

34 & 38 Ballymadigan Road
Castlerock
Co. Londonderry
BT51 4RR

20th May 2024

Mr Oliver McMullan
Chairperson, Planning Committee
Causeway Coast & Glens Borough Council
Cloonavin, 66 Portstewart Road
Coleraine, Co. Londonderry BT52 1EY

Dear Sir

Proposed dwelling & detached garage, 30m south of 34 - 36 Ballymadigan Road, Castlerock Your ref. LA01/2023/0627/O

We wish the comments and concerns noted below to be communicated on our behalf, to the Planning Committee at or before their meeting on Wednesday 22nd May in regards to the above planning application.

As brother and sister, we have lived side by side at our current addresses for decades and have enjoyed the quiet rural setting, pleasant views and southerly aspect to the rear of our properties. We hope you and your colleagues can therefore understand our concerns regarding this planning application which proposes a new house and garage immediately to the rear our properties. The proposed dwelling, if permitted, will rob us of privacy in our rear gardens, obstruct the pleasant views and sunny aspect to the rear of our houses and potentially disrupt the peace and quiet we have enjoyed in our homes for many years.

Our houses are located immediately adjacent to the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty defined in the Northern Area Plan 2016 and we would question how the proposed site which is arbitrarily cut out of large field can ever comply with the stringent planning requirements for visual integration of new development within such a sensitive rural environment.

We have consulted local architects and they cannot see how such a planning application can be passed under the relevant planning policy PPS21. Leaving aside our personal concerns, they inform me that the proposal does not come close to complying with any of the limited number of scenarios under this planning policy where a new house can be permitted in the countryside. It is neither a dwelling within a cluster of houses complying with CTY2A, an infill dwelling complying with CTY8 nor a dwelling on a farm complying with the requirements of CTY10. We are greatly heartened that the Planning Service have come to the same conclusion as our architects and have made a sensible decision to refuse this planning application.

In referring the Planning Service's decision to refuse this planning application to the

Planning Committee, the applicant's agents have argued that the proposed dwelling should be considered as a new dwelling in a cluster complying with planning policy PPS21 CTY2A. This policy requires that **ALL** of the following six criteria are met:-

1. The cluster of development lies outside of a farm and consists of four or more buildings (excluding ancillary buildings such as garages outbuildings and open-sided structures) of which at least three are dwellings.
2. The cluster appears as a visual entity in the local landscape.
3. The cluster is associated with a focal point such as a social/ community building facility or is located at a crossroads.
4. The identified site provides a suitable degree of enclosure and is bounded on at least two sides with other development in the cluster.
5. Development of the site can be absorbed into the existing cluster through rounding off and consolidation and will not significantly alter its existing character or visually intrude into the open countryside
6. Development would not adversely impact on residential amenity.

Just because at one time, there were three houses where there are now two, does not mean that criteria 1 is met. There are **now** only two semi-detached houses and their garages so clearly criteria 1 is not complied with.

Two semi-detached houses do not constitute a cluster therefore criteria 2 is not met.

The two houses are clearly not associated with a social or community building or a crossroads so criteria 3 is not complied with.

The site is only bound on one side by the two houses therefore criteria 4 is not complied with either.

Whether criteria 5 can be complied with is highly dubious.

The loss of our privacy in our rear gardens and obstruction of the views to the rear of our houses should be sufficient to determine that the new dwelling will have an adverse impact on our residential amenity therefore criteria 6 is not met.

The above reveals that the planning application barely meets **any** of the criteria necessary to comply with policy CTY2A rather than the **six** that are required.

The applicant's agents have cited as a precedent, a nearby approved house under planning application LA01/2020/0615/F which is a dwelling on a farm applied for by a farmer and considered under planning policy CTY10. This is entirely irrelevant to our contested planning application as it was considered under an entirely different part of the planning policy.

We request that the Planning Committee respect the relevant planning policies and agree with the officers within their Planning Department and refuse this planning application and thereby protect our quiet enjoyment of our homes.

Yours faithfully



Charlie Thompson (no. 34) & Florence Patterson (no. 38)