



Title of Report:	Planning Committee Report – LA01/2021/0063/F
Committee Report Submitted To:	Planning Committee
Date of Meeting:	27th September 2023
For Decision or For Information	For Decision - Referred Item by Cllr Cara McShane

Linkage to Council Strategy (2021-25)	
Strategic Theme	Cohesive Leadership
Outcome	Council has agreed policies and procedures and decision making is consistent with them
Lead Officer	Senior Planning Officer

Budgetary Considerations	
Cost of Proposal	Nil
Included in Current Year Estimates	N/A
Capital/Revenue	N/A
Code	N/A
Staffing Costs	N/A

Screening Requirements	Required for new or revised Policies, Plans, Strategies or Service Delivery Proposals.		
Section 75 Screening	Screening Completed:	N/A	Date:
	EQIA Required and Completed:	N/A	Date:

Rural Needs Assessment (RNA)	Screening Completed	N/A	Date:
	RNA Required and Completed:	N/A	Date:
Data Protection Impact Assessment (DPIA)	Screening Completed:	N/A	Date:
	DPIA Required and Completed:	N/A	Date:

No: LA01/2021/0063/F **Ward:** Torr Head and Rathlin

App Type: Full

Address: Site approximately 20metres South of No.2 Craigfad Road, Ballycastle

Proposal: Farm diversification project to accommodate 2 no. Glamping pods utilising existing access, parking, and pedestrian field access.

Con Area: N/A **Valid Date:** 21/12/2021

Listed Building Grade: N/A

Agent: Manor Architects, Stable Buildings, 30A High Street, Moneymore, BT45 7PD

Applicant: Sean Butler, 23 Fairhead Road, Ballyvoy, Ballycastle, BT45 6RD

Objections: 0 **Petitions of Objection:** 0

Support: 0 **Petitions of Support:** 0

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- Full planning permission is sought for a proposed farm diversification project to accommodate 2 no. glamping pods with a new access and associated car parking and site works.
- The application site is located outside any settlement limits but within the Antrim Coast and Glens Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty as identified in the Northern Area Plan 2016.
- The principle of development is considered to be unacceptable having regard to Policies CTY 11, CTY 13 and CTY 14 of PPS 21, Policy TSM 7 of PPS 16, Policy NH 6 of PPS 2 and PPS 3.
- The proposal is considered to be unacceptable in terms of integration and rural character. The proposed site lacks long established boundaries to provide a suitable degree of enclosure and relies on new planting for integration.
- It has not been demonstrated that there would be no detrimental impact on road safety as a result of this proposal. DFI Roads were consulted and requested additional information. This requested information was not received.
- The proposal will not significantly impact on the privacy or amenity of neighbouring dwellings.
- The proposal will have an adverse impact on the AONB.
- DFI Roads, Environmental Health, DFI Rivers, NI Water, NIEA, DETI – Geological Survey (NI), HED and DAERA were consulted to make comment.
- DFI Roads requested for additional information to determine if there would be any detrimental impacts on road safety. This information was not submitted.
- Refusal is recommended.

Drawings and additional information are available to view on the Planning Portal- <https://planningregister.planningssystemni.gov.uk/>

1 RECOMMENDATION

- 1.1 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.

2 SITE LOCATION & DESCRIPTION

- 2.1 The application site is considered to be agricultural land located in a rural setting as it is outside any development limits as identified in the Northern Area Plan 2016. The boundary of the site is defined by post and wire fencing along its western boundary, defined by a wall at its northern boundary with the south and east currently open to the remainder of the existing agricultural land. The application site is located south of associated farm buildings (including of the farm dwelling). Other lands in the surrounding area include other agricultural land.

3 RELEVANT HISTORY

LA01/2021/0057/F – PERMISSION GRANTED for a farm diversification project to accommodate 2 no. glamping pods utilising an existing access, planting and parking area on lands 95m West of 23 Fairhead Road.

4 THE APPLICATION

- 4.1 This is a full application for a "Farm diversification project to accommodate 2 no. Glamping pods utilising existing access, parking, and pedestrian field access".

5 PUBLICITY & CONSULTATIONS

- 5.1 **External**
Neighbours: No objections.

5.2 Internal

NIEA: No objections

DFI Roads: Request additional information

NI Water: No objections

Environmental Health: No objections

Rivers Agency: No objections

DETI – Geological Survey (NI): No objections

Historic Environment Division: No objections

DAERA: No objections

6 MATERIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 6.1 Section 45(1) of the Planning Act (Northern Ireland) 2011 requires that all applications must have regard to the local plan, so far as material to the application, and all other material considerations. Section 6(4) states that in making any determination where regard is to be had to the local development plan, the determination must be made in accordance with the plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 6.2 The development plan is:
 - The Northern Area Plan 2016 (NAP)
- 6.3 The Regional Development Strategy (RDS) is a material consideration.
- 6.4 The Strategic Planning Policy Statement for Northern Ireland (SPPS) is a material consideration. As set out in the SPPS, until such times as a new local plan strategy is adopted, councils will apply specified retained operational policies.
- 6.5 Due weight should be given to the relevant policies in the development plan.
- 6.6 All material considerations and any policy conflicts are identified in the “Considerations and Assessment” section of the report.

7 RELEVANT POLICIES & GUIDANCE

The Northern Area Plan 2016

The Strategic Planning Policy Statement (SPPS)

Planning Policy Statement 2: Natural Heritage

Planning Policy Statement 3: Access, Movement and Parking

Planning Policy Statement 6: Planning, Archaeology and the Built Heritage

Planning Policy Statement 16: Tourism

Planning Policy Statement 21: Sustainable Development in the Countryside

8 CONSIDERATIONS & ASSESSMENT

- 8.1 The proposal must be considered having regard to the NAP 2016, SPPS, and PPS policy documents specified above. The main considerations in the determination of this application relate to principle of development; and the integration and visual impact of the surrounding area and the impacts on road safety.

Planning Policy

- 8.2 The principle of the type and scale of the development proposed must be considered having regard to the SPPS and PPS policy documents specified above.

Principle of Development

- 8.3 The site is located outside any development limits and within the Antrim Coast and Glens AONB. The surrounding uses comprise of the associated farm buildings and agricultural lands. The application site's existing use is agricultural.
- 8.4 Paragraph 6.73 of the Strategic Planning Policy Statement (SPPS) and Planning Policy Statement 21 – Sustainable Development in the Countryside, Policy CTY 1 states there are a range of types of development which in principle are considered to be acceptable in the

countryside and that will contribute to the aims of sustainable development. All proposals for development in the countryside must be sited and designed to integrate sympathetically with their surroundings and to meet other planning and environmental considerations. One of the acceptable types of development is farm diversification in accordance with Policy CTY 11.

- 8.5 The application is described as a farm diversification proposal and therefore the SPPS and Policy CTY 11 of PPS 21 is the relevant policy context.
- 8.6 The proposal comprises of glamping pods for tourism purposes and therefore, PPS 16: Tourism will also be a relevant consideration.

Farm Diversification

- 8.7 Policy CTY 11 states that proposals for farm diversification will only be acceptable where they involve the re-use or adaptation of existing farm buildings. Exceptionally, a new building may be permitted where there is no existing building available to accommodate the proposed use, either because they are essential for the maintenance of the existing farm enterprise, are clearly unsuitable for adaptation and re-use or cannot be adapted to meeting the requirements of other statutory agencies.
- 8.8 Policy CTY 11 also states that farm diversification proposals must meet the following criteria:
(a) The farm of forestry business is currently active and established;

DAERA have been consulted and have confirmed the farm business has been active and established for at least 6 years,

- (b) In terms of character and scale it is appropriate to its location;*

Given the nature and scale of the proposal, it would not be considered appropriate to its location. Integration and rural character are considered under paragraphs 8.10 – 8.16.

- (c) It will not have an adverse impact on the natural heritage or built heritage; and*

The application site lies within the Antrim Coast and Glens Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty with the proposal posing the risk of

adverse impact to this special character area. The impact on the AONB is considered in paragraphs 8.14 – 8.16 of this report.

(d) It will not result in detrimental impact on the amenity of nearby residential dwellings including potential problems arising from noise, smell and pollution.

Environmental Health have been consulted in relation to the proposal and had no adverse comments. The proposal would not have a detrimental impact on the amenity of nearby residential dwellings in terms of noise, smell and pollution.

8.9 Due to the lack of integration, the application site is deemed to be contrary to Policy CTY 11 as it is non-compliant with both criteria (b) and (c) as outlined above.

Proposed Site, Integration and Rural Character

8.10 Policy CTY 13 of PPS 21 states that planning permission will be granted for a building in the countryside where it can be visually integrated into the surrounding landscape and is of an appropriate design.

8.11 A new building will be unacceptable where:

- (a) It is a prominent feature in the landscape; or
- (b) The site lacks long established natural boundaries or is unable to provide a suitable degree of enclosure for the building to integrate into the landscape; or
- (c) It relies primarily on the use of new landscaping for integration; or
- (d) Ancillary works do not integrate with their surroundings; or
- (e) The design of the building is inappropriate for the site and its locality; or
- (f) It fails to blend with the landform, existing trees, buildings, slopes and other natural features which provide a backdrop; or
- (g) In the case of a proposed dwelling on a farm (see Policy CTY 10) it is not visually linked or sited to cluster with an established group of buildings on a farm.

Following a site inspection of the application it was determined that the site lacked any established boundaries with mature vegetation. During the processing of this application plans were amended several times to try and address the integration issue. The proposal

was originally for 5 no. glamping pods. Following several submissions the proposed pods were reduced to two and located adjacent to the existing agricultural buildings to the north of the site. The site is located in the northern portion of a larger agricultural field. The roadside boundaries of the site comprise of post and wire fencing. The southern and eastern boundaries are undefined. There would be an element of a backdrop provided for users of the Craigfad Road travelling in a northern direction. However, the site would rely on new landscaping to provide enclosure with a lack of natural features present to filter views from critical views. Open views of the site would be achieved when travelling in both directions along the Craigfad Road. Considering the lack of enclosure and screening available to the site it was determined that the application site lacks the ability to absorb the proposed development, similarly the site fails to acceptably integrate into the site's surroundings. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to Policy CTY 13 of PPS 21 (b) and (c) in that the site lacks long established natural boundaries and it relies heavily on new landscaping for integration.

8.12 Policy CTY 14 of PPS 21 states planning permission will be granted for a building in the countryside where it does not cause a detrimental change to, or further erode the rural character of an area.

8.13 Planning permission will be granted for a building in the countryside where it does not cause a detrimental change to, or further erode the rural character of an area. A new building will be unacceptable where:

- (a) It is unduly prominent in the landscape; or
- (b) It results in a suburban style build-up of development when viewed with existing and approved buildings; or
- (c) It does not respect the traditional pattern of settlement exhibited in that area; or
- (d) It creates or adds to a ribbon of development (see Policy CTY 8);
or
- (e) The impact of ancillary works (with the exception of necessary visibility splays) would damage rural character.

The proposal is not directly contrary to the criteria outlined in Policy CTY 14.

Natural Heritage

- 8.14 The application site is located within the Antrim Coast and Glens Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. In accordance with PPS 2: Natural Heritage, planning permission will only be granted for development within the AONB if it adheres to the relevant criteria.
- 8.15 Planning permission for new development within an AONB will only be granted where it is of an appropriate design, size and scale for the locality and all the following criteria are met:
- (a) The siting and scale of the proposal is sympathetic to the special character of the AONB in general and of the particular locality; and
 - (b) It respects or conserves features (including buildings and other man-made features) of importance to the character, appearance or heritage of the landscape; and
 - (c) The proposal respects:
 - Local architectural styles and patterns;
 - Traditional boundary details, by retaining features such as hedges, walls, trees and gates; and
 - Local materials, design and colour.
- 8.16 Considering the open views of the site, lack of natural screening and enclosure to the site, it has been determined that the proposal is non-compliant with Policy NH 6 as it would have a detrimental impact on the character of this AONB. The siting of the proposal would not be in keeping with the locality with the site location not being appropriate for development of this nature. This particular location within the AONB is predominantly agricultural with a small number of single dwelling and farm holdings. There is minimal development along the surrounding area around Craigfad Road and Fairhead Road and the proposed development would appear incongruous and out of place in this protected AONB location. The proposal is therefore contrary to Paragraphs 6.187 of the SPPS and (a) of Policy NH 6 of PPS 2.

Tourism

- 8.17 Although the proposal is a tourism use, it does not fall under any typologies from TSM 2 to TSM 6 of PPS 16. The proposal cannot be considered to be a holiday park as it now only features two units. Paragraphs 5.3 and 5.4 of PPS 16 outlining that proposals for self-catering accommodation involving the reuse or adaptation of an

existing farm building, or exceptionally a new building on a farm can also be acceptable provided it complies with constraints of Policy CTY 11 of PPS 21. This is also outlined in paragraph 7.29 of PPS 16.

- 8.18 Policy TSM 7 of PPS 16 relates to the criteria for tourism development. It advises that tourism development must be compatible with surrounding land uses and neither the use or built form will detract from the landscape quality and character of the surrounding area. The site location in this instance is considered to be unsuitable as there is no integration with the surrounding area. The proposal will detract from the landscape quality and local character found on the Craigfad Road and within the Antrim Coast and Glens AONB.
- 8.19 More specifically, TSM 7 outlines a range of Design Criteria and General Criteria for tourism development to which proposals must comply. Criteria (c) advises that appropriate boundary treatment and means of enclosure must be provided. Due to the lack of existing natural enclosure available to the site the proposal is considered to be contrary to criteria (c).
- 8.20 The proposal also fails General Criteria (g). The proposal would not be considered compatible with surrounding land uses and due to the nature and scale of the development would detract from the landscape quality and character of the surrounding area.
- 8.21 The proposal also fails General Criterion (k – m). These refer to access and road safety. Access and road safety are considered in paragraphs 8.22.

Road Access

- 8.22 DFI Roads were consulted in regards to the impacts of the proposal and its access onto Craigfad Road and responded requesting amended plans. Several sets of amended plans were submitted seeking to address these concerns but DFI Roads concerns were not addressed and it has not been proven that the proposal would not have a detrimental impact on road safety. Therefore, it is considered that the proposal could have a detrimental impact on road safety and contrary to PPS 3.

Archaeological Sites / Monuments

- 8.23 The application site is located within the vicinity of several archaeological sites or monuments, to this HED were issued with a consultation. In their response, HED: Historic Buildings stated that

they are content that the proposal is satisfactory to the SPPS and PPS 6 policy requirements.

9 CONCLUSION


- 9.1 The proposal is considered to be unacceptable in this location having regards to the Northern Area Plan 2016, the relevant planning policies, guidance and other material considerations, including the SPPS. The proposal is contrary to Policy CTY 11 of PPS 21 as the site location is not appropriate in terms of character and scale and it is not satisfactorily integrated into its surroundings. The proposal is contrary to PPS 16 and policies CTY 13 of PPS 21 as the proposal cannot be absorbed into the area with effective integration without adverse impact on visual amenity in this AONB location. The site lacks long established natural boundaries to provide a suitable degree of enclosure and would rely on new landscaping for integration. The proposal fails Policies CTY 1, CTY 11 and CTY 13 of PPS 21; TSM 7 of PPS 16; Policy NH 6 of PPS 2; and PPS 3.

10 Reasons for Refusal

1. The proposal is contrary to 6.73 of the Strategic Planning Policy for Northern Ireland (SPPS) 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 and does not integrate sympathetically with its surroundings.
2. The proposal is contrary to 6.73 of the Strategic Planning Policy for Northern Ireland (SPPS) and Policy CTY 11 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside in that the proposal is not appropriate in this location and would have a detrimental impact on the natural heritage.
3. The proposal is contrary to Paragraph 6.77 of the Strategic Planning Policy for Northern Ireland (SPPS) and Policy CTY13 of Planning Policy Statement 21, Sustainable Development in the Countryside, in that the proposed site lacks long established natural boundaries/ is unable to provide a suitable degree of enclosure for the building to integrate into the landscape and therefore would not visually integrate into the surrounding landscape and it relies primarily on the use of new landscaping for integration.

4. The proposal is contrary to Paragraph 6.260 of the Strategic Planning Policy for Northern Ireland (SPPS) and Policy TSM 7 of Planning Policy Statement 16, Tourism in that the buildings lack appropriate boundary treatment and means of enclosure, and would detract from the landscape quality and character of the surrounding area, and may detrimentally impact road safety as it has not been demonstrated that the proposed access can be provided to an adequate standard.
5. The proposal is contrary to Paragraph 6.187 to the Strategic Planning Policy Statement and Policy NH 6 of Planning Policy Statement 2, Natural Heritage in that the development, if permitted, would have a detrimental impact upon the character and appearance of the designated Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty.
6. The proposal is contrary to Paragraph 6.77 of the Strategic Planning Policy for Northern Ireland (SPPS) and Policy AMP 2 of Planning Policy Statement 3, Access, Movement and Parking in that it has not been demonstrated that the proposed access can be provided to an adequate standard.

Site Location Map



Referral Request

From: cara mcshane

Sent: 08 November 2022 17:06

To: Planning <Planning@causewaycoastandglens.gov.uk>

Cc: Oliver McMullan <; Denise Dickson < >

Subject: LA01/2021/0063/F - Refer to committee request

Importance: High

Good afternoon,

Hope you are all well.

I would be most grateful if the application for Glamping Pods at Craigfad road (Reference as above), could be referred to the Planning Committee. There is additional information to be considered, including as below:

1. This is for glamping pods - a farm diversification which cannot therefore be located in a settlement;
2. Glamping pods and tourism are appropriate in a rural location especially an AONB and this proposal is for two small units. Glamping is not a suitable suburban type development;
3. There are established natural boundaries however it was noted to planning that the applicant could construct a 500sqm Agri shed the same location without planning permission and that therefore this had to be considered. An Agri shed would obviously have a greater impact. CCG granted approval for glamping pods in this vicinity – LA01/2021/0057/F;
4. It is not reasonable to suggest a suburban style build up with two pods;
5. Defi comments are easily remedied and indeed the applicant had their support when they had the access in the original location.
6. Again reference that an Agri shed could be built without permission on the same site which would have a much greater impact; and
7. Again DFI comments can be addressed with the reversion to the original access point.

This is a farm diversification project which seeks to give financial support to family members and keep them in this location. The backdrop is derelict hen houses, and a higher level farm yard.

If you require anything further, please do not hesitate to get in touch.

Look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Best wishes,

Cara

Sinn Féin Councillor, Causeway Coast and Glens

Addendum

LA01/2021/0063/F

1.0 Update

- 1.1 The application was presented to the Planning Committee in January 2023 with a recommendation to refuse. The application was deferred by the Planning Committee to allow for roads amendments to be submitted to address concerns in relation to road safety. A revised site location plan and block plan were received (31/01/23 and 26/04/23). The previous access plan was utilising an existing access in to the adjacent farm yard. The amended plans propose a new access into the site from the Craighfad Road. DFI Roads were re-consulted and responded on 26th April 2023 raising no objection to the proposal subject to planning conditions.


Consideration

- 1.2 The application was presented to the Planning Committee with six reasons for refusal including a refusal reason on road safety (Reason no. 6). The amended location plan and site layout address the issues of road safety and this refusal reason is no longer necessary.
- 1.3 The remaining five reasons for refusal relate to the principle of development, impact on rural character, the AONB and integration. The amended plans do not address these concerns and as such these reasons for refusal still remain.



2.0 Recommendation

- 2.1 That the Committee note the contents of this Addendum and agree with the recommendation to refuse the application in accordance with Paragraph 1.1 of the Planning Committee report and the reasons outlined in Part 10, with the exception of reason 6.

Site location plan



Site Layout



MANOR ARCHITECTS
100, 102, 104, 106, 108, 110, 112, 114, 116, 118, 120, 122, 124, 126, 128, 130, 132, 134, 136, 138, 140, 142, 144, 146, 148, 150, 152, 154, 156, 158, 160, 162, 164, 166, 168, 170, 172, 174, 176, 178, 180, 182, 184, 186, 188, 190, 192, 194, 196, 198, 200, 202, 204, 206, 208, 210, 212, 214, 216, 218, 220, 222, 224, 226, 228, 230, 232, 234, 236, 238, 240, 242, 244, 246, 248, 250, 252, 254, 256, 258, 260, 262, 264, 266, 268, 270, 272, 274, 276, 278, 280, 282, 284, 286, 288, 290, 292, 294, 296, 298, 300, 302, 304, 306, 308, 310, 312, 314, 316, 318, 320, 322, 324, 326, 328, 330, 332, 334, 336, 338, 340, 342, 344, 346, 348, 350, 352, 354, 356, 358, 360, 362, 364, 366, 368, 370, 372, 374, 376, 378, 380, 382, 384, 386, 388, 390, 392, 394, 396, 398, 400, 402, 404, 406, 408, 410, 412, 414, 416, 418, 420, 422, 424, 426, 428, 430, 432, 434, 436, 438, 440, 442, 444, 446, 448, 450, 452, 454, 456, 458, 460, 462, 464, 466, 468, 470, 472, 474, 476, 478, 480, 482, 484, 486, 488, 490, 492, 494, 496, 498, 500, 502, 504, 506, 508, 510, 512, 514, 516, 518, 520, 522, 524, 526, 528, 530, 532, 534, 536, 538, 540, 542, 544, 546, 548, 550, 552, 554, 556, 558, 560, 562, 564, 566, 568, 570, 572, 574, 576, 578, 580, 582, 584, 586, 588, 590, 592, 594, 596, 598, 600, 602, 604, 606, 608, 610, 612, 614, 616, 618, 620, 622, 624, 626, 628, 630, 632, 634, 636, 638, 640, 642, 644, 646, 648, 650, 652, 654, 656, 658, 660, 662, 664, 666, 668, 670, 672, 674, 676, 678, 680, 682, 684, 686, 688, 690, 692, 694, 696, 698, 700, 702, 704, 706, 708, 710, 712, 714, 716, 718, 720, 722, 724, 726, 728, 730, 732, 734, 736, 738, 740, 742, 744, 746, 748, 750, 752, 754, 756, 758, 760, 762, 764, 766, 768, 770, 772, 774, 776, 778, 780, 782, 784, 786, 788, 790, 792, 794, 796, 798, 800, 802, 804, 806, 808, 810, 812, 814, 816, 818, 820, 822, 824, 826, 828, 830, 832, 834, 836, 838, 840, 842, 844, 846, 848, 850, 852, 854, 856, 858, 860, 862, 864, 866, 868, 870, 872, 874, 876, 878, 880, 882, 884, 886, 888, 890, 892, 894, 896, 898, 900, 902, 904, 906, 908, 910, 912, 914, 916, 918, 920, 922, 924, 926, 928, 930, 932, 934, 936, 938, 940, 942, 944, 946, 948, 950, 952, 954, 956, 958, 960, 962, 964, 966, 968, 970, 972, 974, 976, 978, 980, 982, 984, 986, 988, 990, 992, 994, 996, 998, 1000

REVISIONS		
NO.	DATE	DESCRIPTION

SCALE: 1:200
 Proposed Site Plan
 & Access Details

PLANNING PERMISSIONS		

SCALE: 1:200
 DRAWN BY: [] CHECKED BY: [] DATE: []
 PROJECT NUMBER: 20-93-PL-03h

Addendum 2

LA01/2021/0063/F

1.0 Update

- 1.1 The application was presented to the Planning Committee in January 2023 with a recommendation to refuse. The application was deferred by the Planning Committee to allow for roads amendments to be submitted to address concerns in relation to road safety. A revised site location plan and block plan were received (31/01/23 and 26/04/23).
- 1.2 The application has been subject to eight amendments to the site layout and access arrangements. The latest amendment is proposing a new access off the Craighfad Road. The previous iteration was utilising an existing access through the farmyard. The latest iteration has not been subject to advertisement and neighbour notification which is required.


Consideration

- 1.2 An amended P1 Form is required with a revised description referring to the proposed new access. This will require re-advertisement and re-neighbour notification.



2.0 Recommendation

- 2.1 That the Committee note the contents of this Addendum and agree with the recommendation to **defer** the application to allow for receipt of an amended P1 application form and to undertake necessary advertising and neighbour notification.

Site location plan



Site Layout



Notes:

1. All proposed walls to be constructed in accordance with the Building Regulations.
2. All proposed gates to be constructed in accordance with the Building Regulations.
3. All proposed access roads to be constructed in accordance with the Building Regulations.
4. All proposed trees to be planted in accordance with the Building Regulations.
5. All proposed boundaries to be marked in accordance with the Building Regulations.
6. All proposed structures to be constructed in accordance with the Building Regulations.
7. All proposed works to be completed in accordance with the Building Regulations.
8. All proposed works to be completed in accordance with the Building Regulations.
9. All proposed works to be completed in accordance with the Building Regulations.
10. All proposed works to be completed in accordance with the Building Regulations.

MANOR ARCHITECTS

20th Budge, Moor Road, Ballyvaughan,
County Dublin, E14 3D2
Telephone: 01840 46557
Email: info@manorarchitects.com
www.manorarchitects.com

REV	DATE	DESCRIPTION

PLANNING

20-93-PL-03h

SCALE: 1:200 A1

DRAWN BY: CHECKED BY: DATE: 25/04/2020

DRAWING NUMBER: 20-93-PL-03h

Addendum 3

LA01/2021/0063/F

1.0 Update

- 1.1 The application was deferred at the Planning Committee in June 2023. The application was deferred by the Planning Committee to allow for an amended P1 Form to be submitted which referred to a new access being proposed off the Craighfad Road. The previous iteration was utilising an existing access through the adjacent farm yard. The application was re-advertised on 16th August 2023 and re. neighbour notified on 4th August 2023. In addition, the agent has submitted a Planning Statement and photomontages on 7th July 2023 for consideration.

2.0 Consideration

- 2.1 The Planning Statement submitted on 7th July refers to the visual impact of the proposal and compares its visual impact to that of an agricultural building which they consider would be permitted development.
- 2.2 This agricultural building is hypothetical and not to be considered as a material consideration. A proposed agricultural shed on this site would not be considered permitted development as the proposal fails to meet the requirements of Part 7 of The Planning (General Permitted Development) Order (NI) 2015 in that there is a 3rd party dwelling (no. 23 Fairhead Rd) located within 75 metres of the site (contrary to Part 7, A1 (f)). Regardless, the presence of an agricultural building may not have the same detrimental visual impacts as glamping pods at this site. Glamping pods can be considered to be out of character (without sufficient screening) in a rural location whereas an agricultural building is considered a typical feature in the countryside with small clusters of farm holdings typical of the surrounding area.
- 2.3 The Planning Statement then goes onto critique recommended reasons for refusals.
- 2.4 In response to recommended refusal reason 1, the Planning Statement refers to the need for alternative tourism

accommodation in this 'secluded part of County Antrim' and how glamping pod's primary attraction are 'solitude and the connection with nature'. The Planning Statement also refers to the planning approval LA01/2021/0057/F. This application was a farm diversification proposal for 2 glamping pods, for the same applicant, on a site approximately 95m west of 23 Fairhead Road. Planning permission was granted for this application on 18/10/2021.

- 2.5 LA01/2021/0057/F was considered to integrate into its rural surroundings due to the existing vegetation which was considered to provide a good degree of natural screening and enclosure. LA01/2021/0063/F does not have the benefit of satisfactory existing screening and differs from LA01/2021/0057/F in this regard. Recommended refusal reason 1 states that there are no overriding reasons why this development is essential to this rural location and could not be located with a settlement and does not integrate sympathetically with its surroundings.
- 2.6 The Planning Statement refers to recommended refusal reasons 2 and 6, claiming that the refusal reason is '*flawed as it is vague and does not make any specific reference to any aspect of natural heritage*'. The Planning Committee Report (paras 8.14 – 8.16) refers to the site being located within the Antrim Coast and Glens AONB. The site lacks satisfactory existing levels of screening and would appear incongruous and out of place in this protected AONB location. Therefore, the proposal is contrary to PPS 2: Natural Heritage.
- 2.7 The Planning Statement refers to recommended refusal reasons 3 and 4, claiming that there would be '*a fleeting view of the site (for approximately 10 metres) but as the road suddenly changes direction this view is for a very short period*'. There is no existing mature vegetation along the western boundary, which abuts Craighfad Road, and the remainder of the site is open to a larger field. This boundary is approximately 115m in length and is contrary to the claims that views of the site will be 'fleeting'. The assessment of integration is outlined in paragraph 8.11 of the Committee report. It is accepted that the existing agricultural buildings provide an element of backdrop to the proposed glamping pods. However, the lack of any intervening vegetation or

natural features from the critical views will result in a development which is appears of out of place.

- 2.8 The access works require the re-location of the boundary wall around No. 02 Craighfad Road to provide the necessary visibility splays. The proposed access does not utilise an existing access and laneway and together with proposed car parking would further exacerbate the impacts of the proposal in regards to integration.

3.0 Recommendation

- 3.1 Having regard to the policy context and other material considerations, the proposal is not considered to be acceptable and planning permission is recommended to be **REFUSED**.