

SITE VISIT REPORT: MONDAY 20th May 2024

Committee Members: Alderman, Boyle, Coyle, Scott, Stewart, S McKillop (Vice Chair) and; Councillors Anderson, C Archibald, Hunter, Kennedy, McGurk, McMullan (Chair), Peacock, Nicholl, Storey, Wallace and Watton

LA01/2020/0631/O – 168 Agivey Road, Coleraine

App Type: Outline Application

Proposal: Replacement of derelict former school building with dwelling and alteration of existing access to serve the development

Present: Alderman Boyle and Coyle, Councillors Archibald, Hunter and Watton

Officials: J McMath

Comments: Site visit took place within site at 168 Agivey Road, Coleraine. Officials outlined the details of the application and showed members a copy of the site location plan. Officials outlined the red line, the boundaries of the site, all members viewed all of the existing buildings on site and officials answered questions about the proposed access.

Officials explained that the proposal seeks outline permission for the replacement of the former school building with a dwelling and alteration of the existing access to serve the development. Officials explained that the SPPS does not permit the replacement of former schools with dwellings and under CTY3 explained that as the building does not display the essential characteristics of a dwelling, as it was a former school building, replacement is not permitted under the first test of CTY3.

Officials referred members to third paragraph of CTY3 which permits replacement of a redundant non residential building with a single dwelling where redevelopment would bring significant environmental benefit and provided the building is not listed or otherwise makes an important contribution to the heritage, appearance or character of the locality. Officials explained that the building is not listed but makes an important contribution to the heritage of the locality and advised that no significant environmental benefits had been

forthcoming. Therefore, CTY3 does not permit replacement of this non residential building.

Officials advised that a structural report had been submitted which advised that the main school building is in a “relatively good condition” and that the building could be retained as a store or garage. Officials confirmed that Building Control had been consulted on a previous application which contained the structural report. In answer to comments about significant environmental benefits officials referred members to PAC examples quoted in committee report/addendum.

Officials outlined the planning history on the site and explained that a previous application for the replacement of the building was recommended for refusal under LA01/2017/1311/O in 2018, that Committee had agreed with the recommendation to refuse and that the application was subsequently withdrawn.

Members asked about any other planning history on the remainder of the school site and officials explained that there was planning history but confirmed that I would find out if it was still live for the committee meeting.

J McMath