

**PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD
WEDNESDAY 21 DECEMBER 2022**

Table of Key Adoptions

No.	Item	Summary of Decisions
1.	Apologies	<i>Alderman Boyle and McKeown</i>
2.	Declarations of Interest	<i>None</i>
3.	Minutes of Planning Committee meeting held Wednesday 23 November 2022	<i>Confirmed as a correct record</i>
4.	Order of Items and Confirmation of Registered Speakers	<i>Received</i>
5.	Schedule of Applications	
5.1	LA01/2021/0175/F (Major) Land located at Smulgedon Hill, South of Legavallon Road, approx. 9km to the North East of Dungiven and 8km West of Garvagh	<i>Approve</i>
5.2	LA01/2022/0080/F (Major) Craigahulliar Holiday Park, 23 Ballymacrea Road, Craigahulliar Rd, Portrush, BT56 8NS	<i>Approve</i>
5.3	LA01/2021/1296/F (Council), Picnic site adjacent to car park at Village Hall, 81 Beach Road, Portballintrae, Bushmills	<i>Approve</i>
5.4	LA01/2022/0845/F (Council) Roemill Recreation Grounds, Roemill Road, Limavady	<i>Approve</i>
5.5	LA01/2022/0869/F (Council), Riverside Park, Armour Avenue, Ballymoney	<i>Approve</i>
5.6	LA01/2021/1402/F (Referral) 57 Ballymacrea Road, Portrush	<i>Refuse</i>
5.7	LA01/2022/0085/F (Referral), 80m North East of 4 Glenstaughey Road, Craiganee, Ballintoy, Ballycastle	<i>Refuse</i>

5.8	LA01/2019/1390/F (Referral) 6 & 8 Crocknamack Road, Portrush	Approve
6.	Correspondence	
6.1	Dfl - S26 – Windfarm at Townlands of Carnbuck, Magheraboy and Moneyneagh, near Corkey.	Noted (Items 6.1-6.7 inclusive)
6.2	Dfl – Long Term Water Strategy	
6.3	Dfl – Council’s Response - Notice of Opinion – Londonderry Hotel/Atlantic Bar, Portrush	
6.4	Dfl – Second Homes and Short Term Lets	
6.5	DfC – Notice of Listing – War Memorial, Ballydevitt Road, Aghadowey	
6.6	F&O DC – Motion – Implementation of Romp’s Legislation	
6.7	NIHC – Lifetime Homes for Northern Ireland	
	‘In Committee’ (Item 7.1 - 7.2)	
7.	Confidential Items	
7.1	Update on Legal Issues	Noted
7.2	Finance Period 1 – 7 2022/23	Noted
8.	Any Other Relevant Business (in accordance with Standing Order 12 (o))	None

**MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING
COMMITTEE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CIVIC HEADQUARTERS
AND VIA VIDEO CONFERENCE
ON WEDNESDAY 21 DECEMBER 2022 AT 10.30AM**

Chair: Councillor McMullan (C)

Committee Members Present: Alderman Baird (C), Duddy (C), S McKillop (R);
Councillors Anderson (C), Dallat O'Driscoll (R), McGurk (R), MA McKillop (R), Nicholl (R), Peacock (R), Scott (C), Storey (R).

Officers Present: D Dickson, Head of Planning (C)
S Mathers, Development Management and Enforcement Manager (R)
S O'Neill, Senior Planning Officer (R)
R Beringer, Senior Planning Officer (R)
J Lundy, Senior Planning Officer (R)
S Duggan, Civic Support & Committee & Member Services Officer (R)
I Owens, Committee & Member Services Officer (C)

Non-Committee Members In Attendance:

Councillor Quigley (C) (Item 5.6)

In Attendance: A Lennox, ICT Officer (C)

Public 10 no. (R)

Press 3 no. (R)

Key: R = Remote C = Chamber

Registered Speakers

Application No	Name
LA01/2021/0175/F	P Neary
LA01/2022/0080/F	D Dalzell C Mayrs
LA01/2021/1402/F	J Martin Cllr S Quigley
LA01/2022/0085/F	C Laverty

The Head of Planning undertook a roll call of Committee Members in attendance.

The Chair read extracts in relation to the Remote Meetings Protocol and reminded the Planning Committee of their obligations under the Local Government Code of Conduct.

1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were received for Alderman Boyle and McKeown.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no Declarations of Interest.

3. MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD WEDNESDAY 23 NOVEMBER 2022

Copy, previously circulated.

Proposed by Alderman Duddy
Seconded by Alderman Baird

- that the Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held Wednesday 23 November 2022 are signed as a correct record.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.
10 Members voted For, 0 Members voted Against, 0 Member Abstained.
The Chair declared the motion carried.

RESOLVED - that the Minutes of the Planning Committee meeting held Wednesday 23 November 2022 are signed as a correct record.

4. ORDER OF ITEMS AND CONFIRMATION OF REGISTERED SPEAKERS

The Chair invited proposals for site visits. No proposals were put.

5. SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS

5.1 LA01/2021/0175/F (MAJOR) LAND LOCATED AT SMULGEDON HILL, SOUTH OF MAJOR, LEGAVALLON ROAD APPROX 9KM TO THE NORTH EAST OF DUNGIVEN AND 8KM WEST OF GARVAGH

Report, previously circulated, was presented by Development Management and Enforcement Manager.

Reason for Referral to Planning Committee: Major

App Type: Full Planning

Proposal: Proposed amendments to the original consent B/2009/0070/F consisting of: - a reduction in the overall turbine tip height from 120.5m to 114.90m; a reduction in height from 85m to 68.9m and an increase in rotor

diameter from 71m to 92m, for all 7 turbines - a new development site entrance; relocation of the combined substation and construction compound area; and a revised access track route to service T1, T2, T5 & T6 (as per previous consent B/2013/0196/f) - all ancillary development including minor increases in the size of the crane pads & wind turbine foundations to accommodate the newly proposed turbine models - The installed capacity will be 16.45MW

Recommendation

That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to APPROVE planning permission subject to the conditions set out in section 10.

The Development Management and Enforcement Manager presented via Powerpoint presentation:

- This proposal is for a new windfarm, in lieu of a scheme approved in 2012 for 7 wind turbines. Essentially, the proposal is for a change in turbine design with a reduction in tip height by 5.6m and an increase in rotor diameter from 71m to 92m. The number of wind turbines is to remain 7. The new turbine design shall result in a modest increase in generational capacity of the windfarm from 16.1MW as approved previously to 16.45MW. The extant approval offers a fall-back position as it remains capable of full implementation.
- As indicated in the Northern Area Plan 2016, the site is located outside both the Binevenagh and Sperrins AONB. The Northern Area Plan 2016 is silent on the matter of wind farm development.
- As this is a major planning application, it was preceded by a PAN accompanied by a community consultation report.
- As this proposal is EIA development, it was accompanied by an Environmental Statement.
- Principle of Development - The starting point was that the site benefits from an already consented windfarm. However, the application was considered afresh having regard to each component of the planning policy.
- Public Safety/ Human Health & Residential Amenity - The fall over distance from public roads is met. While there are dwellings within 10 times the rotor diameter separation distance, the nearest one, 245 Legavallon Road, is located 748m from the nearest turbine. This is 125m more than considered by the Planning Appeals Commission in a comparable scheme. In terms of noise, Environmental Health were content with the effect of the proposal on all properties. Given the separation distance, the potential for shadow flicker at any dwelling is likely to be low. A shadow flicker avoidance scheme is regulated by condition.
- Visual Amenity/ Landscape Character - The most critical views of the visual impact of the proposal are from the west i.e. from the Roe Valley

(the detail of which is provided in the Report). From these views the proposal, by reason of the scale of the turbines, will appear as a prominent and skyline feature. However, given the reduction in height relative to the previous approval, the turbines are considered to be less prominent.

- Natural Heritage - Consideration has been given to a range of issues such as priority habitat (including blanket bog), the presence of badgers, birds, bats and impacts on the water environment including the River Roe and its Tributaries SAC. Through the submission of various reports, consultation with the relevant authorities and the use of specific conditions, the proposal is considered acceptable.
- Other Issues - No unacceptable issues are arising regarding built heritage interests, water quality, peat slide, telecommunications or aviation safety.
- Representations - The detail of representations are considered in the report.
- Conclusion - Having regard to the relevant issues the proposal is considered to comply with policy. Therefore, approval is recommended.

The Chair invited questions from Elected Members for the Development Management and Enforcement Manager.

At the request of an Elected Member the Development Management and Enforcement Manager clarified the objector did not live in the property within closest proximity to the proposed application, that only an email address had been provided by the objector. An Elected Member asked if the property in the slide was the closest in proximity to the proposed application. The Development Management and Enforcement Manager advised that he had looked at the GIS mapping software and confirmed that the property shown in the slide was not the closest in proximity and that the closest property to the application was 191 Legavallon Road.

The Chair invited P Neary, Agent, to speak in support of the application.

P Neary advised there were wider environmental, economic and social benefits of the application to the local community. The view of the proposal shown on the site was not a true reflection of the view from the property in the slide and was less prominent. Evidence of an increase in renewables and reduction of carbon and 100% reduction in greenhouse gases with a significant contribution to environmental targets. The application was acceptable in terms of policy, public safety and accessibility and compliant with conditions. There was public support for the application and only one objector. Benefits to the local community of £574,000 during the lifetime of the scheme.

The Chair invited questions from Elected Members for the Agent.

At the request of an Elected Member, P Neary said that initial negotiations had taken place with four Community Groups, two of which were Sports Clubs with regard to the Community Benefit Fund associated with the application. P Neary advised that the fund of around £574,000 community benefit would come to fruition over the lifetime of the scheme, if approved.

Following a comment that Members felt there was a lack of engagement with Communities at an early stage in the application process, an Elected Member raised concern Members were negotiating on behalf of Clubs and Organisations, suggesting this was outside the realms of the Planning Committee.

The Head of Planning reminded Elected Members the Community Benefit Fund as stated at paragraph 5 of SPPS could not be taken into consideration as part of the assessment of the planning application.

* **Councillor Quigley arrived in the Chamber at 10.55 am.**

Proposed by Councillor Scott
Seconded by Alderman Duddy

- That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to APPROVE planning permission subject to the conditions set out in section 10.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.
6 Members voted For, 0 Members voted Against, 5 Members Abstained.
The Chair declared the motion carried and application approved.

RESOLVED - That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to APPROVE planning permission subject to the conditions set out in section 10.

* **Alderman S McKillop joined the meeting at 11.05am.**

5.2 LA01/2022/0080/F (MAJOR) CRAIGAHULLIAR HOLIDAY PARK, 12 BALLYMACREA ROAD, CRAIGAHULIER TD, PORTRUSH, BT56 8NS

Report, previously circulated, was presented by Development Management and Enforcement Manager.

Reason for Referral to Planning Committee: Major

App Type: Full Planning

Proposal: Retention of design amendments to previously approved caravan park (approved under planning permission C/2013/0097/F), including 59no. caravan pitches suitable for static caravans in lieu of 48no. approved

touring caravan pitches and 14no. approved static caravan pitches (a reduction from 62no. approved to 59no. pitches constructed), Laundry Building in lieu of Amenity Caravan, relocation of Bin Store and Gas Tank Compound. Reconfiguration of Play Area.

Recommendation

That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to APPROVE planning permission subject to the conditions set out in section 10.

Erratum Recommendation

That the Committee note the contents of this Erratum and agree with the recommendation to approve the application in accordance with Paragraph 1.0 of the Planning Committee report.

The Development Manager and Enforcement Manager presented via Powerpoint presentation:

- Proposal comprises 59 static caravan pitches in addition to some smaller elements comprising a laundry building, a reconfigured play area and some services. This is an amendment to the “front” portion of the scheme approved in 2017. Specifically, 14 static sites and 48 touring sites are being replaced with 59 static sites. The proposal is retrospective as the development has already been carried out.
- In terms of the Northern Area Plan 2016, the site is located in the open countryside beyond the settlement development limit of Portrush. The Northern Area Plan does not contain specific policies on tourism development, rather directing that regional policies apply.
- This is a major planning application so it was preceded by a PAN accompanied by a community consultation report. In addition, as a major application, it was accompanied by a Design and Access Statement.
- Principle of Development - Policies TSM 6 New and Extended Holiday Parks in the Countryside and TSM 7 Criteria for Tourism Development make provision for this development proposal. The area has the capacity to absorb the development without adverse impact on visual amenity and rural character by reason of its integration characteristics. Planting undertaken as part of the original scheme, particularly along the site frontage, has been successful in limiting critical views of the site. Retention of the planting is sufficient to allow the development to integrate. While static units have a more permanent appearance than touring sites, the extent of visual impact is not dissimilar due to the landscaping.
- Layout and Open Space - The overall layout complies with policy as the development takes the form of discrete groupings or clusters of units. The overall provision of open space exceeds the 15% site area requirement specified by policy.
- Amenity - There are dwellings in proximity to the application site at Craighulliar Road. The relationship of the proposal with these is

considered acceptable and would be similar to use of the site for touring units as approved previously.

- Access - The site shall be accessed from Ballymacrea Road using the existing access which has been confirmed as acceptable by DfI Roads.
- Sewerage - NI Water has confirmed that mains sewerage is available to service the proposal.
- Conclusion - The proposal meets with the policy requirements for a caravan site/ holiday park in the countryside. Approval is recommended.

The Chair invited questions from Elected Members for the Development Management and Enforcement Manager. There were no questions put.

The Chair invited D Dalzell, Agent and C Mayers, Applicant to speak in support of the application. D Dalzell advised he wished to support the recommendation from Officers to approve the application and advised C Mayers would not be speaking.

The Chair invited questions from Elected Members for the Agent. There were no questions put to the Speaker.

Proposed by Alderman Baird
Seconded by Alderman Duddy

- That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to APPROVE planning permission subject to the conditions set out in section 10.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.
12 Members voted For, 0 Members voted Against, 0 Members Abstained.
The Chair declared the motion carried and application approved.

RESOLVED - That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to APPROVE planning permission subject to the conditions set out in section 10.

5.3 LA01/2021/1296/F (COUNCIL), PICNIC SITE ADJACENT TO CAR PARK AT VILLAGE HALL, 81 BEACH ROAD, PORTBALLINTRAE, BUSHMILLS

Report and Erratum, previously circulated, was presented by Senior Planning Officer, R Beringer.

Reason for Referral to Planning Committee: Council

App Type: Full Planning

Proposal: Removal of existing section of fence and the construction of 1m high wall faced in dark granite and incorporating a metal historical information

plaque and a timber bench seat together with the erection of a perforated metal panel 3050 x 1500mm on two 80 x 30 x 10mm steel channels with the bottom of the panel set 1m above ground level.

Recommendation

That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to Approve planning permission subject to the reasons set out in section 10.

The Senior Planning Officer, R Beringer, presented via Powerpoint presentation:

- LA01/2021/1296/F is for the removal of existing section of fence and the construction of 1m high wall faced in dark granite and incorporating a metal historical information plaque and a timber bench seat together with the erection of a perforated metal panel 3050mm x 1500mm on two 80 x 30 x 10mm steel channels with the bottom of the panel set 1m above ground level.
- Accompanying the committee report is an erratum. The site is just outside the settlement development limit of Portballintrae.
- The site as shown in the red line, is located to the northern corner of the public footpath circumnavigating the Salmon Rock Beach Car Park at the conclusion of Beach Road. The site is irregular in shape and contains a segment of footpath and timber post and rail boundary fence, together with a section of grass headland. The timber fence defines part of the northern boundary of the site with all remaining boundaries being undefined and open to the surroundings. The topography of the site itself is relatively flat, with the site occupying an elevated position in relation to sea level, but sitting at a lower level to the car park and surrounding amenity areas to the south.
- (Slide)The proposal is for full planning permission to remove an existing section of fence to be replaced by a 1m high wall in dark granite incorporating a metal historical information plaque and a timber bench seat. A perforated metal panel 3050 x 1500mm supported on two 80 x 30 x 10mm steel channels will be erected to the rear of the wall with the bottom of the panel set 1m above ground level. Stone detailed on plan view as smooth basalt but confirmed with agent that this is to be dark granite as per description.
- (Slide) This slide shows the application site as viewed from within the car park.
- (Slide) View of the site from the south west
- (Slide) View of the site from the south east
- (Slide) Images of the site provided by the agent showing the proposed panel temporarily erected on the site as part of a local arts festival held in June 2022. The panel was supported on temporary makeshift timber posts for this event.

- The site is located just outside the Settlement Development Limit for Portballintrae and within the Causeway Coast Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB). The site also lies within the Distinctive Landscape Setting of the Giant's Causeway and Causeway Coast World Heritage Site (designation COU 3 of the NAP 2016), and within the Bay LLPA (designation PEL 02) which incorporates the Dunluce/Ballintrae SLNCI.
- The proposal involves an historical art installation in the form of a perforated steel panel which is supported on two 80 x 30 x 10mm steel channels, and sited on the seaward side of the existing footpath. The panel will be complimented by a new section of wall incorporating an information plaque and bench seat which replaces an existing length of timber fencing and which will tie in with the existing stone wall. The proposed development is intended to create a focal point providing information and education on the historical events which will preserve the legacy of La Girona and the Spanish Armada while attracting further visitors to the area.
- The proposal meets the specified exception of criteria 1 of Policy COU 4 of the NAP 2016. The proposal is considered a modest form of development that will positively contribute to the public amenity of the area through the provision of an additional tourist focal point together with improving the existing public infrastructure. The proposal will not adversely affect the features or character of the designated LLPA and it complies with Policy ENV 1. The proposal is considered sympathetic to this AONB location and complies with policy NH6 of PPS 2.
- Representations are covered within the planning committee report.
- Approval is recommended.

The Chair invited questions from Elected Members for the Senior Planning Officer.

Following a question from an Elected Member, the Senior Planning Officer advised that there was no proposal to make any changes to the picnic area.

Proposed by Alderman Duddy
Seconded by Councillor Anderson

- That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to Approve planning permission subject to the reasons set out in section 10.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

12 Members voted For, 0 Members voted Against, 0 Members Abstained.

The Chair declared the motion carried and application approved.

RESOLVED - That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to Approve planning permission subject to the reasons set out in section 10.

5.4 LA01/2022/0845/F (COUNCIL) ROWMILL RECREATION GROUNDS ROEMILL ROAD, LIMAVADY

Report, previously circulated, was presented by Senior Planning Officer, R Beringer.

Reason for Referral to Planning Committee: Council

App Type: Full Planning

Proposal: Site for single concessionary trading trailer for multiple catering and other trading activities including the sale of hot food, beverages and snacks.

Recommendation

That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to Approve planning permission subject to the reasons set out in section 10.

The Senior Planning Officer, R Beringer, presented via Powerpoint presentation:

- LA01/2022/0845/F is for a site for single concessionary trading trailer for multiple catering and other trading activities, including the sale of hot food, beverages and snacks at Roemill Recreation Grounds, Roemill Road, Limavady.
- The site as shown in the red line is located at Roe Mill Recreation Grounds on the Roe Mill Road in Limavady. The site is located within the settlement development limit for Limavady, and within a designated major area of existing open space. The site is also within the Roe Park Local Landscape Policy Area as identified in the NAP 2016.
- The application seeks full planning permission for a site for a single concessionary trading trailer and is positioned approx. 7.5m SW of the existing pavilion buildings. The site has a proposed footprint of 4m x 3m on an area of existing hardstanding.
- (Slide) View of existing area of hardstanding to the south west of the existing buildings.
- (Slide) View of the site with the playground positioned to the south.
- The site is located within the settlement development limit, within an existing area of open space and within the Roe Park LLPA, Designation

LYL 02. The proposal is for a site for a single concessionary trading trailer and is located on an area of existing hardstanding.

- Policy ENV 1 states that planning permission will not be granted for development proposals that would be liable to affect adversely those features, or combination of features, that contribute to the environmental quality, integrity or character of a designated LLPA. Where development is permitted, it will be required to comply with any requirements set out for individual LLPAs in the District Proposals.
- The NAP 2016 states that no further development is appropriate within the Roe Park LLPA, other than modest extensions to the hotel, sensitively integrated into the landscape, or modest facilities associated with the existing recreational areas. This is a modest facility on account of its scale and use, which is expected to be limited to those utilising the recreation grounds and with limited operating hours associated with the opening times of the recreation grounds. The nature of the proposal allows for moveable trailers, further reducing any potential impact on the site and wider area. The proposal will not adversely affect the features which contribute to the environmental quality, integrity or character of the designated LLPA and the proposal complies with Policy ENV 1.
- Policy DES 2 requires development proposals in towns and villages to make a positive contribution to townscape and be sensitive to the character of the area surrounding the site in terms of design, scale and use of materials. Given the nature of the proposal and the siting on an existing area of hardstanding, adjacent to existing buildings, the visual impact would be limited. The siting of a single mobile concessionary trading trailer would not result in a detrimental impact to the character of the area and the proposal complies with Policy DES 2.
- Policy OS1 of PPS 8 exists to protect open space. The policy states that development would not be permitted where it would result in the loss of existing open space or land zoned for the provision of open space. As the area of hardstanding where the proposed trailer would be sited is existing and the scale and nature of the proposal are modest, being instantly restored upon removal of the trailer, the proposal can be reasonably deemed an exception to Policy OS 1 and there is no conflict.
- No objections have been received in relation to this proposal.
- Approval is recommended.

The Chair invited Elected Members questions for the Senior Planning Officer.

At the request of an Elected Member the Senior Planning Officer advised that the application was for a trading trailer only and that concessionary trading applications would be considered by Environmental Services via licencing.

Proposed by Councillor Scott
Seconded by Alderman Baird

- That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to Approve planning permission subject to the reasons set out in section 10.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.

12 Members voted For, 0 Members voted Against, 0 Members Abstained.

The Chair declared the motion carried and application approved.

RESOLVED That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to Approve planning permission subject to the reasons set out in section 10.

5.5 LA01/2022/0869/F (COUNCIL), RIVERSIDE PARK, ARMOUR AVENUE, BALLYMONEY

Report, previously circulated, was presented by Senior Planning Officer, R Beringer.

Reason for Referral to Planning Committee: Council

App Type: Full Planning

Proposal: Site for single concessionary trading trailer for multiple catering and other trading activities including the sale of hot food, beverages and snacks.

Recommendation

That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to Approve planning permission subject to the reasons set out in section 10.

The Senior Planning Officer, R Beringer, presented via Powerpoint presentation:

- LA01/2022/0869/F is for a site for single concessionary trading trailer for multiple catering and other trading activities, including the sale of hot food, beverages and snacks at Riverside Park, Armour Avenue, Ballymoney.
- Verbal erratum to clarify that at section 5.0 of the Planning Committee Report neighbours were notified in accordance with the legislation and a consultation was sent to Environmental Health. No objections.
- The site as shown in the red line is located at Riverside Park, Armour Avenue, Ballymoney. The site is located within the settlement development limit for Ballymoney, and within a designated major area of existing open space. The site is also within the Ballymoney River Upper Local Landscape Policy Area as identified in the NAP 2016.

- The application seeks full planning permission for a site for a single concessionary trading trailer and is positioned to the north-eastern side of the Pavilion, adjacent to the car park. The site has a proposed footprint of approx. 3.7m x 2.5m on an area of existing hardstanding.
- (Slide) View of proposed site with the existing Pavilion building to the rear.
- (Slide) View of the site showing existing hardstanding.
- (Slide) View of site, with existing mature vegetation along the site boundary with Armour Avenue.
- The site is located within the settlement development limit, within an existing area of open space and within the Ballymoney River Upper LLPA, Designation LYL 02. The proposal is for a site for a single concessionary trading trailer and is located on an area of existing hardstanding.
- Policy ENV 1 states that planning permission will not be granted for development proposals that would be liable to affect adversely those features, or combination of features, that contribute to the environmental quality, integrity or character of a designated LLPA. Where development is permitted, it will be required to comply with any requirements set out for individual LLPAs in the District Proposals.
- The NAP 2016 states that any development proposals in this LLPA shall be fully compatible with retaining its character and shall require minimal tree removal. This is a modest facility on account of its scale and use, which is expected to be limited to those utilising the recreation grounds and with limited operating hours associated with the opening times of the recreation grounds. The nature of the proposal allows for moveable trailers, further reducing any potential impact on the site and wider area. The proposal does not involve the removal of any trees. The proposal will not adversely affect the features which contribute to the environmental quality, integrity or character of the designated LLPA and the proposal complies with Policy ENV 1.
- Policy DES 2 requires development proposals in towns and villages to make a positive contribution to townscape and be sensitive to the character of the area surrounding the site in terms of design, scale and use of materials. Given the nature of the proposal and the siting on an existing area of hardstanding, adjacent to the existing pavilion building, the visual impact would be limited. The siting of a single mobile concessionary trading trailer would not result in a detrimental impact to the character of the area and the proposal complies with Policy DES 2.
- Policy OS1 of PPS 8 exists to protect open space. The policy states that development would not be permitted where it would result in the loss of existing open space or land zoned for the provision of open space. As the area of hardstanding where the proposed trailer would be sited is existing and the scale and nature of the proposal are modest, being instantly restored upon removal of the trailer, the proposal can be reasonably deemed an exception to Policy OS 1.

- No objections have been received in relation to this proposal.
- Approval is recommended.

The Chair invited questions from Elected Members to the Senior Planning Officer.

At the request of Elected Members the Senior Planning Officer confirmed that there was no tree removal as part of the application, opening times would be limited to current opening times of park which was gated and locked.

An Elected Member raised concerns about ongoing anti-social behaviour which was being monitored by PSNI in this vicinity and hoped that residents would not be affected by the proposal.

The Chair suggested that some additional litter receptacles be put in place.

Proposed by Alderman Duddy
Seconded by Alderman Baird

- That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to Approve planning permission subject to the reasons set out in section 10.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.
12 Members voted For, 0 Members voted Against, 0 Members Abstained.
The Chair declared the motion carried and application approved.

RESOLVED That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to Approve planning permission subject to the reasons set out in section 10.

- * **The Chair declared a recess for a comfort break at 11.35 am.**
- * **The meeting resumed at 11.40 am.**

The Head of Planning undertook a roll call.

5.6 LA01/2021/1402/F (REFERRAL) 57 BALLYMACREA ROAD, PORTRUSH

Report and Site Visit Report, previously circulated, was presented by Senior Planning Officer, R Beringer.

Reason for Referral to Planning Committee: Referral

App Type: Full Planning

Proposal: Retrospective garden room with proposed extension to provide ancillary guest accommodation & garage / store.

Recommendation

That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to REFUSE full planning permission subject to the reasons set out in section 10.

The Senior Planning Officer, R Beringer, presented via Powerpoint presentation:

- LA01/2021/1402/F is for a retrospective garden room with proposed extension to provide ancillary guest accommodation and garage / store.
- The application was initially presented to the November Planning Committee and was deferred to allow a site visit which took place on Monday.
- Accompanying the committee report is a site visit note.
- The site as shown in the red line is located at 57 Ballymacrea Road, Portrush. The site is located in the countryside, outside the settlement limit for Portrush, as defined in the NAP 2016. The site comprises the existing detached single storey dwelling at No. 57, a timber garden shed, and the detached single storey garden room, which has already been constructed, positioned in the south eastern corner of the site. The site layout shows the siting of the proposal relative to the existing dwelling which is positioned in the northern corner. The proposal is located approximately 31.4m south east of the existing dwelling and is not physically linked to the main dwelling.
- The proposal is for a retrospective garden room with extension to provide ancillary guest accommodation and a garage (or) store space. The proposal will provide further accommodation, in the form of a two storey extension, comprising a porch, garage and boot room at ground floor level and a bedroom, dressing area with walk-in wardrobe, and ensuite at first floor level. This is in addition to the garden room which is already constructed on the site. Access is also provided to the attic store situated above the garden room.
- (Slide) This slide shows the existing north, front, elevation of the garden room as constructed on site. The proposed two storey extension is sited at this end of the existing building.
- (Slide) Again, the western elevation of the garden room as constructed, which is positioned to the south east of the existing dwelling at No. 57. An existing post and wire fence and planting separates this part of the site from the main garden. A small grass path remains to provide access.
- (Slide) Southern aspect of the as constructed garden room on site.
- (Slide) View of the application site, with the garden shed in the foreground, from within the main garden area of No. 57.
- (Slide) This photo shows the existing dwelling with parking
- (Slide) Separate access and parking for the proposal from the laneway.
- (Slide) View towards the eastern elevation of the site taken from the garden area which lies further to the south east of the proposal.

- Policy EXT1 of the Addendum to PPS7 provides the policy guidance in relation to residential extensions and alterations at Paragraphs 2.8 – 2.11. Paragraph 2.9 states that ancillary accommodation should be subordinate to the main dwelling and its function supplementary to the use of the existing residence. The accommodation should normally be attached to the existing property and be internally accessible from it.
- Paragraph 2.10 of APPS 7 outlines that where an extension to the existing dwelling is not practicable and it is proposed to convert / extend an existing outbuilding, planning permission will normally depend on the development providing a modest scale of accommodation. This is to ensure the use of the building forms part of the main dwelling. The construction of a separate building, as self-contained accommodation, within the curtilage of an existing dwelling will not be acceptable, unless a separate dwelling would be granted permission in its own right. It is stated that in all cases the Planning Authority will need to be satisfied that the proposed accommodation will remain ancillary to the main residential property.
- Paragraph A49 of APPS 7 states that accommodation must demonstrate dependency on the existing residential property with shared facilities. Ancillary uses that could practically and viably operate on their own will not be acceptable.
- This proposal for a retrospective garden room with proposed extension would provide a self-contained unit of accommodation. The scale and design of the proposal result in it appearing as a separate dwelling, comprised of urban features with a flat roof two storey extension, and large sections of glazing to the first floor. While the proposed plans do not identify a kitchen space, considering the scale and level of accommodation proposed, the separate access and parking, and the physical separation of the proposal from the main dwelling house, the accommodation could practically and viably operate on its own.
- The proposal would provide a bedroom, dressing area with walk-in wardrobe, ensuite, garage and bootroom in addition to a large area of living space that would be provided by the garden room as already constructed on site. The proposed accommodation is not subordinate to the main dwelling. The proposal does not meet with the requirements of APPS 7 with regards to ancillary accommodation and the principle of development on this site is considered unacceptable. The proposal is contrary to Policy EXT 1 of APPS 7.
- In this instance, a separate dwelling would not be acceptable as it does not meet the provisions for development in the countryside under Policy CTY 1 of PPS 21.
- As the principle of development is not acceptable under policy, refusal is recommended.

The Chair invited Elected Members questions to Senior Planning Officer.

At the request of an Elected Member the Senior Planning Officer confirmed that the application does not benefit from planning permission and was not immune from enforcement.

The Chair invited J Martin, Agent to speak in support of the application.

Regarding the first reason for refusal 4.26 and 4.27 concerning design, there were other buildings nearby with large glazing and a flat roof. This application has a high-quality design which minimises scale and massing. Additionally, under PPS7 extension to existing garden room – application is modest in scale, not excessive, much smaller than existing dwelling and public views are limited. Unable to extend existing property due to rights of way and a lane on three sides.

The second reason for refusal does not apply as refers to extension to existing dwelling. Letter from enforcement regarding the garden room confirmed that there was a slight variation and matter not expedient to pursue and that height ridge was only 30 cm in excess of what was permitted.

The Chair invited Elected Members questions to the Agent. There were no questions put to the Agent.

The Senior Planning Officer advised there were other enforcement matters to be considered which were recommended to be heard, 'In Committee'.

At the request of an Elected Member the Chair agreed to hear the other speaker before moving '*In Committee*'.

The Chair invited Councillor Quigley to speak in support of the application.

Councillor Quigley referred to the letter read out by the Agent indicating that enforcement would not be pursued and advised that the construction was more than 4 years old. The application was a cost-effective solution which was not intrusive and did not require removal of trees or hedgerow. Over the past 8 years there have been garages viewed as single dwellings which can operate independently of the main dwelling.

The Chair invited questions from Elected Members to Councillor Quigley.

At the request of an Elected Member Councillor Quigley referred to the letter stating that enforcement would not be pursued and that the ridge height was only 30 cm in excess of what was permitted.

An Elected Member asked why access at site visit by Members was denied, Councillor Quigley said she believed this was a miscommunication and the applicant was more than content for the garden room to be seen. Following questions, Councillor Quigley explained there was a need for the garden room as the applicant had caring responsibility for her sister's children and the accommodation in the main property was insufficient, having only two bedrooms.

MOTION TO PROCEED ‘IN COMMITTEE’

Proposed by Councillor Anderson
Seconded by Councillor Scott and

AGREED – that Planning Committee move ‘*In Committee*’.

- * **Press and public were disconnected from the meeting at 12.05 pm.**
- * **Councillor Quigley left the Chamber at 12.05 pm.**

The information contained in the following items is restricted in accordance with Part 1 of Schedule 6 of the Local Government Act (Northern Ireland) 2014.

An Elected Member asked if this had not been a retrospective application what the likelihood it would have been approved. The Senior Planning Officer advised that the issues on principal would still stand and the application would have been recommended for refusal.

At the request of an Elected Member the Senior Planning Officer provided a slide with photographs of the inside of the building which contained within the enforcement file and provided details from the enforcement investigation.

The Head of Planning confirmed that a garden room should be dependent on the main dwelling and that the application being considered was independent and self-sufficient.

Elected Members asked for the status of the building when enforcement was halted on 17th January 2019. The Senior Planning Officer provided details on the enforcement investigations relating to the property.

MOTION TO PROCEED ‘IN PUBLIC’

Proposed by Alderman Duddy
Seconded by Councillor Scott

AGREED – that Planning Committee move ‘*In Public*’.

- * **The Press and Public were re-admitted to the meeting at 12.30 pm**
- * **Councillor Quigley re-joined the meeting in the Chamber at 12.30 pm**

The Chair invited questions, there were no questions put to Councillor Quigley.

Councillor Quigley asked if she could provide further clarity and the Chair ruled that she was not permitted to further speak on the application.

Proposed by Councillor Anderson
Seconded by Alderman Baird

- That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to REFUSE full planning permission subject to the reasons set out in section 10.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.
10 Members voted For, 0 Members voted Against, 0 Members Abstained.
The Chair declared the motion carried and application Refused

RESOLVED That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to REFUSE full planning permission subject to the reasons set out in section 10.

**5.7 LA01/2022/0085/F (REFERRAL), 80M NORTH EAST OF 4
GLENSTAUGHEY ROAD, CRAIGANEE, BALLINTOY, BALLYCASTLE**

Report, Erratum and Site Visit Report, previously circulated, was presented by Senior Planning Officer, S O'Neill.

Reason for Referral to Planning Committee: Referral

App Type: Full Planning

Proposal: Farm diversification proposal for 4 glamping pods on a farm & associated site works

Recommendation

That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for recommendation set out in Section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to REFUSE planning permission subject to the conditions set out in section 10.

Erratum Recommendation

That the Committee note the contents of this Erratum and agree with the recommendation to refuse the application in accordance with Paragraph 1.1 of the Planning Committee report.

The Senior Planning Officer provided a verbal erratum to the Committee Report relating to the level of hedge removal required.

The Senior Planning Officer presented via Powerpoint presentation:

- (Slide) The site is located opposite no. 4 Glenstaughey Road, Ballintoy. The site is located in the open countryside and within the Antrim Coast and Glens AONB.
- (Slide) This is the site layout drawing. The site comprises 4 small timber pods, access and parking area and is a linear site running along the edge of the road.
- In terms of policy consideration, it falls to be considered under policy CTY 11 of PPS 21 as a farm diversification proposal. It has been confirmed that the farm business is currently active and established for the purposes of the policy. In terms of character and scale it is considered that the proposal is not appropriate to the location given its openness and lack of existing natural boundaries. The application site lies within the Antrim Coast and Glens Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty with the proposal posing the risk of having an adverse impact on this special character area. A proposal will only be acceptable under this policy where it involves re-use of existing buildings. Exceptionally a new building may be permitted where no existing buildings are capable or available to accommodate the proposed use, either because they are essential for the maintenance of the farm enterprise or are unsuitable. Where a new building is justified it should be satisfactorily integrated with an existing group of buildings
- The site is removed from the farm grouping, which is on the opposite side of the road, by mature trees and the Glenstaughey Road and as such is not integrated with the existing group of buildings. As such the proposal fails to meet policy CTY 11 of PPS 21.
- The proposal was also assessed under policy TSM 6 of PPS 16. It is considered that the proposal fails to comply with criteria (a), (b) and (e) of policy TSM 6 which relates to integration and design in that the site is located in an area that does not have the capacity to be absorbed into the landscape without having an adverse impact on visual amenity and rural character.
- (Slide) These are sectional drawings through the site. The proposal includes the removal of 38 metres of roadside hedgerow and requires the raising of ground levels at the site entrance to achieve necessary access arrangement which will have a detrimental impact on the landscape. The topography of the site falls in an easterly direction towards the rear of the site.
- (Slide) Another sectional drawing showing the glamping pod.
- (Slide) Views of the site will be achieved when travelling in both directions along the Glenstaughey Road. This is a view from Glenstaughey Road with the site indicated by the blue arrow. The Glenstaughey Road is generally characterised by clusters of development – agricultural/rural dwellings set back off the road. The development of this roadside site for the proposed use would appear out of character and incongruous with the surrounding area and would have a negative impact on this AONB location.
- (Slide) This is a closer view of the site and this approach would be the most critical view. The proposal would require the removal of approximately 38 metres of roadside hedgerow together with the raising of site levels at the entrance to achieve the access arrangements – this

will open up views of the site. The proposed site is also undefined along the rear boundary and the northern boundary and would require new planting along the frontage as well as these remaining boundaries to provide enclosure and aid integration. This is contrary to policies CTY 13 and 14 of PPS 21. The proposal also fails criteria (a), (b) and (e) of policy TSM 6 which relates to integration and design and policy TSM 7 in that the proposal would have an adverse impact on visual amenity and rural character. The proposal also fails tourism policies TSM 6 and 7 in PPS 16 and policy NH 6 of PPS 2 due to the negative impact the development would have on the AONB.

- Officer's recommendation is to refuse planning permission.

At the request of an Elected Member the Head of Planning advised that Officers were not in a position to identify alternative sites for applications as this was a matter for the applicant.

The Chair invited C Lavery to speak in Support of the Application.

C Lavery advised that this was a large area of agriculture land which rose steeply. One area adjacent to the farm was used as a handling area and essential for future use of the farm. The farmyard is busy and dangerous and sheds are used to house animals during winter months. The site can be observed from the farmhouse. This is an established farm and there were no objections. Regarding refusal reasons, the application integrates when viewed from Whitepark Road and on approach is screened from existing boundaries. Only just within an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and impact is minimal. The parking area and gravel path are not prominent and no substantial impact on ground area. Site area for parking reduced to 14.6 m from 25 m deep to make the site compact. Should be able to avail of farm diversification as only on the edge of an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. The application complies with Policy.

The Chair invited questions from Elected Members for the Agent.

At the request of an Elected Member the Agent confirmed that the communal parking area had been reduced from 25 m to 14.6 m in depth.

Proposed by Councillor Anderson
Seconded by Councillor Scott

- That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for recommendation set out in Section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to REFUSE planning permission subject to the conditions set out in section 10.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.
2 Members voted For, 1 Members voted Against, 7 Members Abstained.
The Chair declared the motion carried and application Refused.

RESOLVED - That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for recommendation set out in Section 9 and the policies and guidance in sections 7 and 8 and resolves to REFUSE planning permission subject to the conditions set out in section 10.

5.8 LA01/2019/1390/F (REFERRAL) 6 & 8 CROCKNAMACK ROAD, PORTRUSH

Report, Addendum and Addendum 2 previously circulated, was presented by Senior Planning Officer, J Lundy.

Reason for Referral to Planning Committee: Referral

App Type: Full Planning

Proposal: Proposed mews retirement development to provide single (1 no.) two storey retirement unit as annex to dwellings approved on 6 Crocknamack Road, Portrush.

Senior Planning Officer referred to Addendum 2 previously circulated. Addendum 2 evidenced that the scheme was significantly amended, DfI Roads and Northern Ireland Water issues have been resolved and additional information submitted. Private amenity to front is screened by wall and is acceptable as no significant adverse impact on residential amenity. Shadow study has been submitted and impact is limited to only one property in winter. Approval is Recommended.

Verbal Erratum is required to amend the last sentence of para 8.9 of PCR as there are no windows overlooking this site from No 5 Hopfield.

Recommendation

That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the Addendum 2 Report and resolves to APPROVE outline planning permission for the reasons set out in section 1.4-1.7 of Addendum 2 report.

The Senior Planning Officer presented via Powerpoint presentation:

- At the January Planning Committee meeting an addendum was circulated requesting deferral to allow the planning certificate to be amended. At the committee the proposed development was recommended for refusal.
- 3 letters of objection have been received relating to the over development of the site, car parking, access onto an unadopted lane and the height of the proposal. These objections were submitted when the original submission was for 2 dwellings no further objections have been received since the scheme has been amended.
- Following deferral DFI Roads and NIW issues have been resolved. Further info was submitted in the form of a statement and shadow study.

The reassessment of the additional information is set out in addendum 2 and approval is now recommended.

- The guidance for backland development is set out in DCAN 8. It states a fundamental requirement of backland development is for the backland plot to be of a sufficient depth to accommodate new housing in a way which provides a quality residential environment for new and existing residents. The guidance states that backland development on plot depths of less than 80m is unlikely to be acceptable, except where the existing urban grain is very urban in character, and where careful design can overcome concerns of overlooking and day lighting. The plot depth is 52m and requires careful consideration. The information provided allowed further consideration of the design and lighting to demonstrate that the proposal can meet the relevant planning policies namely PPS 7.
- (Slide) The site is within the settlement development limit of Portrush and is located in the approved rear gardens of a semi-detached 3 storey block. The proposed access is from a private lane out onto Croc Na Mac Square.
- (Slide) This is the approved layout for the 2 semi-detached dwellings with the proposed site located within the rear gardens of both dwellings.
- (Slide) This slide shows the 3d images of the approved scheme and the garden design showing laid lawn and additional car parking to the rear for the 2 dwellings.
- The proposed 2 storey dwelling is located in the rear gardens of the dwellings.
- The proposed dwelling has been designed as 2 interlinking blocks. With private amenity space to the rear and to the front as shown on the block plan at the bottom of the slide. Though not normally acceptable the area to the front is screened by a high wall and has no overlooking from surrounding properties and is located on a back lane. The proposed dwelling is only 1m of the rear shared boundary and well below the 10m advocated in policy. However, the design and surrounding character of the tight urban grain this is in balance is considered acceptable as there is no overlooking or significant overshadowing of surrounding properties.
- (Slide) The dwellings at Croc na Mac Road approved as 3 storey semi-detached.
- (Slide) The proximity of No 3 Hopefield Avenue to the site, no windows from the proposed development will overlook the property.
- (Slide) The rear of the dwellings to Rodney Square, we had raised concern that due to the proximity of the 2 storey dwelling to the shared boundary there would be potential to overshadow and result in a loss of light to this dwellings located on the eastern boundary. The shadow study shows some loss of light in the winter at the later part of the day to the last property on the row. As this is in the winter months when the sun is at its lowest and for the latter part of the day it was not considered to cause a significant detrimental impact to warrant a refusal.
- The application has been reassessed due to the additional information submitted and is considered to meet with the policies set out in the SPPS and PPS 7 and the guidance. The representations have been considered

in the reassessment and noted and proposed changes have addressed the main points of concern. Approval is recommended.

The Chair invited questions from Elected Members for Senior Planning Officer.

There were no questions put to the Senior Planning Officer.

Proposed by Alderman Duddy
Seconded by Councillor Anderson

- That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the Addendum 2 Report and resolves to APPROVE outline planning permission for the reasons set out in section 1.4-1.7 of Addendum 2 report.

The Chair put the motion to the Committee to vote.
9 Members voted For, 0 Members voted Against, 0 Members Abstained.
The Chair declared the motion carried and application Approved.

RESOLVED That the Committee has taken into consideration and agrees with the reasons for the recommendation set out in the Addendum 2 Report and resolves to APPROVE outline planning permission for the reasons set out in section 1.4-1.7 of Addendum 2 report.

6. CORRESPONDENCE

6.1 Dfl - S26 – Windfarm at Townlands of Carnbuck, Magheraboy and Moneyneagh, near Corkey.

Correspondence, previously circulated was presented by Head of Planning.

6.2 Dfl – Long Term Water Strategy

Correspondence, previously circulated was presented by Head of Planning.

6.3 Dfl – Council’s Response - Notice of Opinion – Londonderry Hotel/Atlantic Bar, Portrush

Correspondence, previously circulated was presented by Head of Planning.

6.4 Dfl – Second Homes and Short Term Lets

Correspondence, previously circulated was presented by Head of Planning.

6.5 DfC – Notice of Listing – War Memorial, Ballydevitt Road, Aghadowey

Correspondence, previously circulated was presented by Head of Planning.

6.6 F&O DC – Motion – Implementation of Romp’s Legislation

Correspondence, previously circulated was presented by Head of Planning.

6.7 NIHC – Lifetime Homes for Northern Ireland

Correspondence, previously circulated was presented by Head of Planning.

Following a comment from an Elected Member, the Chair concurred that second homes remain high on the Planning Committee Agenda.

RESOLVED – That Planning Committee note the correspondence report items 6.1-6.7 inclusive).

MOTION TO PROCEED ‘IN COMMITTEE’

Proposed by Alderman Baird
Seconded by Alderman Duddy and

AGREED – that Planning Committee move ‘*In Committee*’.

* **Press and public were disconnected from the meeting at 12.55 pm.**

The information contained in the following items is restricted in accordance with Part 1 of Schedule 6 of the Local Government Act (Northern Ireland) 2014.

7. CONFIDENTIAL ITEMS

7.1 Update on Legal Issues

The Head of Planning provided a verbal update on the ongoing two Court of Appeal cases and the response regarding the application at Riverside, Coleraine. She further advised of a Pre-Action Protocol letter received in relation to the wind farm development at Rigged Hill and that legal advice was being sought.

7.2 Finance Period 1 – 7 2022/23

Confidential, previously circulated, was presented by Head of Planning.

Background

This Report is to provide Members with an update on the financial position of the Planning Department as of end Period 7 of the 2022/23 business year.

Recommendation

IT IS RECOMMENDED that the Committee notes the update provided on the Planning Budget as of end of Period 7 of 2022/23 business year.

RESOLVED – That Planning Committee note the report.

8. ANY OTHER RELEVANT BUSINESS (IN ACCORDANCE WITH STANDING ORDER 12 (O))

There was no Any Other Relevant Business.

MOTION TO PROCEED '*IN PUBLIC*'

Proposed by Alderman Duddy
Seconded by Alderman Baird

AGREED – that Planning Committee move '*In Public*'.

This being all the business the Chair thanked everyone for being in attendance, and the meeting concluded at 1.05 pm.

Chair