

## MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

In the Chair	:	Councillor S Flanagan	
Committee Members Present	:	Aldermen - T Campbell a Councillors - J Archibald-I N Ramsay and R Swann	nd J Smyth Brown, H Cushinan, M Magill,
Non-Committee Members Present	:	Councillors A Bennington,	, A McAuley, V McWilliam and R Wilson
Public Speakers	:	Gavin Rolston David Donaldson Tom Stokes Brendan Heatley Councillor R Wilson Kevin Pelan Paul Heron Nelson McCausland John Smylie Dermot Monaghan Patrick O'Reilly Stephanie Lyttle Simon Russell Richard Agus Nigel Coffey Robert Bryson Robert Kerr Andrew Rankin Jenny Mawhinney	In Objection (Item 3.1) In Support (Agent, Item 3.1) In Support (Agent, Item 3.2) In Objection (Item 3.2) In Objection (Item 3.3) In Objection (Item 3.3) In Support (Agent, Item 3.3) In Objection (Item 3.4) In Support (Agent, Item 3.4) In Support (Agent, Item 3.4) In Support (Agent, Item 3.6) In Objection (Item 3.7) In Support (Agent, Item 3.7) In Support (Agent, Item 3.7) In Support (Agent, Item 3.8 & 3.9) In Support (Agent, Item 3.13) In Support (Agent, Item 3.14) In Support (Agent, Item 3.14) In Support (Agent, Item 3.15)
Officers Present	:	- M McAlister Deputy Director of Plannin Borough Lawyer & Head	of Legal Services - P Casey pment Management (Interim) < O'Connell A Leathem er – C Bell Vilson er – V Lisk

## CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS

The Chairperson welcomed Committee Members to the May Planning Committee Meeting. The Chairperson reminded all present of the protocol for speaking, timeframes accorded and of the audio recording procedures.

Although COVID restrictions had been relaxed, to manage numbers and minimise risk, members of the public and press could continue to access those parts of the Council meetings which they are entitled to attend through the livestream on the Council's website.

The Chairperson advised Members that additional information relating to Items 3.4 & 3.5 had been uploaded to the Planning Portal in advance of the meeting, that Addendum reports relating to Items 3.4, and 3.5, the Site Visit report along with an updated speakers' list had also been circulated to Members in advance of the meeting, with hard copies being made available in the Chamber.

The Chairperson further advised Members that Item 3.10 had been withdrawn by Officers.

## 1 APOLOGIES

Aldermen - F Agnew and P Brett Councillors - R Lynch and B Webb Chief Executive J Dixon

The Borough Lawyer & Head of Legal Services reminded Members about a number of issues in relation to their role as Members of the Planning Committee and their obligations under the Code of Conduct.

## 2 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Item 3.14 - Councillor Archibald-Brown

## PART ONE PLANNING APPLICATIONS

## ITEM 3.1 APPLICATION NO: LA03/2020/0880/RM

PROPOSAL:	Development of 57 no. dwellings (27 detached, 22 semi- detached and 8 detached bungalows) with garages and associated landscaping and site works. New vehicular access to join approved Ballyclare Relief Road and pedestrian/cycle access to Doagh Road.
SITE/LOCATION:	Lands to the north of 150 Doagh Road and west of approved Ballyclare Relief Road, Ballyclare, BT39 0TN
APPLICANT:	Mr and Mrs William Stevenson

Kieran O'Connell, Senior Planning Officer, introduced the Planning Report to the Committee and made a recommendation to approve reserved matters.

The undernoted public speakers addressed the Committee and responded to enquiries from Members as requested –

Gavin Rolston	In Objection
David Donaldson	In Support/Agent
Damian McLaughlin	In Support/Architect (for questions)

Proposed by Alderman Campbell Seconded by Alderman Smyth that reserved matters be approved.

On the proposal being put to the meeting 7 Members voted in favour, 0 against and 1 abstention, it was agreed that

# reserved matters be approved for the application subject to the conditions set out in the Planning Report

ACTION BY: Sharon Mossman, Deputy Director of Planning

#### ITEM 3.2 APPLICATION NO: LA03/2021/0548/F

PROPOSAL:	Residential development comprising 56 no. dwellings, garages, open space and landscaping, car parking, site access, wastewater treatment works and all other associated site works.
SITE/LOCATION:	Lands west of Hydepark Lane, south west of 23 Hydepark Road and c.195m south east of 12A Grange Lane Mallusk.

**APPLICANT:** Hydepark Road Developments Ltd

Kieran O'Connell, Senior Planning Officer, introduced the Planning Report to the Committee, advised Members that the application was for 55 dwellings and made a recommendation to grant planning permission.

The undernoted public speakers addressed the Committee and responded to enquiries from Members as requested –

Tom Stokes	In Support/Agent
Brendan Heatley	In Objection
Michael Mullan	In Support/Agent (for questions)
Conor O'Hara	In Support/Consultant (for questions)
John Stewart	In Support/Applicant (for questions)

Proposed by Alderman Campbell Seconded by Councillor Archibald-Brown that planning permission be granted.

On the proposal being put to the meeting 7 Members voted in favour, 0 against and 1 abstention, it was agreed that

#### planning permission be granted for the application subject to the conditions set out in the Planning Report

ACTION BY: Sharon Mossman, Deputy Director of Planning

Councillor Magill left and returned to the Chamber during the following item and was therefore unable to vote on item 3.3.

## ITEM 3.3 APPLICATION NO: LA03/2020/0516/F

PROPOSAL:	Proposed 6no glamping pods and welcome/communal building with associated siteworks
SITE/LOCATION:	130m NW of 14 Ballydunmaul Road, Randalstown
APPLICANT:	James Alexander

Kieran O'Connell, Senior Planning Officer, introduced the Planning Report to the Committee and made a recommendation to grant planning permission.

The undernoted Elected Member and public speakers addressed the Committee and responded to enquiries from Members as requested –

Councillor R Wilson	In Objection
Kevin Pelan	In Objection
Paul Heron	In Support/Agent

Proposed by Councillor Archibald-Brown

Seconded by Alderman Smyth that the application be deferred to the June Meeting of the Planning Committee to seek clarification from Dfl Roads Service.

On the proposal being put to the meeting 4 Members voted in favour, 2 against and 0 abstention, it was agreed that

the application be deferred to the June Meeting of the Planning Committee to seek clarification from Dfl Roads Service.

ACTION BY: Sharon Mossman, Deputy Director of Planning

## ITEM 3.4 APPLICATION NO: LA03/2020/0744/F

PROPOSAL:	Demolition of existing house, erection of 5 no. 2-storey detached houses with associated hard and soft landscaping, and new vehicular entrance to Ballycraigy Road.
SITE/LOCATION:	4 Ballycraigy Road, Glengormley, Newtownabbey, BT36 5ZZ
APPLICANT:	Noel Reid

Barry Diamond, Head of Planning Development Management (Interim), introduced the Planning Report and associated addendum report to the Committee and made a recommendation to refuse planning permission.

The undernoted public speakers addressed the Committee and responded to enquiries from Members as requested –

Nelson McCausland John Smylie In Objection In Support/Agent

Proposed by Alderman Campbell

Seconded by Councillor Ramsay that planning permission be refused.

On the proposal being put to the meeting 8 Members voted in favour, 0 against and 0 abstentions, it was unanimously agreed that

#### planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposal is contrary to the policy provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policy QD 1 of Planning Policy Statement 7 'Quality Residential Environments' in that the proposed development does not respect the surrounding context and is considered to be inappropriate to the character and appearance of the area; the layout will have an adverse impact on the amenity of existing and proposed residents in terms of overlooking and overshadowing, dominance and general disturbance.
- 2. The proposal is contrary to the policy provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policy LC 1 of Addendum to Planning Policy Statement 7 'Safeguarding the Character of Established Residential Areas' in that the proposed development does not respect the surrounding context and is considered to be inappropriate to the character and appearance of the area.
- 3. The proposal is contrary to the policy provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and would cause harm to an interest of acknowledged importance, namely sewage disposal, as it has not been demonstrated there is a satisfactory means of dealing with sewage associated with the development.

ACTION BY: Sharon Mossman, Deputy Director of Planning

## ITEM 3.5 APPLICATION NO: LA03/2021/0739/F

PROPOSAL:	Demolition of existing shed on the site. Proposed residential development comprising of 10 x 2 storey semi-detached dwellings and 2 x 2 storey town houses, associated infrastructure, carparking and landscaping.
SITE/LOCATION:	Site 10m East of 10 and 19 Glenabbey Drive 10m East of 20 and 23 Glenabbey Avenue 10m East of 26 and 53 Glenabbey Crescent Newtownabbey BT37 0YT
APPLICANT:	T A Downey Limited

Barry Diamond, Head of Planning Development Management (Interim), introduced the Planning Report and associated addendum report to the Committee and made a recommendation to refuse planning permission.

The undernoted public speakers addressed the Committee and responded to enquiries from Members as requested –

Dermot Monaghan	In Support/Consultant
Edelle Henry	In Support/Agent (for questions)
Ronan Sheehy	In Support/Consultant (for questions)
Rey Gaston	In Support/Consultant (for questions)

Proposed by Councillor Ramsay

Seconded by Councillor Flanagan that planning permission be refused.

On the proposal being put to the meeting 5 Members voted in favour, 3 against and 0 abstention, it was agreed that

#### planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposal is contrary to the policy provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policy QD 1 of Planning Policy Statement 7 'Quality Residential Environments' in that the proposed boundary treatment on Plot 7 would be detrimental to the overall quality of the layout and residential environment.
- 2. The proposal is contrary to the policy provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and would cause harm to an interest of acknowledged importance, namely sewage disposal, as it has not been demonstrated there is a satisfactory means of dealing with sewage associated with the development.
- 3. The proposal is contrary to the policy provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policy QD 1 of Planning Policy Statement 7 'Quality Residential Environments' in that it has not been demonstrated that there will be no unacceptable adverse effects on the proposed properties in terms of noise and vibration.

ACTION BY: Sharon Mossman, Deputy Director of Planning

Councillor Swann experienced technical difficulties during item 3.6 and therefore was unable to vote on Item 3.6.

#### ITEM 3.6 APPLICATION NO: LA03/2021/0304/O

PROPOSAL:	Proposed demolition of existing dwellings at no. 89-93 Belfast Road and erection of 8 No dwellings with associated site works
SITE/LOCATION:	Land to the South of 85 Belfast Road Bruslee Ballyclare including no. 89-93 Belfast Road but excluding existing hall
APPLICANT:	Ms R Lindsay

Barry Diamond, Head of Planning Development Management (Interim), introduced the Planning Report to the Committee and made a recommendation to refuse outline planning permission.

The undernoted public speaker addressed the Committee and responded to enquiries from Members as requested –

Patrick O'Reilly In Support/Agent

#### Proposed by Alderman Campbell

Seconded by Councillor Ramsay that outline planning permission be refused.

On the proposal being put to the meeting 7 Members voted in favour, 0 against and 0 abstention, it was unanimously agreed that

#### outline planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

- The proposal is contrary to the policy provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement, Policy QD1 of Planning Policy Statement 7 (PPS 7), Quality Residential Environments, and Policy LC1 of the second Addendum to PPS 7, Safeguarding the Character of Established Residential Areas, in that the proposed development represents an overdevelopment of the site as: it does not respect the surrounding context in terms of the density of development.
- 2. The proposal is contrary to the policy provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policy QD1 of Planning Policy Statement 7 (PPS 7), Quality Residential Environments, in that it has not been established that there will not be an adverse impact upon future residents of the site in terms of noise generated from Bruslee Recycling site.
- 3. The proposal is contrary to the policy provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Planning Policy Statement 3, Access, Movement and Parking, Policy AMP 2, in that it would, if permitted, prejudice the safety and convenience of road users since it adds to a proliferation of accesses onto this road.
- 4. The proposal is contrary to the policy provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement, in that, it has not been established that the proposal would safeguard the future residential amenity of the site from the detrimental impact of existing land contamination.

ACTION BY: Sharon Mossman, Deputy Director of Planning

Councillor Cushinan left and returned to the meeting during the following Item and was therefore unable to vote.

## ITEM 3.7 APPLICATION NO: LA03/2020/0551/O

PROPOSAL:	Site for detached dwelling and garage
SITE/LOCATION:	40 metres southeast of 96 Jordanstown Road, Jordanstown, Newtownabbey, BT37 0NU
APPLICANT:	Mr & Mrs S Russell and Mr & Mrs J Russell

Barry Diamond, Head of Planning Development Management (Interim), introduced the Planning Report to the Committee and made a recommendation to refuse outline planning permission.

The undernoted public speakers addressed the Committee and responded to enquiries from Members as requested –

Stephanie Lyttle Richard Agus Simon Russell In Objection In Support/Consultant In Support/Applicant

Proposed by Alderman Campbell

Seconded by Councillor Archibald-Brown that outline planning permission be refused.

On the proposal being put to the meeting 3 Members voted in favour, 3 against and 1 abstention. The Chairperson used his casting vote in favour of the proposal and it was agreed that

outline planning permission be refused for the following reason:

1. The proposal is contrary to the SPPS and Policy AMP 2 of Planning Policy Statement 3 Access, Movement and Parking as it has not been demonstrated that the access will not prejudice road safety or significantly inconvenience the flow of traffic on the Jordanstown Road.

ACTION BY: Sharon Mossman, Deputy Director of Planning

Alderman Smyth left and returned to the Chamber during the following item and was therefore unable to vote on Item 3.8.

## ITEM 3.8 APPLICATION NO: LA03/2022/0053/O

PROPOSAL:	Site for a dwelling and garage and associated ancillary works (infill opportunity as per CTY8 of PPS21)
SITE/LOCATION:	50m south of 10a Ballyhill Lane, Nutts Corner, Crumlin
APPLICANT:	Mr JH Carson

Alicia Leathem, Senior Planning Officer, introduced the Planning Report to the Committee and made a recommendation to refuse outline planning permission.

The undernoted public speaker addressed the Committee and responded to enquiries from Members as requested –

Nigel Coffey In Support/Agent

Proposed by Councillor Flanagan Seconded by Councillor Archibald-Brown that outline planning permission be refused.

On the proposal being put to the meeting 6 Members voted in favour, 1 against and 0 abstentions, it was agreed that

#### outline planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposal is contrary to the policy provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policy CTY1 of PPS 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside, in that there are no overriding reasons why this development is essential in this rural location and could not be located within a settlement and fails to meet with the provisions for an infill dwelling in accordance with Policy CTY 8 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside, in that the application site does not comprise a small gap within a substantial and continuously built up frontage.

- 2. The proposal is contrary to the policy provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy and Policy CTY 13 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside, in that the proposed site lacks long established natural boundaries and is unable to provide a suitable degree of enclosure for the building to integrate into the landscape.
- 3. The proposal is contrary to the provisions contained in the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policies CTY 8 and 14 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside, in that the building would, if permitted, would result in a suburban style build-up of development; and the creation of ribbon development along Ballyhill Lane.

ACTION BY: Sharon Mossman, Deputy Director of Planning

#### ITEM 3.9 APPLICATION NO: LA03/2022/0054/O

PROPOSAL:	Site for a dwelling and garage and associated ancillary works (infill opportunity as per CTY8 of PPS21)
SITE/LOCATION:	50m north of 14 Ballyhill Lane, Nutts Corner, Crumlin, BT29 4YP
APPLICANT:	Mr JH Carson

Alicia Leathem, Senior Planning Officer, introduced the Planning Report to the Committee and made a recommendation to refuse outline planning permission.

The undernoted public speaker addressed the Committee and responded to enquiries from Members as requested –

Nigel Coffey In Support/Agent

Proposed by Councillor Flanagan

Seconded by Councillor Archibald-Brown that outline planning permission be refused.

On the proposal being put to the meeting 6 Members voted in favour, 1 against and 0 abstentions, it was agreed that

#### outline planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposal is contrary to the policy provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policy CTY1 of PPS 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside, in that there are no overriding reasons why this development is essential in this rural location and could not be located within a settlement and fails to meet with the provisions for an infill dwelling in accordance with Policy CTY 8 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside, in that the application site does not comprise a small gap within a substantial and continuously built up frontage.

- 2. The proposal is contrary to the policy provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy and Policy CTY 13 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside, in that the proposed site lacks long established natural boundaries and is unable to provide a suitable degree of enclosure for the building to integrate into the landscape.
- 3. The proposal is contrary to the provisions contained in the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policies CTY 8 and 14 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside, in that the building would, if permitted, would result in a suburban style build-up of development; and the creation of ribbon development along Ballyhill Lane.

ACTION BY: Sharon Mossman, Deputy Director of Planning

ITEM 3.10 APPLICATION NO: LA03/2019/1049/O

PROPOSAL:	Proposed new dwelling on a farm
SITE/LOCATION:	Site 75m west of 19 Loup Road, Moneyglass
APPLICANT:	Ms Mary Duffin

The Chairperson advised Members that this application had been withdrawn by Officers.

ACTION BY: Sharon Mossman, Deputy Director of Planning

Councillor Archibald-Brown left the Chamber during the following item and was therefore unable to vote on Item 3.11.

#### ITEM 3.11 APPLICATION NO: LA03/2022/0050/O

PROPOSAL:	Site for dwelling and domestic garage
SITE/LOCATION:	50m South West of 56 Roguery Road, Toomebridge, BT41 3TJ
APPLICANT:	Damian O'Donnell

Alicia Leathem, Senior Planning Officer, introduced the Planning Report to the Committee and made a recommendation to refuse outline planning permission.

There were no public speakers to address this item.

Proposed by Alderman Smyth

Seconded by Councillor Ramsay that outline planning permission be refused.

On the proposal being put to the meeting 7 Members voted in favour, 0 against and 0 abstentions, it was unanimously agreed that

that outline planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposal is contrary to the provisions contained in the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policies CTY 1, CTY 2a and CTY 8 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside, in that there are no overriding reasons why this development is essential in this rural location and could not be located within a settlement and it fails to meet with the provisions for an infill dwelling in accordance with Policy CTY 8 or a dwelling in an existing cluster in accordance with Policy CTY 2a of PPS21.
- 2. The proposal is contrary to the provisions contained in the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policies CTY 8 and 14 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside, in that the building would, if permitted, would extend an existing ribbon of development and result in a suburban style build-up of development.

ACTION BY: Sharon Mossman, Deputy Director of Planning

Councillor Archibald-Brown returned to the Chamber during item 3.12 and was therefore unable to vote.

#### ITEM 3.12 APPLICATION NO: LA03/2022/0068/O

PROPOSAL:	Site for dwelling on a farm and detached garage
SITE/LOCATION:	60m east of 147 Portglenone Road, Ballytresna, Randalstown, BT41 3EN
APPLICANT:	R Rainey & Sons Ltd

Alicia Leathem, Senior Planning Officer, introduced the Planning Report to the Committee and made a recommendation to refuse outline planning permission.

There were no public speakers to address this item.

Proposed by Councillor Magill Seconded by Alderman Campbell that outline planning permission be refused.

On the proposal being put to the meeting 7 Members voted in favour, 0 against and 0 abstentions, it was unanimously agreed that

#### outline planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposal is contrary to the policy provisions contained in the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policy CTY 1 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside, in that there are no overriding reasons why this development is essential in this rural location and could not be located within a settlement.
- 2. The proposal is contrary to the provisions contained in the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policy CTY 10 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside, in that it has not been demonstrated that the farm business is both active and established over a 6-year period.

3. The proposal is contrary to the provisions contained in the Strategic Planning Policy Statement in that insufficient information has been provided in order to determine that the proposed development will not have a detrimental impact on human health resultant from contamination risks associated with the sites historic land use.

ACTION BY: Sharon Mossman, Deputy Director of Planning

Councillor Magill left and retuned to the Chamber during Item 3.13 and was therefore unable to vote.

#### ITEM 3.13 APPLICATION NO: LA03/2021/1055/F

PROPOSAL:	Proposed new driveway access alteration including infilling and raising of ground level of side garden to create lawn area (Retrospective).
SITE/LOCATION:	86 Lurgan Road, Crumlin, BT29 4QE.
APPLICANT:	Mr Thomas Stewart

Alicia Leathem, Senior Planning Officer, introduced the Planning Report to the Committee and made a recommendation to refuse planning permission.

The undernoted public speaker addressed the Committee and responded to enquiries from Members as requested –

Robert Bryson In Support/Agent

Proposed by Alderman Campbell Seconded by Councillor Ramsay that planning permission be refused.

On the proposal being put to the meeting 5 Members voted in favour, 2 against and 0 abstentions, it was agreed that

#### planning permission be refused for the following reason:

1. The proposal is contrary to the provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policy FLD 3 of PPS 15 Planning and Flood Risk in that the development would, if permitted, increase the risk of flooding elsewhere through the removal of the flood storage area on the application site.

ACTION BY: Sharon Mossman, Deputy Director of Planning

Having declared an interest in the following item Councillor Archibald-Brown left the Chamber.

## ITEM 3.14 APPLICATION NO: LA03/2022/0154/F

PROPOSAL:	Erection of single-storey replacement agricultural style shed to west of site and new replacement timber fencing to front of site (retrospective development)
SITE/LOCATION:	168 Doagh Road, Ballyclare, BT39 9ER
APPLICANT:	Mrs Lynda Thompson

Barry Diamond, Head of Planning Development Management (Interim), introduced the Planning Report to the Committee and made a recommendation to refuse planning permission.

The undernoted public speakers addressed the Committee and responded to enquiries from Members as requested –

Robert Kerr	In Support/Agent
Andrew Rankin	In Support/Applicant

Proposed by Alderman Campbell Seconded by Councillor Ramsay that planning permission be refused.

On the proposal being put to the meeting 5 Members voted in favour, 1 against and 1 abstention, it was agreed that

## planning permission be refused for the following reason:

1. The proposal is contrary to Policy EXT1 of the Addendum to Planning Policy Statement 7 in that the development would, if permitted, detract from the appearance of No. 168 Doagh Road and its design and appearance would have a detrimental impact on the appearance and character of the area.

ACTION BY: Sharon Mossman, Deputy Director of Planning

Councillor Archibald-Brown returned to the Chamber.

## ITEM 3.15 APPLICATION NO: LA03/2021/0951/F

PROPOSAL:	Part change of use of council building to provide an extension to previously approved adjoining waste transfer station (T/2012/0225/F). Internal layout changes, changes to the elevation and other associated site works.
SITE/LOCATION:	Council Depot, 6b Orchard Way, Newpark Industrial Estate, Antrim, BT41 2RU
APPLICANT:	Natural World Products Ltd

Barry Diamond, Head of Planning Development Management (Interim), introduced the Planning Report to the Committee and made a recommendation to grant planning permission.

The undernoted public speaker addressed the Committee and responded to enquiries from Members as requested –

Jenny Mawhinney In Support/Agent

Proposed by Councillor Magill Seconded by Councillor Ramsay that planning permission be granted.

On the proposal being put to the meeting 7 Members voted in favour, 0 against and 1 abstention, it was agreed that

## planning permission be granted for the application subject to the conditions set out in the Planning Report

ACTION BY: Sharon Mossman, Deputy Director of Planning

## PART TWO OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

#### ITEM 3.16

## P/PLAN/1 DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS AND APPEALS

A list of planning decisions issued by Officers during April 2022 under delegated powers together with information relating to planning appeals was circulated for Members' information.

One appeal in relation to LA03/2020/0202/F (PAC Reference 2021/A0140) regarding a proposed rounding off to Glenoak Grange Meadows, Crumlin was withdrawn.

Proposed by Alderman Campbell Seconded by Councillor Flanagan and agreed that

#### the report be noted.

NO ACTION

#### ITEM 3.17

# P/FP/LDP/001/VOL2 MID AND EAST ANTRIM BOROUGH COUNCIL – CORRESPONDENCE

Members were advised that correspondence had been received from Mid and East Antrim in relation to their Local Development Plan Independent Examination. A copy of the correspondence was circulated for Members' information. Proposed by Alderman Campbell Seconded by Councillor Flanagan and agreed that

## the report be noted.

NO ACTION

#### ITEM 3.18

# P/FP/LDP/052 STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND (SoCG) BETWEEN ANTRIM AND NEWTOWNABBEY BOROUGH COUNCIL AND BELFAST CITY COUNCIL

A Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) between Antrim and Newtownabbey Borough Council and Belfast City Council on matters relating to each respective Local Development Plan (LDP) Draft Plan Strategy (DPS) had been agreed, and was circulated for Members information.

Proposed by Alderman Campbell Seconded by Councillor Flanagan and agreed that

#### the report be noted.

NO ACTION ITEM 3.19

#### P/FP/LDP/1 INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION UPDATE

The Planning Appeals Commission had published the Hearing Programme for weeks 3 and 4 of the public hearing sessions of the Independent Examination of the Councils Draft Plan Strategy, to be conducted from Monday 20 June 2022 to Friday 1 July 2022 inclusive. Topics to be covered include Spatial Growth Strategy, Housing, Community Infrastructure, Monitoring and Status of Changes were circulated. Anticipated questions for these sessions would be published in due course.

Proposed by Alderman Campbell Seconded by Councillor Flanagan and agreed that

#### the report be noted.

NO ACTION

The Chairperson advised that Any Other Business would be taken at this point.

#### 4. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

There being no other business, the Chairperson thanked the Planning Committee for their participation for the last year and extended his thanks to the Vice-Chair, Director, Officers, Member Services and IT for their support during his tenure.

Some Members commended the Chairperson and Vice Chairperson on their stewardship of the Committee.

## PROPOSAL TO PROCEED 'IN CONFIDENCE'

Proposed by Councillor Archibald-Brown Seconded by Alderman Smyth and agreed that

#### the following Committee business be taken In Confidence.

The Chairperson advised that the livestream and audio recording would now cease.

## PART TWO OTHER PLANNING MATTERS IN CONFIDENCE

**ITEM 3.20** 

## P/FP/LDP/1 PROPOSED CHANGES TO DRAFT PLAN STRATEGY – IN CONFIDENCE

The Independent Examination into the Council's Draft Plan Strategy for the Local Development Plan commenced on 4 May 2022 and was ongoing.

Under the Council's Revised Scheme of Delegation, powers were delegated to officers in relation to minor changes relating to typographical, clarificatory of factual modification which do not materially alter the operation of substance of the development plan. A number of these minor changes had been agreed during the IE process.

However, during the course of the Examination, two other proposed changes, as set out below, fall under part Part E (d) and (e) of the Council's Scheme of Delegation which go beyond a minor modification and as such must be brought to Planning Committee for consideration. These changes relate to Retail Policy and Overhead Electricity Lines, the detail of which is set out below.

Retail Policy - Proposed Change 1

Development Management (DM) Policy 6.2 "Development within Centres". Page 97 of the Draft Plan Strategy

DM 6.2 on page 98 of the Draft Plan Strategy, relates to planning to support and protect "Town Centres".

The policy as drafted states that proposals that would result in the loss of retail units would only be permitted where it was demonstrated that the retail use was no longer viable (e.g. evidence to show that despite marketing of the unit/building for at least 12 months there had been no interest shown). It was the view of officers that in the current pandemic climate and to support other acceptable town centre uses that the policy should be amended to a lesser test of at least 6 month's marketing, as opposed to one year's marketing.

Proposed change - DM 6.2 amend "at least 12 months" to "at least 6 months".

Public Utilities and Infrastructure Policy - Proposed Change 2

Development Management (DM) Policy 14 "Public Utilities and Infrastructure". Page 126 of the Draft Plan Strategy

Policy DM 14 relates to Public Utilities and Infrastructure. DM 14.3 relates specifically to overhead electricity lines. This policy states that overhead electricity lines would

be acceptable where they meet a number of criteria including that they avoid areas identified for their landscape importance. The Draft Plan Strategy had identified a number of Strategic Landscape Policy Areas with Local Landscape Policy Areas to be identified at the next stage of the plan.

The Planning Commissioner raised questions in relation to the Council's proposed policy in terms of how flexible the policy was. NIE Networks also raised an objection to the policy at the time of the public consultation (enclosed) and also at the IE. The reference to "SP 8" in the text was already a minor change agreed by the Council in its public consultation report.

At the hearing it was proposed by Officers in terms of flexibility that the criteria was potentially amended to read:

<u>Proposed change – DM 14.3 (a) They avoid areas identified for their landscape</u> importance as set out in SP 8 except where it is demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Council that this is not feasible;

Officers would report back to the Commissioner on the outcome of the Council's decisions on these matters and it would be entirely the Commissioners decision whether or not to make the changes in his report to the Department for Infrastructure.

The next set of hearings are due to start in June and any further changes of significance would be reported back to the Planning Committee.

Proposed by Alderman Smyth Seconded by Councillor Magill and agreed that

#### the proposed policy wording changes in relation to Retail Policy and Public Utilities and Infrastructure be approved.

ACTION BY: Sharon Mossman, Deputy Director of Planning

## PART ONE - DECISIONS ON ENFORCEMENT CASES – IN CONFIDENCE

## ITEM 3.21 ENFORCEMENT CASE: LA03/2022/0041/CA

Sharon Mossman, Deputy Director of Planning, introduced the Enforcement Report to the Committee and made a recommendation that authority be granted to progress enforcement action, the detail of which is delegated to appointed Officers.

Proposed by Councillor Ramsay Seconded by Alderman Smyth and agreed that

# enforcement action be progressed in this case as outlined in the report with the detail of this delegated to appointed Officers.

ACTION BY: Sharon Mossman, Deputy Director of Planning

## PROPOSAL TO MOVE OUT OF 'IN CONFIDENCE'

Proposed by Councillor Archibald-Brown Seconded by Councillor Flanagan and unanimously agreed

#### that any remaining Committee business be conducted in Open Session.

#### The Chairperson advised that audio recording would recommence.

There being no further Committee business the Chairperson thanked Members for their attendance and the meeting concluded at 8.52 pm.

MAYOR