



**MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE
HELD IN MOSSLEY MILL ON MONDAY 21 FEBRUARY 2022 AT 6.00 PM**

- In the Chair** : Councillor S Flanagan
- Committee Members Present** : Aldermen - P Brett, T Campbell and J Smyth
Councillors - J Archibald-Brown, H Cushinan, R Lynch, M Magill, N Ramsay, R Swann and B Webb
- Non-Committee Members Present** : Councillors - A McAuley, N McClelland and V McWilliam
- Public Speakers** : Councillor N McClelland In Support (Item 3.1)
Robert Gilmour In Support (Agent, Item 3.2)
Trevor Clarke MLA In Support (Item 3.2)
John Blair MLA In Objection (Items 3.3 & 3.4)
Ivan McClean In Support (Agent, Items 3.3 & 3.4)
Robin Park In Support (Agent, Items 3.6 & 3.7)
Stephen Villiers In Support (Agent, Item 3.8)
Conor Mulligan In Support (Item 3.8)
- Officers Present** : Deputy Chief Executive of Economic Growth & Planning
- M McAlister
Borough Lawyer & Head of Legal Services - P Casey
Head of Planning and Development Management (Interim
- B Diamond
Principal Planning Officer – S Thompson
Senior Planning Officer – A Leathem
Senior Planning Officer - J McKendry
ICT Helpdesk Officer – J Wilson
ICT Helpdesk Officer - D Mason
Member Services Officer - S Boyd
Member Services Officer – J Moreland
Member Services Manager – V Lisk

CHAIRPERSON'S REMARKS

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

Although the 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 Addendum Reports relating to Site Visits and Items 3.6, 3.7 and 3.8 had been circulated to Members in advance of the meeting, and uploaded to the Council website, and that information relating to Item 3.1 had been uploaded to Northern Ireland Planning Portal. Members were further advised that Item 3.5 had been withdrawn by the agent.

1 APOLOGIES

Alderman F Agnew
Chief Executive J Dixon
Deputy Director of Planning S Mossman

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 3.2 Alderman J Smyth and Councillor J Archibald-Brown

PART ONE PLANNING APPLICATIONS

ITEM 3.1 APPLICATION NO: LA03/2020/0506/F

PROPOSAL:	Part-demolition of existing buildings to rear of 19-21 Market Square & Proposed residential development comprising 15no. apartments
SITE/LOCATION:	Lands to the rear of 19, 20, 21 & 21 A-F Market Square, Antrim
APPLICANT:	Mr B Heffron

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

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

Councillor N McClelland In Support

Proposed by Alderman Brett
Seconded by Councillor Webb that planning permission be refused.

On the proposal being put to the meeting 9 Members voted in favour, 1 against and 0 abstentions, it was agreed that

planning permission be refused for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposal is contrary to the policy provisions of paragraph 6.12 of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and criteria (a) and (b) of Policy BH 11 of PPS6 'Planning, Archaeology and the Built Heritage' in that, if permitted, the development proposal would not respect the listed buildings in close proximity to the application site in terms of the scale, height, massing and alignment of the proposed development and the works proposed do not make reference to the use of traditional or sympathetic building materials and techniques which respect those found on those listed buildings in close proximity to the application site.**
- 2. The proposal is contrary to the policy provisions of paragraph 6.18 of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement, Policy BH12 of PPS 6 'Planning Archaeology and the Built Heritage' and Section 104 (11) of the Planning Act (NI) 2011 in that, if permitted, the proposal would neither preserve nor enhance the character, appearance and setting of the Conservation Area given the layout and arrangement of the development along with the scale, form, massing, alignment, materials and detailing of the building as well as the loss of protected trees in the Conservation Area.**
- 3. 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 the proposed development does not maintain or enhance the distinctive character and appearance of the Conservation Area, does not respect the surrounding context and is inappropriate to the character and topography of the site in terms of layout, scale, proportions, massing and appearance of buildings, structures and landscaped and hard surfaced areas and would result in a cramped form of development on a restricted site.**
- 4. 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 the proposed development does not respect features of the built heritage and landscape features have not been protected or integrated into the overall design and layout of the development.**
- 5. 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 the proposed development does not make adequate provision for private open space and landscaped areas as an integral part of the development.**
- 6. The proposal is contrary to paragraph 6.304 of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement, Policy AMP 7 of Planning Policy Statement 3 'Access, Movement and Parking' and criterion (f) of Policy QD 1 of PPS 7 'Quality Residential Environments' in that it has not been demonstrated that the proposal warrants a reduced level of car parking provision to serve the development.**
- 7. The proposal is contrary to the Strategic Planning Policy Statement set out at paragraph 3.8 in that it has not been demonstrated that the residential amenity of future occupiers of the development would not be subject to high levels of noise from nearby noise generating activities, it has not been demonstrated that possible land contamination issues will adversely impact human health receptors and it has not been demonstrated that foul sewerage created by the proposed development can adequately be dealt with so as not to impact to human health**

receptors and residential amenity.

ACTION BY: Sharon Mossman, Deputy Director of Planning

Having declared an interest in the following item Councillor Archibald-Brown left the Chamber, and Alderman Smyth left the meeting.

ITEM 3.2 APPLICATION NO: LA03/2021/0855/F

PROPOSAL:	Retention of two residential units
SITE/LOCATION:	Land/barns opposite 21 Creevery Road Antrim
APPLICANT:	William Crawford

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 Gilmour In Support (Agent)

Proposed by Alderman Brett

Seconded by Councillor Ramsay that planning permission be refused.

On the proposal being put to the meeting 4 Members voted in favour, 4 against and 0 abstentions, the Chairperson used his casting vote in favour of the proposal and 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 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 and Policy CTY 4 of Planning Policy Statement 21 `Sustainable Development in the Countryside, in that the intensity of use of the building would result in an unacceptable provision of amenity for the residential units which are the subject of the application due to:
 - i) inadequate levels of private amenity space (one bedroom unit);
 - ii) the impacts of overlooking, overshadowing and general disturbance (two bedroom unit).

ACTION BY: Sharon Mossman, Deputy Director of Planning

Councillor Archibald-Brown returned to the Chamber and Alderman Smyth returned to the meeting.

The Chairperson advised Members that Items 3.3 and 3.4 would be taken together but voted on individually.

Alderman Brett left and returned to the Chamber during Item 3.3 and was therefore unable to vote on Items 3.3 and 3.4.

Councillor Magill joined the meeting during Item 3.3 and was therefore unable to vote on Items 3.3 and 3.4.

ITEM 3.3 APPLICATION NO: LA03/2021/1107/O

PROPOSAL: Site of Infill Dwelling and Garage (Site 2)
SITE/LOCATION: 35 metres south west of No. 63 Craigstown Road, Randalstown
APPLICANT: Mr & Mrs Kevin Bryne

Alicia Leathem, Senior Planning Officer, 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 –

John Blair MLA	In Objection
Ivan McClean	In Support (Agent)

Proposed by Councillor Archibald-Brown
Seconded by Councillor Cushinan that outline planning permission be granted.

On the proposal being put to the meeting 2 Members voted in favour, 7 against and 0 abstentions, and the proposal was declared not carried

In favour: Councillors Archibald-Brown and Cushinan
Against: Aldermen Campbell and Smyth
Councillors Flanagan, Lynch, Ramsay, Swann and Webb

Proposed by Councillor Webb
Seconded by Councillor Ramsay that outline planning permission be refused.

On the proposal being put to the meeting 7 Members voted in favour, 2 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 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 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.

3. The proposal is contrary to the policy provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policies CTY 8 and CTY 14 of Planning Policy Statement 21, in that a new dwelling, if permitted, would result in a suburban style build-up of development; and the creation of ribbon development along the Craigstown Road.
4. The proposal is contrary to the policy provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policy CTY 13 of Planning Policy Statement 21, in that a new dwelling, if permitted, would fail to integrate into the landscape.
5. The proposal is contrary to the policy provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement in that, if permitted, the proposed access laneway would have an unacceptable adverse effect on the dwelling under construction in terms of overlooking and general disturbance.

ACTION BY: Sharon Mossman, Deputy Director of Planning

ITEM 3.4 APPLICATION NO: LA03/2021/1115/O

PROPOSAL:	Site of Infill Dwelling and Garage (Site 1)
SITE/LOCATION:	30m approx. North East of 57 Craigstown Road Randalstown
APPLICANT:	Mr & Mrs Kevin Byrne

Alicia Leathem, Senior Planning Officer, introduced the Planning Report to the Committee, advised Members that an additional letter of objection had been received, and made a recommendation to refuse outline planning permission.

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

John Blair MLA	In Objection
Ivan McClean	In Support (Agent)

Proposed by Councillor Webb

Seconded by Councillor Flanagan that outline planning permission be refused.

On the proposal being put to the meeting 7 Members voted in favour, 2 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 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 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.
3. The proposal is contrary to the policy provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policies CTY 8 and CTY 14 of Planning Policy Statement 21, in that a new dwelling, if permitted, would result in a suburban style build-up of development; and the creation of ribbon development along the Craigstown Road.
4. The proposal is contrary to the policy provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policy CTY 13 of Planning Policy Statement 21, in that a new dwelling, if permitted, would fail to integrate into the landscape.
5. The proposal is contrary to the policy provisions of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement in that, if permitted, the proposed access laneway would have an unacceptable adverse effect on the dwelling under construction and the proposed site being considered under LA03/2021/1107/O in terms of overlooking and general disturbance

ACTION BY: Sharon Mossman, Deputy Director of Planning

ITEM 3.5 APPLICATION NO: LA03/2021/1178/O

PROPOSAL:	Site for 2 no. single storey detached dwellings with detached garages as an infill
SITE/LOCATION:	Between 21 and 23 Dundesert Road, Crumlin, BT29 4SL
APPLICANT:	Mr J McClurg

The Chairperson reminded Members that this application had been withdrawn by the agent.

ACTION BY: Sharon Mossman, Deputy Director of Planning

ITEM 3.6 APPLICATION NO: LA03/2021/0615/O

PROPOSAL: Site for Infill Dwelling

SITE/LOCATION: Lands 50 metres west of 36 Aughnabrack Road, Ballyutoag, Belfast

APPLICANT: Mr Gary Bates

Barry Diamond, Head of Planning and Development Management (Interim), introduced the Planning Report and associated addendum 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 –

Robin Park In Support (Agent)

Proposed by Councillor Ramsay

Seconded by Alderman Brett that outline planning permission be refused.

On the proposal being put to the meeting 10 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 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 provisions contained within the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and fails to meet 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.**
- 3. The proposal is contrary to the provisions contained within the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policy CTY 13 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside, in that a dwelling on this site, if permitted, would fail to integrate into the countryside.**
- 4. The proposal is contrary to the provisions contained within 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, result in ribbon development resulting in a suburban style build up when viewed with the existing dwellings along the Aughnabrack Road.**

ACTION BY: Sharon Mossman, Deputy Director of Planning

Councillor Ramsay left and returned to the Chamber during the following Item and was therefore unable to vote.

ITEM 3.7 APPLICATION NO: LA03/2021/1126/O

PROPOSAL:	Site for replacement dwelling (superseding approval granted under LA03/2020/0866/F)
SITE/LOCATION:	158 Staffordstown Road, Cranfield, Randalstown
APPLICANT:	Dympna Bateson

Barry Diamond, Head of Planning and Development Management (Interim), introduced the Planning Report and associated addendum 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 –

Robin Park In Support (Agent)

Proposed by Councillor Webb

Seconded by Alderman Brett that outline planning permission be refused.

On the proposal being put to the meeting 7 Members voted in favour, 1 against and 2 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.**
- 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 Policy CTY 15 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside, in that the building would, if permitted, result in urban sprawl as it would mar the distinction between the settlement limit and the surrounding countryside.**

ACTION BY: Sharon Mossman, Deputy Director of Planning

Alderman Campbell left and returned to the meeting during the following Item and was therefore unable to vote.

ITEM 3.8 APPLICATION NO: LA03/2021/1124/F

PROPOSAL:	Erection of 1 no. dwelling including landscaping, hardstandings, access and all other associated site works
SITE/LOCATION:	Land adjoining and immediately south-west of 202 Moneynick Road, Toome
APPLICANT:	Aspen Developments Ltd

Barry Diamond, Head of Planning and 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 speaker addressed the Committee and responded to enquiries from Members as requested –

Stephen Villiers	In Support (Agent)
Conor Mulligan	In Support

Proposed by Alderman Brett

Seconded by Councillor Magill that planning permission be granted.

In favour: Aldermen - Brett and Smyth
Councillors – Archibald-Brown, Cushinan, Flanagan, Magill and Swann

Against: Councillors – Lynch, Ramsay and Webb

On the proposal being put to the meeting 7 Members voted in favour, 3 against and 0 abstentions it was agreed that

planning permission be granted subject to the imposition of conditions addressing the following matters, the detail of which was delegated to Officers

- 1) normal time limits**
- 2) boundary definition**
- 3) access and parking**

The reason for the decision contrary to the Officer recommendation was that Members considered that it would not have a detrimental impact on house number 202 or the surrounding development.

ACTION BY: Sharon Mossman, Deputy Director of Planning

PART TWO OTHER PLANNING MATTERS

ITEM 3.9

P/PLAN/1 DELEGATED PLANNING DECISIONS AND APPEALS

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

Members noted that there were no planning appeal decisions for the Borough issued during January by the Planning Appeals Commission. One appeal in relation to LA03/2020/0778/F (PAC reference 2021/A0130) regarding 17 Carnaree Road, Templepatrick was withdrawn by the appellant.

Proposed by Alderman Brett

Seconded by Councillor Archibald-Brown and unanimously agreed

that the report be noted.

NO ACTION

ITEM 3.10

P/PLAN/1 PROPOSAL OF APPLICATION NOTICES FOR MAJOR DEVELOPMENT

Prospective applicants for all development proposals which fall into the Major development category under the 2011 Planning Act are required to give at least 12 weeks' notice to the Council that an application for planning permission is to be submitted. This is referred to as a Proposal of Application Notice (PAN). One PAN was registered recently, the details of which are set out below.

PAN Reference:	LA03/2022/0057/PAN
Proposal:	Proposed use class B4 storage and distribution warehouse with associated ancillary office, car parking, areas of circulation and hard standing, landscaping and boundary treatment
Location:	Land west of B101 Nutts Corner, Dundrod Road, Nutts Corner
Applicant:	Tamar (Selby) Limited
Date Received:	20 January 2022
12 week expiry:	14 April 2022

Under Section 27 of the 2011 Planning Act obligations are placed on the prospective developer to consult the community in advance of submitting a Major development planning application. Where, following the 12-week period set down in statute, an application is submitted this must be accompanied by a Pre-Application Community consultation report outlining the consultation that has been undertaken regarding the application and detailing how this has influenced the proposal submitted.

As part of its response to Coronavirus, the Department for Infrastructure (DfI) introduced an amendment to subordinate legislation to temporarily remove the requirement for a public event as part of the pre application community consultation (PACC). The initial Departmental Regulations were subsequently extended and given the ongoing pandemic The Planning (Development Management) (Temporary Modifications) (Coronavirus) (Amendment No.2) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2021 which came into effect on 1 October 2021, have temporarily amended The Planning (Development Management) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2015 and therefore the temporary relaxation of pre-application community consultation requirements during Coronavirus emergency period now apply until 31 March 2022. As with the previous Regulations applicants will still need to comply with other requirements to ensure communities are aware of and can input to major development proposals for their areas. However, this temporary change will allow major planning applications to continue to be submitted during the COVID-19 outbreak.

Guidance issued by the Department indicates that specific detail should be included in the PAN application indicating what consultation methods the prospective applicant was proposing to ensure that the local community is able to access, and comment on, information about a proposed development, despite the absence of a PACC public event.

Proposed by Alderman Brett

Seconded by Councillor Archibald-Brown and unanimously agreed

that the report be noted.

NO ACTION

ITEM 3.11

P/FP/LDP/52 PLANNING APPEALS COMMISSION – CORRESPONDENCE

Members were advised that correspondence had been received from the Planning Appeals Commission (PAC) in relation to the Independent Examination of Lisburn & Castlereagh City Council's Local Development Plan 2032: Draft Plan Strategy.

A copy of the correspondence was circulated for Members' information.

Proposed by Alderman Brett

Seconded by Councillor Archibald-Brown and unanimously agreed

that the report be noted.

NO ACTION

ITEM 3.12

P/PLAN/1 AGENDANI NORTHERN IRELAND PLANNING CONFERENCE 2022

Members were advised that the annual Northern Ireland Planning Conference will take place this year on Wednesday 2 March 2022 at the Europa Hotel, Belfast.

The discussion topics include the following:

- Planning policy for recovery and growth
- Planning case law update
- Reimagining Belfast for the next decade
- The effectiveness of the planning system in Northern Ireland
- Planning and transport: Ensuring women-led design at every stage of the placemaking process
- Putting Net Zero at the heart of the planning system
- Tactical Urbanism: Rethinking public spaces post-Covid
- Planning for the future development of Northern Ireland

Full details can be found on the following link: <https://www.ni-planning.agendani.com/>

The conference provides an opportunity for all those with a role in planning to come together for discussion and debate. The Local Government delegate cost is £195 + VAT per person and the event will take place at the Europa Hotel, Belfast commencing at 9.00 am.

Proposed by Councillor Webb

Seconded by Alderman Brett and unanimously agreed

that Planning Committee Members attend this conference as an approved duty, along with the appropriate Officers.

ACTION BY: Sharon Mossman, Deputy Director of Planning/Member Services

ITEM 3.13

P/FP/LDP96 DEPARTMENT FOR INFRASTRUCTURE (DFI), ISSUES PAPER – REVIEW OF STRATEGIC PLANNING POLICY ON RENEWABLE & LOW CARBON ENERGY

The Department for Infrastructure (Dfi) published an Issues Paper relating to the review of their Strategic Planning Policy on renewable and low carbon energy, announced by Minister Mallon on 21 April 2021 – copy circulated for information.

The aim of this review is to ensure that Strategic Planning Policy on renewable and low carbon energy remains fit for purpose and up-to-date to inform decision-making in relation to development proposals for this subject area. It is intended to inform the Local Development Plan (LDP) process and enable plan-makers to bring forward appropriate local policies, all within the wider contemporary context for energy and the climate emergency.

Officers drafted a response (copy circulated) which was circulated to Members for feedback before submission to Dfi on 11 February 2022. It is the Department's intention to issue a draft revised policy document for full public consultation in due course. This document would be brought to Elected Members for further consideration.

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

that the report be noted.

NO ACTION

ITEM 3.14

P/PLAN/1 PLANNING PORTAL UPDATE

The Department for Infrastructure was continuing to work on the delivery of the new replacement Planning Portal in 2022. An update would be brought to the Planning Committee in due course. In the meantime the current Planning Portal was experiencing a number of technical issues that had the potential to impact on service delivery. It was recommended that the Chair of the Planning Committee writes to the Chief Planner seeking clarification and an urgent update on the resolution of current issues.

Proposed by Councillor Webb
Seconded by Councillor Magill and unanimously agreed

that the Chair of the Planning Committee writes to the Chief Planner seeking an update on the operation of the current Planning Portal.

ACTION BY: Sharon Mossman, Deputy Director of Planning

ITEM 3.15

P/PLAN/1 DEPARTMENT OF INFRASTRUCTURE AND NORTHERN IRELAND AUDIT OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE –

Members were advised that correspondence had been received from the Department for Infrastructure (DfI) to advise that they have published the review of The Planning Act 2011, and from the Northern Ireland Audit Office (NIAO) to advise that they have published a report on Planning in Northern Ireland.

Links to these publications can be found at: <https://www.infrastructure-ni.gov.uk/publications/review-planning-act-ni-2011-report> and; <https://www.niauditoffice.gov.uk/publications/planning-northern-ireland-0>

Officers were currently reviewing both publications and would report back to Elected Members in due course.

Proposed by Councillor Flanagan
Seconded by Councillor Webb and unanimously agreed

that the report be noted.

ACTION BY: Sharon Mossman, Deputy Director of Planning

PROPOSAL TO PROCEED 'IN CONFIDENCE'

Proposed by Councillor Archibald-Brown
Seconded by Councillor Magill 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 3.16

P/FP/LDP/1/ ENFORCEMENT CASE UPDATE - KELLS BESS - IN CONFIDENCE

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

that the report be noted.

ACTION BY: Sharon Mossman, Deputy Director of Planning

PROPOSAL TO MOVE OUT OF 'IN CONFIDENCE'

Proposed by Councillor Magill
Seconded by Councillor Flanagan and unanimously agreed

that any remaining Committee business be conducted in Open Session.

The Chairperson advised that the audio recording would recommence.

There being no further Committee business the Chairperson thanked Members for their attendance and the meeting concluded at 7.25 pm.

MAYOR