

SITE VISIT REPORT: Monday 26th January 2026

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

Application: LA01/2024/0061/F

App Type: Full

Proposal: Three proposed glamping pods as part of a Farm Diversification Scheme

Present: Ald Hunter, Cllrs Kennedy, Watton

Officials: Emma Hudson

Comments: The site visit began at the site along the laneway. The official advised the extent of the site by showing members the location plan. The official advised the description of development for 3 glamping pods and that it was submitted as part of a farm diversification scheme. The applicant was an active and established farmer and the application site was on their farm land. However, concern related to the siting of the proposed development as it was located between 2 distinct clusters of development along Harbour Road. The area was designated as a LLPA which states that it is visually important that these clusters remain. Our concern relates to the fact that development would extend these clusters and adversely impact on the visual gap when viewed from the laneway and along Whitepark Rd. The area is of highly scenic value to tourists and when viewed from Whitepark rd would impact on the view and layout of the topography which is characterised by a long linear field pattern. Views are achieved of the church at Ballintoy which is listed and of public interest and the setting is currently free from development from this viewpoint.

The official pointed out the 2 Listed buildings in the vicinity of the site (Ballintoy Church and 130 Whitepark Road) and that HED had concerns in relation to the impact in particular from no. 130 Whitepark Road.

The official showed members the site layout and section plan and that the pods had been reduced during processing of the application. She advised that the pods sat lower than the laneway however were set back into the site and elevated views would be achieved from the Whitepark Road. Also new

boundaries would be uncharacteristic of the current field pattern. The official advised that a siting closer to the existing cluster may be more appropriate however the agent felt that this area was more elevated and integration wouldn't be as good. The official pointed out the McShane Glen holiday complex and that extension to it had been limited to ensure a more compact form in the landscape.

The official advised reasons for refusal related to the SPPS, NAP, PPS 21, PPS 2 and PPS 16.

E Hudson

26.01.26