

LISBURN & CASTLEREAGH CITY COUNCIL

Minutes of Meeting of the Planning Committee held remotely and in the Council Chamber, Island Civic Centre, The Island, Lisburn, on Monday 9 May 2022 at 10.00 a.m.

PRESENT:

Present in Chamber:

Councillor A Swan (Chairman)

Alderman J Tinsley (Vice-Chairman)

Aldermen WJ Dillon, D Drysdale, O Gawith and A Grehan

Councillors J Craig, M Gregg

Present in Remote Location

Councillor J Palmer

IN ATTENDANCE:

Present in Chamber:

Director of Service Transformation

Head of Planning and Capital Development

Principal Planning Officer (RH)

Senior Planning Officer (RT)

Senior Planning Officer (MB)

Member Services Officer (PS)

Member Services Officer (EW)

Present in Remote Location:

Legal Advisor – B Martyn, Cleaver Fulton Rankin

Commencement of Meeting

The Chairman, Councillor A Swan, welcomed everyone to the meeting which was being live streamed to enable members of the public to hear and see the proceedings.

He stated that planning officers would be present in the Council chamber and the legal advisor and some of those making representations would be attending remotely.

The Head of Planning and Capital Development advised on housekeeping and evacuation procedures. The Member Services Officer then read out the names of the Elected Members in attendance at the meeting.

The Chairman then expressed his congratulations to newly elected MLAs.

1. Apologies

It was agreed that apologies for non-attendance at the meeting would be recorded from Councillors U Mackin and J McCarthy. It was further indicated that Alderman A Grehan would be arriving late.

2. Declarations of Interest

The Chairman sought Declarations of Interest from Members and reminded them to complete the supporting forms which had been left at each desk. He indicated that a form would also be available for those Members attending remotely.

The following Declaration of Interest was made:

- During the course of the meeting, Alderman O Gawith referred to LA05/2020/0800/RM advising that - as he had called the application in - he would be withdrawing from the meeting during its determination.

At the end of the meeting, by way of a completed Declarations of Interest Form the following Declaration of Interest was made:

- Alderman D Drysdale said he had been contacted regarding LA05/2020/0800/RM on a matter of process and referred this query to the Planning Office.

3. Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held on 4 April 2022

It was proposed by Councillor M Gregg, seconded by Councillor J Craig, and agreed that the minutes of the Committee Meeting held on 4 April 2022 as circulated be signed.

4. Report from the Head of Planning and Capital Development

4.1 Schedule of Applications

The Chairman reminded Members that they needed to be present for the entire determination of an application. If absent for any part of the discussion they would render themselves unable to vote on the application.

The Legal Adviser highlighted paragraphs 43 - 46 of the Protocol for the Operation of the Lisburn & Castlereagh City Council Planning Committee which, he advised, needed to be borne in mind when determinations were being made.

- (1) LA05/2018/1030/F - Demolition of existing buildings and erection of service and associated forecourt and parking at 99 Moneyreagh Road, Moneyreagh

It was proposed by Councillor J Craig, seconded by Alderman D Drysdale and agreed by the Committee to defer the determination of the above planning application pending a site visit being arranged.

The Head of Planning and Capital Development then explained that Ms Celine Duff, the newly appointed Principal Professional Technical Officer from the Department for Infrastructure (Roads) had been present to assist with the determination of the above application which had been withdrawn from the schedule. In the absence of being able to make a contribution to the meeting, he took the opportunity to introduce Ms Duff to the Committee.

Adjournment of Meeting

The Chairman, Councillor A Swan, declared the meeting adjourned at 10.15 am to allow time for the next speaker to join the meeting remotely.

Resumption of Meeting

The Chairman, Councillor A Swan declared the meeting resumed at 10.25 am.

At the resumption of the meeting, the Chairman explained that he should have confirmed the previous proposal to defer the application by a show of hands from the Committee. He asked members to indicate whether they were content with the proposal, which had been made by Councillor J Craig and seconded by Alderman D Drysdale to defer the determination of the planning application pending a site visit being arranged and by a majority show of hands of 5:2 the proposal was carried.

- (2) LA05/2020/0862/O – Proposed 1 ½ storey private dwelling and garage with surrounding garden on land 20m east of No 52 Gransha Road, Gransha, Comber

The Senior Planning Officer (MB) presented this application as outlined within the circulated report.

(Alderman J Tinsley arrived at 10.30 am, the Director of Service Transformation left at 10.30 am)

The Committee received Mr D Donaldson who wished to speak in support of the application and who had provided the Committee with a written submission in advance of the meeting and highlighted the following:

- He said that the planning history was important as it indicates that it was accepted that there was a cluster.
- He said the application met all the requirements.
- He said there was clearly a visible entity and a focal point.
- He outlined why he felt this would not create harm to the rural character or visual amenity.
- He said there was more than adequate space for the new dwelling.
- He clarified proposals for a garage and driveway.
- He clarified the amenity space.
- He advised that there would be no demonstrable harm.

Mr Donaldson then responded to Members' queries as follows:

- Councillor J Craig said that the site visit had been helpful and he felt that the buildings around the site minimised any visual impact, he sought Mr Donaldson's comments on this. Mr Donaldson responded that he did not think there would be any impact from a westerly direction, from the east you would get a glimpse of the house but No 52 sat at a higher level and this would minimise visibility until it disappeared behind the church hall.
- Alderman D Drysdale sought more detail on policy requirements and Mr Donaldson replied that the planning unit had considered that the development met all of the requirements apart from the issue of visual entity. He said he did not understand how it did not. He said there was a church, a church hall and dwellings and he considered there was a clear link. The other issue raised was extending the cluster to the east but he said it was clear from the map that this was not the case. He said that the La Mon House Hotel on the other side of the road adds to this.

There then followed a question and answer session with the planning officers during which the following issues arose:

- Councillor M Gregg asked what has changed since the previous appeal. The Head of Planning and Capital Development said that since then the SPSS has been introduced but that did not change the policy. He read out an extract from the appeal decision as relevant to this application. He said that the car park and graveyard were not accepted as part of the cluster at that time and it was considered that the fifth criteria had not been met i.e. that this intruded further into the countryside. With the aid of a drawing he demonstrated the location of the proposal and said that planning officers had considered that there was no distinguishable difference in the situation on the ground between the appeal decision and now.
- Alderman D Drysdale outlined that only from the east would this dwelling be visible and it would be behind a church, he asked if there was a cluster and stated that he felt it was a rounding off. He also said he did not feel that this did extend into the countryside by any significant amount and asked whether planning officers agreed. The Head of Planning and Capital Development said that this was a finely balanced decision. He again referred to the Commission's previous decision stating that they had considered that it did extend into the countryside. Alderman Drysdale asked for one of the slides to be displayed and said that he could not accept that this was the case. The Head of Planning and Capital Development outlined the appeal site and the application site on the map and he said it was felt that the building would be visible from the easterly direction.
- Councillor J Craig said that he felt it ironic that this site was surrounded by large houses which had benefited from planning permission. The application was right beside other houses which he felt it would integrate into, some of which were at a higher level. He could not see how this could not be seen to be integrating and given this he requested a clear explanation of why this was extending into the countryside. The Head of Planning and Capital Development outlined the levels and ridge heights of the neighbouring buildings explaining that there was a visual test regarding the extension of the development into the countryside. He referred again to

the appeal decision which had been made previously and which he explained demonstrated consistency in respect of the application of policy.

- Councillor A Swan asked if there had been a policy change since the appeal decision and was advised that there had not.
- Councillor J Craig said that the planning unit had based their decision on the appeal, he asked whether, during the appeal, the Commissioner had visited the site and were they aware of the other application which had been approved. The Head of Planning and Capital Development advised that the approval had come after the appeal and said that whilst it is not detailed in the appeal decision, it is his experience that it would be normal for the Commission to have visited the site. He went on to advise of the process.
- Councillor J Craig then suggested that the other dwelling approved had impacted on the cluster. The Head of Planning and Capital Development replied that the commission had agreed that all other conditions were met, it was the extension into the countryside that was the issue. He read again from the appeal decision and with the use of a map explained how the location of the approved site met the requirements of policy and distinguishable from this proposal. Councillor J Craig asked how the other site had been approved given the issue of extending into the countryside and the Head of Planning and Capital Development went on to outline the difference in levels which meant that it did not sit on all fours with the application before the committee at the meeting.
- Alderman O Gawith asked whether the planning officers were aware that the garage was to be demolished and whether the church hall had been extended since the appeal and was advised that the entrance had been questioned but could be conditioned should the application be approved. He advised that there was no obvious extension to the church, approval had been given for a small extension in 2019 but it had not yet been built.

During the ensuing debate, the following comments were made:

- Councillor J Craig disagreed with the recommendation. He said there was a fine line as to what was intrusive into the countryside and what was not. He said he could see no difference between this application and what had been approved previously.
- Alderman D Drysdale concurred, he said that the first thing you see from the road was the church and he could not see how there was a visual impact issue with this application.
- Alderman J Dillon said that planning officers had made a judgement and this concurs with the previous appeal and he felt that this was the right decision.
- Councillor M Gregg said that this was a very finely balance decision and the additional site approved makes it more possible. This does however push it too far north and he would therefore be supporting the recommendation.
- Councillor A Swan said he would be supporting the recommendation, there was the option of an appeal for the applicant.

The Committee, having considered the information provided within the report of the Senior Planning Officer and by those making representations, agreed by a

majority of 5:2 with 0 abstentions to refuse the application as outlined in the Officer's report.

(Alderman A Grehan arrived at 11.30 am but neither she nor Alderman J Tinsley were able to vote as they had not been present for the entire discussion on the application.)

- (3) LA05/2020/0614/O – Site for dwelling, garage and associated site works at a side garden of 21 Moss Brook Road, Carryduff.

The Senior Planning Officer (MB) presented this application as outlined within the circulated report.

The first speaker on the application experienced technical difficulties with zoom and it was decided to postpone the determination of the application to allow him to make his way to the Council Offices and attend the meeting in person.

The Chairman then moved on to the following applications for which there were no speakers.

- (4) LA05/2020/0794/O - Infill site on lands 40m north west of 180 Ballynahinch Road, Dromore.

- (5) LA05/2020/0795/O – Infill site on lands 100m north west of 180 Ballynahinch Road, Dromore.

The above applications were presented together but voted on individually.

The Principal Planning Officer (RH) presented these applications as outlined within the circulated report.

There were no speakers on these applications.

There then followed a question and answer session with the planning officers during which the following issues arose:

- Alderman J Tinsley sought clarification on why one of the buildings had been excluded and the Head of Planning and Capital Development went on to explain the reasons.
- Councillor M Gregg sought clarification on the refusal reasons which the Head of Planning and Capital Development explained had been provided at paragraph 122. He went on to explain that this was not a small gap, but one which could accommodate more than two houses. He went on to outline the plots and the other building which did not benefit from planning permission. He then responded to a number of queries from Councillor M Gregg on the size of the plots and their frontages.

During the ensuing debate, no comments were made and the Committee proceeded to vote on the applications as follows –

LA05/2020/0794/O - Infill site on lands 40m north west of 180 Ballynahinch Road, Dromore.

The Committee, having considered the information provided within the report of the Principal Planning Officer agreed unanimously to refuse the application as outlined in the Officer's report.

LA05/2020/0795/O – Infill site on lands 100m north west of 180 Ballynahinch Road, Dromore.

The Committee, having considered the information provided within the report of the Principal Planning Officer, agreed unanimously to refuse the application as outlined in the Officer's report.

Councillor M Gregg asked whether enforcement action would be taken and it was confirmed to him that the matter would be referred to the enforcement unit.

Adjournment of Meeting

The Chairman, Councillor A Swan declared the meeting adjourned at 12.05 pm

Resumption of Meeting

The Chairman, Councillor A Swan declared the meeting resumed at 12.20 pm

On resumption of the meeting, the Chairman advised that the speaker who had wished to speak on LA05/2020/0614/O had now arrived at the Council Chamber and that the determination of that planning application could now resume.

(3) LA05/2020/0614/O – Site for dwelling, garage and associated site works at a side garden of 21 Moss Brook Road, Carryduff continued ...

The Senior Planning Officer (MB) summarised the presentation of this application as made earlier in the meeting.

The Committee received Mr N Coffey who wished to speak in support of the application and who had provided the Committee with a written submission in advance of the meeting and highlighted the following:

- He said that the proposal was compliant with CTY8.
- He highlighted an amended map which had been submitted.
- He outlined an example of precedent which he said was material.
- He said that he considered that planning permission should be granted.

Mr Coffey then responded to Members' queries as follows:

- Alderman J Tinsley referred to a slide and asked if the content was accurate. Mr Coffey explained that a revised plan had been submitted recently which altered the size of the frontages slightly. He went on to explain the differences. The Head of Planning and Capital Development offered assistance to the members by way of detailing the differences that Mr Coffey described on a map associated with the presentation.
- Alderman J Tinsley wanted to know if the changes made a difference to the recommendation. Mr Coffey emphasised that the plots in the past had been sold in two separate lots and he felt this needed to be reflected upon.
- Councillor J Craig referred to the hen house which appeared to have a separate access. Mr Coffey confirmed that his was the case and he explained that this had been the domain of the owner's husband, now deceased.
- Councillor M Gregg asked if the hen house was a permanent structure and was advised that it was.
- Having made adjustments the Senior Planning Officer then proceeded to advise of the frontage sizes in light of the change referred to by Mr Coffey earlier in the meeting. These were as follows:

	Frontage	Area
Frontage of house	44.5m	927 sq m
Site as amended	18.3m	355 sq m
Hen house	11.4m	260 sq m

A google map was displayed on the screen and the Head of Planning and Capital Development outlined the various elements of the site which were taken account of in the application.

Mr Coffey again emphasised that the plot had in the past been marketed as two plots.

- Councillor A Swan sought clarification on an area on the map and was advised that it was a vegetable patch.

There then followed a question and answer session with the planning officers during which the following issues arose:

- Alderman J Tinsley sought confirmation on the number of buildings and frontages and was advised by the Head of Planning and Capital Development that his was the challenge. The planning officer's report refers to one plot but Mr Coffey says it was marketed as two plots. On the ground there was a vegetable plot and the hen house has been part of the curtilage for some time which is why it had been taken as one plot. He said that whichever view was taken the plot size was not consistent with the established pattern of development.
- Councillor J Craig asked if officers could confirm that we are being absolutely consistent as he recalled instances in the past where a similar

scenario had been acceptable. The Head of Planning and Capital Development responded that Mr Coffey had cited an example however that needed to sit on all fours with the site under consideration, he said that the Senior Planning Officer would look at the example given and make comment. He again outlined the plot sizes and frontages and said that these can only be compared with the house next door and there was inconsistency as outlined in the report at paragraph 85. The Senior Planning Officer (MB) then said he had looked at the example of precedent referred to by Mr Coffey and said that it represented two different plots with houses in them and was therefore not the same scenario. He said that he was aware of more recent applications, similar to this which had been refused and which had had appeals dismissed.

During the ensuing debate, the following comments were made:

- Alderman D Drysdale said he would have difficulty in voting against the recommendation.
- Alderman J Dillon said he felt the planning officers had made the correct recommendation.
- Councillor A Swan said he would be supporting the recommendation.

The Committee, having considered the information provided within the report of the Senior Planning Officer and by those making representations, agreed by a majority of 8:1 with 0 abstentions to refuse the application as outlined in the Officer's report.

(6) LA05/2021/0928/O - Site for a dwelling, garage including ancillary site works on land 30m north of 39 Garlandstown Road, Glenavy

The Senior Planning Officer (RT) presented this application as outlined within the circulated report.

The Committee received Mr N Coffey who wished to speak in support of the application and who had provided the Committee with a written submission in advance of the meeting and highlighted the following:

- He said that regarding CTY8 there were six buildings and only three were required by the policy.
- He said that the plot sizes were varied and went on to outline these as interpreted by him.
- He outlined the cluster under CTY2A and highlighted the focal point as perceived by him.
- He outlined how this would provide closure.
- He outlined how he felt this application was compliant.

There were no questions for Mr Coffey from the Committee.

There then followed a question and answer session with the planning officers during which the following issues arose:

- Alderman J Tinsley asked how this did not integrate with the infill policy and was advised by the Head of Planning and Capital Development that this was the challenge in establishing what the pattern of development is. Mr Coffey explains the plot sizes are much smaller on the ground than they appear on the map but the Head of Planning and Capital Development outlines that the planning officer has gone to the site and considers No. 39 to be one plot. Mr Coffey says it is split due to the presence of the pillars but this was not obvious on the ground and the plot appears to be the entire field and it is for the Committee to weigh the difference in the two opinions in making a decision.
- Councillor J Craig referred to extensive mature growth and asked if this does not help it integrate. The Head of Planning and Capital Development responded that there was always a fine balance in such circumstances, the challenge was not just one of intervisibility but whether a building could be integrated. Councillor J Craig said he was confused as trees had been alluded to before as assisting with integration so why was that not the case in this instance. The Head of Planning and Capital Development went on to highlight the differences in this instance and said that the principle of development in CTY8 also needed to be taken into account.

During the ensuing debate, the following comments were made:

- Alderman J Tinsley said that he personally felt there was integration and he would not be supporting the recommendation.
- Councillor J Craig said he failed to see how this application did not meet the criteria and he would also not be supporting the recommendation.
- Councillor M Gregg said that the application did meet a number of the criteria but it failed on plot sizes and therefore he would be supporting the recommendation.
- Councillor A Swan concurred.
- Councillor J Palmer said he could not support it.

The Committee, having considered the information provided within the report of the Senior Planning Officer and by those making representations, agreed by a majority of 7:2 with 0 abstentions to refuse the application as outlined in the Officer's report.

Adjournment of Meeting

The Chairman, Councillor A Swan declared the meeting adjourned at 1.35 pm

Resumption of Meeting

The Chairman, Councillor A Swan declared the meeting resumed at 2.05 pm

- (7) LA05/2020/0800/RM - 12 dwellings and associated works (including retention of works on site) at 6 Lisburn Road, Hillsborough.

“In Committee”

It was proposed by Councillor M Gregg, seconded by Alderman D Drysdale and agreed that the meeting go “in committee”, to obtain legal advice in the absence of members of the press and public being present.

Legal advice was obtained and the information noted.

(During the above discussion the Director of Service Transformation arrived at 2.15 pm)

Resumption of Normal Business

It was proposed by Alderman D Drysdale, seconded by Alderman J Dillon and agreed to come out of committee and normal business was resumed.

(Alderman O Gawith left the meeting at 2.30 pm having declared an interest in this Application).

The Principal Planning Officer (RH) presented this application as outlined within the circulated report.

The Committee received Mr Paul Crute who wished to speak in opposition to the application and who had provided the Committee with a written submission in advance of the meeting and highlighted the following:

- He said that in terms of the loss of amenity he disputed the planning officer’s opinion of its dominance.
- He said that the term ‘difficult to sustain’, did not mean impossible to sustain.
- He highlighted comments made by the architect.
- He queried the overshadowing trajectory.
- He requested a site visit to consider his issues.
- He said that the building work had been commenced ahead of planning permission.
- He said that he found engaging with the planning process difficult.
- He said he had requested permission to show drone footage but no-one had got back to him.

Mr Crute then responded to Members’ queries as follows:

- Alderman D Drysdale asked whether Mr Crute had any planning reasons to support his objection.
- Alderman J Tinsley asked whether Mr Crute had been opposed to the application from the start or is it not what he had envisaged. Mr Crute responded that it was not what he had envisaged and he had object in 2021 and submitted many pictures.

- Councillor J Craig made the comment that the issues raised were in the remit of Planning Enforcement rather than Planning Permission and Mr Crute responded that his issues were in relation to the fact that what was under construction was very different to what was approved. The Head of Planning and Capital Development was asked to clarify the position. He stated that Mr Crute has objected to the Reserved Matters application but that the applicant had proceeded with the development before the application process was concluded. He further clarified that the applicant was advised that this is at risk and that the matter was referred to the enforcement team. A site visit was carried out by them and it was their finding that the building works were in line with the submitted plans. The drawings used in the presentation today reflect what is built on the ground. He reminded the Committee that enforcement proceedings were held in abeyance pending the outcome of an application process.
- Councillor M Gregg asked if Mr Crute could briefly summarise the content of the drone footage and Mr Crute responded that it showed how close the property was to the fence and you can see that the footprint had been increased and sunlight blocked.
- Alderman D Drysdale asked if a Planning Consultant had been employed and Mr Crute responded that his barrister had done that and that measurements would be checked.

The Committee received Mr A McCreedy and Mr G Roulston who wished to speak in support of the application and who had provided the Committee with a written submission in advance of the meeting and highlighted the following:

- Mr Roulston emphasised that the conceptual approval was just that, more detail comes at the Reserved Matters stage.
- Regarding plot 9, this had been assessed by offers and a sunlight diagram had been submitted and showed no adverse effects. He went on to outline the topography of the site.
- He said he fully supported the recommendation.

Mr Roulston then responded to Members' queries as follows:

- Alderman J Tinsley sought confirmation of distances which were provided by Mr Roulston.
- Alderman J Tinsley asked for confirmation that the building was being constructed as per the drawings and Mr Roulston provided that confirmation.
- Alderman J Tinsley asked whether it would not have been preferable to wait on planning permission before proceeding with construction.
- Councillor M Gregg sought information on the difference in ridge height and boundary distances between the property at plot 9 compared to the previous approval and was advised that there had been no ridge height restrictions placed on the development. Regarding separation distance there was a difference of 2m closer to the boundary and the ridge height was 9.2m but as it was a hipped roof it was therefore further away from the objector's property.

There then followed a question and answer session with the planning officers during which the following issues arose:

- Councillor M Gregg asked how the ridge height and boundary distances met Creating Places and sought clarification of the distances, he also requested information on the sunlight issues. The Head of Planning and Capital Development then referred to the revision to the site layout which had been confirmed by the enforcement unit as being in line with what was built on the ground. He provided clarification of ridge height and separation distances and, regarding sunlight, he differentiated between requirement for the Council to consider the impact on the amenity of neighbours and that is different from the test a chartered surveyor might undertake to measure whether there was a loss of light in a room. With the aid of a map he explained how this had been considered by the Planning Unit. He then read out the relevant paragraphs from Creating Places which referred to back to back relationships between buildings but was silent on back to side relationships. He accepted that this back to side relationship was 2m short of normal guidance where the buildings have a back to back relationship. He clarified that the separation was considered acceptable and it was felt that the Reserved Matters submission closely reflected the original concept drawing.
- Councillor J Craig said he wanted to ensure that officers had been on site and checked that everything on the ground was consistent with what was being presented to the Committee, he said he felt there was going to be building control issues in terms of monitoring. The Head of Planning and Capital Development responded that he accepted that the ideal scenario would have been for the developer to wait for the planning application process to be finished before commencing building works on the site, however the developer has been held to the original concept layout, there had been a site inspection and it has been confirmed that the building works were in line with what had been submitted.

During the ensuing debate, the following comments were made:

- Alderman J Dillon said that he would support the recommendation.
- Councillor J Palmer said he was disappointed that the developer had proceeded with construction however he would be supporting the recommendation.
- Alderman D Drysdale said that having considered the information provided there was nothing to warrant refusal.
- Councillor M Gregg outlined his disapproval at the developer commencing works prior to planning permission however he said there was in-adequate evidence to warrant refusal.
- Councillor A Swan said he would be supporting the recommendation.

The Committee, having considered the information provided within the report of the Principal Planning Officer and by those making representations, agreed by a majority of 8:0 with 0 abstentions to refuse the application as outlined in the Officer's report.

Mr Crute then took the opportunity of thanking the Committee for their honesty.

- (8) LA05/2020/0862/O – Proposed infill site for 2 no dwellings with detached garages between 26 and 30 Magheraconluce Road, Hillsborough.

The Committee was advised that the above application had been removed from the Schedule.

Adjournment of Meeting

The Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 3.45 pm

Resumption of Meeting

The Chairman declared the meeting resumed at 3.55 pm

(Councillor J Craig did not return to the meeting).

4.2 Planning Statistics for Quarter 3 (October to December 2021)

Members had been provided with a copy of DfI NI Planning Statistics covering the third quarter of 2020/21 and were provided with a verbal summary by the Head of Planning and Capital Development. Councillor M Gregg commended officers for their efforts.

It was proposed by Councillor M Gregg, seconded by Alderman J Tinsley and agreed that the Committee note the information.

4.3 Statutory Performance Indicators – March 2022

Members were provided with information on Statutory Performance Indicators for the month of March 2022 and a verbal summary was provided by the Head of Planning and Capital Development.

Councillor M Gregg sought an update on the Planning Portal and was advised by the Head of Planning and Capital Development that a report would be produced in due course, he went on to provide a verbal update on issues with the current system.

It was proposed by Councillor M Gregg, seconded by Alderman J Dillon and agreed that the Committee note the information.

4.4 Appeal Decision in respect of planning application LA05/2020/0419/O

Members had been provided with information on the above planning appeal and were advised that it had been dismissed. It was proposed by Councillor J Craig,

seconded by Alderman O Gawith and agreed that the information be noted.

4.5 Appeal Decision in respect of planning application LA05/2020/0255/O and LA05/2020/0256/O

Members had been provided with information on the above planning appeals and were advised that they had been dismissed. It was proposed by Councillor J Craig, seconded by Alderman O Gawith and agreed that the information be noted.

4.6 Ammonia Emission Factors for Broilers Houses (Updated Guidance for Development Proposals – March 2022)

Members were advised that the Council had been notified by DAERA Planning Response team on 23 March 2022 that AFBI has scientific research that has up to date emission factors for broilers housed in buildings under indirect (e.g. hot water) heating systems. They were advised of the key issues and were provided with a link to access the updated guidance. It was proposed by Councillor M Gregg, seconded by Alderman O Gawith and agreed that the information be noted.

4.7 Planning Forum – Internal Advice Note – Consultations in the Planning Application Process Operating Principles for Planning Authorities

Members were advised that the Department had made available to SOLACE an advice note entitled Consultations in the Planning Application Process: Operating Principles for Planning Authorities and Consultees published in December 2021. It was highlighted that the purpose of the advice note was to reflect the best practice principles discussed and agreed through Planning Forum workshops with statutory consultees for the efficient and effective operation of the development management consultation process. They were advised of the key issues and it was proposed by Councillor M Gregg, seconded by Alderman D Drysdale and agreed that the information be noted.

4.8 Response to the NI Audit Office (NIAO) Report – Planning in Northern Ireland

Members were reminded that the NIAO had published a report on Planning in NI on 1 February 2022 and were provided with a copy. They were advised of the key issues and the need for the Council to place on record its views on the content and were provided with a draft response which was considered by the Development Committee at its meeting on 4 May 2022. It was proposed by Councillor M Gregg seconded by Alderman J Dillon and agreed that the information circulated be noted.

Councillor M Gregg stated that he felt the response was admirable and asked if this was something the new Infrastructure Minister could act upon or did it require input from The NI Executive. The Director of Service Transformation responded outlining the process envisaged which would take this forward.

Alderman J Dillon outlined his concern at the opening statement which said that 'The Planning System in NI was not working', he said that as far as he was concerned it was working but could be improved upon.

4.9 Notification by telecommunication operators of intention to utilise permitted development rights.

The Council had been advised by Taylor Patterson of their intention to utilise permitted development rights at two locations within the Council area to install electronic communications apparatus in accordance with Part 18 (Development by Electronic Communications Code Operators) F31 of the Planning (General Permitted Development) Order (NI) 2015. It was proposed by Councillor M Gregg, seconded by Alderman D Drysdale and agreed that the information be noted.

4.10 Proposed abandonment at Quay Street, Lisburn

Members had been advised that the Department for Infrastructure had notified the Council in a letter dated 10 March 2022 of its intention to abandon land at Quay Street, Lisburn. The Committee had been provided with a copy of the correspondence and the associated map and it was proposed by Alderman O Gawith, seconded by Councillor M Gregg and agreed that the information be noted.

4.11 Proposed Stopping-Up at Market Square, Lisburn Castlereagh City Council

Members were advised that the Department for Infrastructure had notified the Council in a letter dated 12 April 2022 that an application had been received for the stopping up of areas from A-B and C-D at Market Square Lisburn. The Committee had been provided with a copy of the correspondence and the associated map and it was proposed by Alderman O Gawith, seconded by Councillor M Gregg and agreed that the information be noted.

4.12 June 2022 Planning Committee

Members were advised of the impact that the two bank holidays in June would have on arrangements for the Planning Committee should it be held on its original scheduled date of 6 June 2022. They were further advised that the date of Monday 13 June 2022 was now the date proposed to hold the Committee Meeting. It was proposed by Councillor M Gregg, seconded by Alderman J Dillon and agreed that the June meeting of the Planning Committee be held on Monday 13 June 2022.

5. Any Other Business

1. Councillor M Gregg
Thanks to the current Chairman – Councillor A Swan

Councillor M Gregg wished to express thanks to the Chairman as this was his final meeting in the position of Chair. Councillor Swan responded by thanking the Committee for their contribution throughout the year saying that he had enjoyed his

period as Chairman of the Committee, he went on to express thanks to staff for their input throughout the year as well.

Alderman O Gawith also thanked that Chairman and commended him for the work he had carried out during the past year.

2. The Head of Planning and Capital Development
Independent Examination

The Head of Planning and Capital Development updated on the forthcoming Independent Examination on Housing which was imminent.

3. The Head of Planning and Capital Development
NI Housing Conference – Wednesday 11 May 2022

The Head of Planning and Capital Development advised members that Councillor U Mackin was now unable to attend the above conference for which a place had been booked for him, he asked that any member wishing to attend in his place advise Members Services so that the name of the delegate attending could be amended.

There being no further business, the meeting concluded at 4.20 pm.

CHAIRMAN / MAYOR