

**Implementation Date: 01 September 2023**

**Template for Requesting Speaking Rights at the Planning Committee**

The Protocol for the Operation of the Planning Committee provides for interested person(s) to register to speak on a planning application that is scheduled to be determined at the next meeting of the Planning Committee. This request must be received by the Planning Department no later than 10am on the Monday before the Planning Committee meeting via email account [planning@causewaycoastandglens.gov.uk](mailto:planning@causewaycoastandglens.gov.uk).

<b>Planning Reference</b>	<del>LA01/2023/0459/a</del> LA01/2023/0563/0
<b>Name</b>	Carol Gourley C. McILvar Ltd
<b>Contact Details</b>	Tel Email:
<b>Support or Objection – please tick relevant box</b>	Support <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Objection <input type="checkbox"/>

**Written representation summarising key points to be addressed and supplementary information in support of your case (minimum font size 10 and maximum length two sides of A4 page).**

Policy CTY8 requires that a small gap site is within a substantial and continuously built-up frontage. There is a substantial and continuously built-up frontage comprising of No. 12, 14, 16, 22 & 26 Munalohug Rd and accompanying outbuildings.

Policy CTY8 also requires that the small gap site is sufficient only to accommodate up to a maximum of two houses provided the proposed development respects the existing development pattern along the frontage in terms of size, scale, siting, and plot size and meets other planning and environmental requirements. For the purposes of the policy, the gap to be considered is that between buildings which in this case is between No. 16 & 22. The frontage length of gap between these buildings' measures approx. 120m.

The frontage length of the application site measures approx. 55m would be in between that of No. 12 Mulalohug Road which has a frontage of 60m and No. 26 which has a frontage of 50m.

The neighbouring roadside plot widths are as follows, No. 12 (60m), No. 14 (45m) No. 16 (47m) and no. 26 (50m). This gives an average of approximately 51m.

Only No. 22, an old 2 storey roadside farmhouse with a plot length of 33m falls considerably below the average plot length along the road and appears as an anomaly along this stretch of road.

The existing settlement pattern along the road is characterised by dwellings with accompanying outbuildings set on generous roadside plots which front directly onto the road. Only no. 33 appears as an irregularity compared with the average plot sizes of its neighbours.

The proposed application site would have a roadside frontage of 55m, which is in keeping with the adjacent plots (with exception of No. 33) and only marginally larger than the average. Notably the proposed plot length would not exceed the largest plot along the frontage which is 60m at No. 12 Munalohug Road.

The policy requirement is that the gap should be small. In this case the gap is such that it could not fit more than two dwellings, meaning that it would respect the development pattern.

As the gap as a whole could NOT accommodate more than two dwellings with similar plot sizes to those along the road frontage, it qualifies as small and consequently the proposal meets the exception to Policy CTY8.

The Council argue that the sites provide 'an important visual break'. There is one clear node of development along the road frontage at Munalohug Road. The application site is squeezed within this node and for this reason it is not an important visual break.

Turning to the remaining policy requirements the application proposal would have a similar frontage width and similar plot size to No. 12 and No. 26. The proposal would not read as visually incongruous in this context given the neighbouring plot sizes.

The imposition of conditions restricting the ridge height of the dwelling, retaining existing vegetation and providing additional planting to the rear of the splays would be sufficient to provide visual integration and enclosure into the landscape setting.

The proposal qualifies as an exception under Policy CTY 8, and therefore it is in accordance with Policy CTY 1.