

**SITE VISIT REPORT: MONDAY 23<sup>rd</sup> August 2021**

*Committee Members: Alderman Baird (Chair), Boyle, Duddy, Finlay, S McKillop and McKeown; Councillors Anderson, Dallat O'Driscoll, Hunter, McGurk, MA McKillop, McLaughlin, McMullan, P McShane (Vice Chair), Nicholl and Scott*

**12.30pm**

LA01/2020/1235/O – Site adjacent 53 East Road, Drumsurn

**App Type: Outline Application**  
**Proposal: Proposed infill site for dwelling between 51 and 53 East Road, Drumsurn.**

**Present:** Alderman Baird, Duddy, McKeown, Councillors Hunter, McShane, Nicholl, Scott, Officials S Mathers and J McMath

**Comments:**

Viewed site from immediate site frontage. Officials commenced the meeting by showing the location map and by outlining the proposal, identifying the boundaries and explaining the planning history. Officials outlined the planning context of PPS21 especially CTY8. Officials explained that the site was adjacent to 53 East Road and explained that 53 and 55 both have a road frontage. However there is no development with a road frontage to the west of the site as no 51 accesses onto a lane approximately 25m back from East Road and the curtilage of no 51 does not extend to East Road. No 51 does not have a common frontage to East Road and cannot be taken to form part of a substantially and continuously built up frontage. A member sought clarification of the lane and the location map was shown for clarification purposes. As there is no development with a common frontage to the western side of the site there is no substantially and continuously built up frontage within which to infill. Members then viewed the site from in front of no 53 and Officials pointed out how no 51 was set back and did not have a common frontage. Officials pointed out that the site if permitted would ribbon development and result in build up. No overriding reasons have been forthcoming therefore the proposal is contrary to CTY1 and as the road frontage of the site was only partially defined by vegetation, when removed for splays this would result in a site that is open, lacks enclosure and fails to integrate and anything other than a modest dwelling would be prominent, the proposal is therefore contrary to CTY13.

J McMath 23/08/2021