 3no. public payphones throughout the Borough.

Background

BT wrote to the Council on 14th April 2026 (see Appendix 1, previously circulated) advising that they have identified 3no. public payphones in the Borough.

To ensure the local community are fully informed, BT has displayed public notices (see template at Appendix 2, previously circulated), including posting dates, on the 3no. affected kiosks. These are located at the addresses set out in the attached sheet (see Appendix 3, previously circulated) All three are the more modern glass kiosks.

BT advised that they assessed these payphones using the criteria in Ofcom's Review of the telephony universal service obligation.

With payphone usage falling, communities are looking at new ways to re-use the phone boxes. BT has indicated that thousands of boxes have already been reinvented as cafes, mini-libraries, and defibrillator sites. Communities can adopt most red phone boxes for just £1. They can also adopt modern glass phone boxes if they wish to house a defibrillator. Officials have advised local community groups listed in the vicinity of the affected kiosks.

Officials emailed (on 23rd April 2026) local community groups in the vicinity of each affected kiosk advising them of the consultation and to contact BT directly (as is required) should they wish to adopt one.

Consultation on the current proposal affecting the Borough is open for 90 days (closing on 13th July 2026). In making its final decision BT will take account of any representations received from or through the Council.

BT will also write to the Council setting out reasons for its decision and publish the reasons at: www.bt.com/payphones/service.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the Planning Committee note the contents of the report and inform the Head of Planning, within the consultation period set out at paragraph 2.6 above, of any representations to this proposal.

RESOLVED - that Planning Committee NOTE the report.

10. ANY OTHER RELEVANT BUSINESS (IN ACCORDANCE WITH STANDING ORDER 12 (O))

There were no items of Any Other Relevant Business.

The Chair thanked the Officers for their support during his tenure as Chair and cited a favourable communication he had received from an applicant which he said underpinned the importance of the Planning Committee.

The Chair passed on his best wishes to the incoming Chair.

Alderman Callan thanked the Chair for his diligence, enthusiasm and hard work.

This being all the business the meeting closed at 3:20pm

Chair