

# Addendum

## LA01/2017/1599/O

### 1.0 Update

- 1.1 A document was submitted 20<sup>th</sup> September 2019 which outlines the applicant/agent's justification as to how the proposal meets the planning policy requirements for the proposed development.
- 1.2 Much of the content submitted is repetition of previously submitted information which has been taken into account within the formation of the recommendation as per the Planning Committee Report. As such this Addendum will only seek to provide comment on any new information and provide clarity on other points of conflict.
- 1.3 Page 4 of the submission states that this application site has been confirmed as an infill site. The Planning Authority do not consider this application site to represent a suitable infill site, for the reasons outlined within the Planning Committee Report. The Planning Authority considers that the application site does not form part of a suitable small gap site within an established built up frontage. The gap between buildings equates to 2.5 times the average plot width in the frontage and is more than twice the width of the largest residential plot in the frontage. The gap therefore is not a small gap in that it could accommodate more than two dwellings.
- 1.4 Page 13 of the submission refers to correspondence with Historic Environment Division regarding the identification and retention of the former Lime Kiln and refers to an e-mail received 20<sup>th</sup> September 2019. The Planning Department has been provided with a copy of the correspondence between the agent and HED. but would advise that with regard to point four on page 13 while the establishment of a separate curtilage around the Lime Kiln would allow the plot for the proposed dwelling to be reduced in width, this manipulation of plot width does not overcome the size of

the gap, which is established as being the distance between buildings within the built up frontage, which is capable of accommodating more than two dwellings.

- 1.5 Page 17 of the submission outlines criteria for what may not represent a gap site. Two of the key points highlighted directly relate to this application in that the gap exceeds the local average plot width and that it represents an important visual break. The application site form the bookend for development to the east of the site, denoted a marked change in character, and also forms an outlook for the dwellings at Muldonagh Cottages.
- 1.6 Pages 24 and 35 of the submission cite a Planning Appeals Commission decision in relation to a dwelling located to the North West of the application site. Planning permission was refused by the then prevailing planning authority under Policies CTY10, CTY13 and CTY 14. With respect to policies CTY13 and CTY 14 the PAC rules that due to the falling landform, set back from the road and the presence of a visual backdrop a dwelling would be suitably enclosed and would not appear as a prominent feature in the landscape. This site approved by the PAC does not form part of the built up frontage along Muldonagh Rd. The Planning Department do not consider the application site to be directly comparable to the appeal site. In order to respect the pattern of development along the built up frontage any proposed dwelling would be required to be sited in a similar position relative to the road as the buildings within the built up frontage. This would mean a dwelling would be required to be sited to the front portion of the site which would be within the more elevated part of the field, and would be elevated above the adjacent dwelling at No.196. Given that the site is devoid of any significant vegetation and that the roadside vegetation would have to be removed to facilitate access the application site would be open and exposed with any dwelling on the site appearing as a prominent and conspicuous feature in the landscape, which would be wholly reliant on the provision of new landscaping to provide adequate screening and enclosure. Given that a dwelling on the site would fail to integrate sympathetically and respect the rural character the proposal is contrary to Paragraph 6.70 of the SPPS and Policies CTY 13 and CTY 14 of PPS 21.

- 1.7 Following consideration of the additional information the Planning Authority still recommend refusal of the application as the proposal fails to comply with Paragraphs 6.70 and 6.73 of the SPPS and Policies CTY1, CTY8, CTY 13 and CTY14 of PPS21.

## **2.0 Recommendation**

- 2.1 That the Committee note the contents of this Addendum and agree with the recommendation to **Refuse** the planning application as set out in Section 9.0 of the Planning Committee Report, with the refusal reasons which have been refined as stated below.

## **3.0 REFUSAL REASONS**

1. The proposal is contrary to paragraph 6.73 of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement for Northern Ireland and Policy CTY1 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 paragraph 6.73 of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement for Northern Ireland and Policy CTY8 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside in that the proposal does not represent a small gap site within a substantial and continuously built up frontage and would, if permitted, add to an existing ribbon of development would not respect the traditional pattern of settlement exhibited in that area and would therefore result in a detrimental change to the rural character of the countryside.

3. The proposal is contrary to paragraph 6.70 of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement for Northern Ireland and Policy CTY 13 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside, in that the proposed building would be a prominent feature in the landscape; relies primarily on the use of new landscaping for integration; the proposed building fails to blend with the landform, existing trees, buildings, slopes and other natural features which provide a backdrop; and therefore would not visually integrate into the surrounding landscape.

4. The proposal is contrary to paragraph 6.70 of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement for Northern Ireland and Policy CTY14 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside in that the building would, if permitted, be unduly prominent in the landscape; result in a suburban style build-up of development when viewed with existing and approved buildings; not respect the traditional pattern of settlement exhibited in that area; would add to ribbon development along Muldonagh Rd and would therefore result in a detrimental change to the rural character of the countryside.

# Site Location Plan

