

COMMITTEE ITEM	3.10
APPLICATION NO	LA03/2022/0514/F
DEA	ANTRIM
COMMITTEE INTEREST	ADDENDUM TO COMMITTEE REPORT
RECOMMENDATION	REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION

PROPOSAL	Two single storey dwellings and associated garages
SITE/LOCATION	Land to the rear of 3 Bourn Road, Antrim, BT41 1NZ
APPLICANT	Mr G Walker
AGENT	Big Design Architecture
LAST SITE VISIT	28 th June 2022
CASE OFFICER	Michael Tomlinson Tel: 028 903 40442 Email: michael.tomlinson@antrimandnewtownabbey.gov.uk

Full details of this application, including the application forms, relevant drawings, consultation responses and any representations received are available to view at the Planning Portal www.planningni.gov.uk

ASSESSMENT OF PLANNING ISSUES/MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Following the publication of the Committee Report additional information was received from the agent on 10th August 2022. The information received is an attempt to address the overlooking caused by House A due to the relationship that would be created with the existing dwelling (No. 3 Bourn Road) and the sewerage capacity issues highlighted by NI Water. Drawing No. 01/1 (date received 10th August 2022) shows the location of a proposed septic tank to service House A and further annotations have been added to the drawing to support the application, whilst Drawing No. 02/1 (date received 11th August 2022) shows amendments to the western elevation of House A.

Planning permission already exists for the erection of one dwelling on the site and therefore the connection to the existing mains sewer for House B in isolation is considered acceptable. The proposed solution for House A is the creation of a septic tank within the application site and House A connecting directly into it. No information regarding soakaways from the septic tank has been provided and the tank will be located 13 metres from the eastern elevation of House A. Whilst a Consent to Discharge sewage effluent to a waterway or underground stratum falls under Article 7 of the Water (NI) Order and with the Department of Agriculture, Environment and Rural Affairs, there is no information to demonstrate that the use of a septic tank is an appropriate solution within the rural area or that the soakaways could be accommodated within the application site.

Furthermore, the agent has noted in Drawing No. 01/1 (date received 11th August 2022) that a toilet had been accepted within the garage of the dwellinghouse granted planning permission under LA03/2021/0239/F. The siting location of House A is within the footprint of the location approved for the garage under LA03/2021/0239/F. This toilet would have provided secondary toilet facilities to the dwellinghouse and therefore it is considered that a single toilet within a garage would produce significantly less sewage effluent than the combined waste produced by a dwelling

and therefore this issue does not provide sufficient weight to overturn this proposed reason for refusal.

Further annotation to Drawing No. 01/1 (date received 11th August 2022) explains that House A is similar in scale to the approved double garage (LA03/2021/0239/F). The garage granted planning permission under LA03/2021/0239/F would have been an ancillary building to the dwellinghouse and would have been read as such. It would not have resulted in the over intensification of the site and whilst it would have been a visible building there is a number of examples of outbuildings located to the rear of the dwellings along Bourlon Road. The creation of 2no. dwellings and 2no. garages would result in a cramped form of development that is not in keeping with the overall character and environmental quality of this established residential area and therefore considered unacceptable.

The amendments made to House A within Drawing No. 02/1 (date received 11th August 2022) shows the removal of the opaque glass block window on the western elevation facing towards the rear of No. 3 Bourlon Road. It is acknowledged that this will reduce the perception of overlooking that would be experienced by No. 3 Bourlon Road. However, there will only be a separation of 21 metres between the rear wall of No. 3 Bourlon Road and House A, with only 6 metres between the western (rear) elevation of House A and the common boundary with 3 Bourlon Road. Due to the sloping topography of the site a greater distance would be required to reduce the perception of overlooking between the proposed new dwelling and the existing dwelling. It is noted that 6no. birch trees are to be planted to supplement the existing hedgerow, however, this is not sufficient in itself to allow for a reduced separation distance in this instance. It is considered that the removal of this glass block window in isolation is insufficient to mitigate against the adverse effect on existing properties in terms of overlooking and privacy.

The previous Committee Report addressed the issues of the proposed development not respecting the surrounding context, adverse effect on existing properties and sewerage issues. It is considered that the proposal is still unacceptable and the proposed recommended reasons for refusal remain the same as before.

CONCLUSION

The following is a summary of the main reasons for the recommendation:

- The proposal does not respect the surrounding context and character of the area;
- House 'A' would have a detrimental impact on the residents at No. 3 Bourlon Road;
- NI Water have raised concerns with capacity issues at this location.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION

PROPOSED REASONS OF REFUSAL

1. 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 does not respect the surrounding context and would result in a cramped form of

development that is not in keeping with the overall character and environmental quality of this established residential area.

2. The proposal is contrary to the policy provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policy QD1 of Planning Policy Statement 7, Quality Residential Environments, in that, if approved, the proposal would have an unacceptable adverse effect on existing properties in terms of overlooking and privacy.
3. The proposal is contrary to the policy provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and would, if permitted, may 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.

COMMITTEE ITEM	3.12
APPLICATION NO	LA03/2022/0438/F
DEA	DUNSILLY
COMMITTEE INTEREST	ADDENDUM TO COMMITTEE REPORT
RECOMMENDATION	REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION

PROPOSAL	Retrospective Planning Application for Silo conversion into seasonal farm accommodation.
SITE/LOCATION	40m NW of 88 Gloverstown Road, Randalstown
APPLICANT	James Alexander
AGENT	OJQ Architecture
LAST SITE VISIT	21 st June 2022
CASE OFFICER	Alexandra Tipping Tel: 028 903 40216 Email: Alexandra.tipping@antrimandnewtownabbey.gov.uk

Full details of this application, including the application forms, relevant drawings, consultation responses and any representations received are available to view at the Planning Portal www.planningni.gov.uk

ASSESSMENT OF PLANNING ISSUES/MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

Following the publication of the Committee Report the agent has submitted additional information. A 'Planning Statement' – Document 01 and a set of farm maps (including Business ID) have now been provided. This Planning Statement is written in support of the application and was submitted following invitation from Officers in attempt to justify the proposal through demonstrating how the application meets with relevant planning policy.

The agent argues within the Planning Statement that the main reason for the conversion of this building 'is the fact that this un-utilised silo was already constructed and a fully integrated part of the existing farmyard'. It is detailed within the statement that Jalex Livestock (the applicants business) has got a need for this type of accommodation due to the growth in the Alexander Farm to approximately 600 acres with 700 ewes and 800-1000 cattle. On site accommodation is required close to the farm for 'convenience but mostly for the safety and wellbeing of the livestock'. It is proposed that the silo accommodation will house trainee vets during lambing season and the calving period.

Furthermore, the agent argues that the accommodation is also required to house auctioneers which operates regular onsite/online livestock auctions for the business. These auctioneers travel from a company based in Carlisle at regular intervals and also require on site accommodation.

The agent has also made reference to a nearby site which has recently been granted planning permission under planning application reference LA03/2020/0516/F for 6 no. Glamping Pods. This site is located approximately 130m NW of 14 Ballydunmaul Road (approximately 2.3 miles from the application site). The agent argues that accommodation will in the future be required for chefs'/staff members

accommodated with this glamping business to ensure they are not taking up any potential accommodations for persons staying on site.

Finally, the agent argues that the accommodation can be used to book a farm stay vacation to experience a real life working farm and also provides an ideal opportunity for clients in the UK and Ireland looking to purchase stock on the farm to be able to stay on site.

The agent proposes that the relevant Planning Policy for assessment of the proposal is Policy CTY 11 – Farm Diversification. It is noted that the applicant has provided a Business ID and set of farm maps, although DAERA have not been consulted on this new information, it is not disputed that the applicant is an active and established farmer.

The Policy within CTY 11 states that 'Planning permission will be granted for a farm or forestry diversification proposal where it has been demonstrated that it is run in conjunction with the agricultural operations on the farm' where the proposal meets all other policy criteria.

The policy does not define what uses qualify as farm or forestry diversification but it is considered that conversion/re-use of an existing farm building to farm workers accommodation (essentially a form of residential accommodation), is not the intention of this policy and thus this policy does not support the proposal. This is supported by Policy CTY 1 which does not list Policy CTY 11 within the applicable policy provisions for 'Housing Development' and rather includes this policy within the subsection entitled 'Non- Residential Development'.

It is noted that the agent has referred to numerous scenarios as to why the accommodation is needed. Firstly, in relation to the need for vets to stay on site during lambing and calving season, it is considered that although this may be more convenient, it has not been sufficiently demonstrated that these workers could not be housed in relative proximity to the site within existing accommodation or why this accommodation could not be provided within the settlement limits of Toome or Randalstown (approximately 3 miles from the farm). It is also noted that No. 88 (the applicants own dwelling) is located directly adjacent to the application site and the farm business meaning there already is a presence on the farm complex during these routinely busy times in the farming calendar.

It is noted that the remaining arguments provided in relation to the need for the proposal do not align with the description of development that is noted within the P1 Form as 'Retrospective Planning Application for Silo conversion into seasonal farm accommodation'.

Notwithstanding this matter, in relation to the need for this accommodation to house auctioneers associated with the livestock auctions at the site, again it is considered that although this may be more convenient, it has not been sufficiently demonstrated that these auctioneers could not be housed in relative proximity to the site within existing accommodation or why this accommodation could not be provided within the settlement limits of Toome (approximately 3 miles from the farm). In this case, the rationale for this accommodation to be provided on site would be afforded even less weight given that other than for convenience purposes there is no necessity for this accommodation to be provided at the farm complex.

In relation to the need for the subject development to provide accommodation for chefs/other staff that may be required in the running of another business (owned by the applicant) – Glamping Pods (approved under planning application reference - LA03/2020/0516/F), it should be noted that this business is not yet operational and thus this argument cannot be given any significant weight in the determination of this application. If the agent is recommending that this application conforms with the policy provisions of CTY 11, this argument is also not appropriate as the need for this diversification is not directly associated with/run in conjunction with the applicant's farm and is essentially a separate business venture.

Finally, in relation to the need for the subject development to accommodate persons who may visit the site for farm experiences/open days. It is firstly noted that this service/offer is not knowingly currently available at the farm complex nor is it a recognised tourist amenity and thus in the absence of further information this argument can also not be sustained.

Giving consideration to all matters discussed above, it is concluded that the principle of development remains unacceptable and there does not appear to be any other overriding and justifiable reason as to why this development is essential at this rural location to meet criteria set out in Policy CTY 1 of PPS 21.

RECOMMENDATION

REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION

RECOMMENDED REASONS FOR REFUSAL

1. The proposal is contrary to the policy provisions of 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 policy provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement relating to the conversion and re-use of existing buildings in the countryside for residential use, in that the building to be converted is not considered to be a locally important building.
3. The proposal is contrary to the policy provisions of Policy CTY 11 – Farm Diversification, in that the proposal relates to a form of residential accommodation which is not supported by this policy which is intended for the provision of appropriate non- residential development.