

SITE VISIT REPORT: MONDAY 23rd 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

13.40

LA01/2020/0456/O – New dwelling & garage in-filling gap within established housing cluster, 30m West of 98 Bolea Road, Limavady.

App Type: Outline Application

Proposal: Proposed dwelling house with detached garage at existing cluster of development.

Present: Alderman Baird, Boyle, Duddy, Finlay McKeown
Councillors Nicholl, Scott
Officials S Mathers and M Wilson

Comments:

Viewed site from immediate site frontage. Officials commenced the meeting by explaining the proposal and informing Members that the applicant had physically marked the site out in the field. Officials explained that further information was submitted by the applicant's agent on the previous Friday and were told what this information was. Officials outlined the planning context of PPS21 and in particular CTY2a. Officials explained that the issue was that the site is not bound by development on at least 2 sides and that the proposal cannot be absorbed into the existing cluster through rounding off and consolidation. It was clarified that the cluster of existing development was considered to be a cluster for the purposes of CTY2a as it was associated with the crossroads at Drumalief/Bolea Roads. However, it was further explained that this site lies outside the cluster as there is a boundary to the rear of no.96 which encloses the cluster. There was discussion about the lane and if this physically and visually separates the site from other development and reference was made to a recent PAC Decision – 2019/A0160. There was further discussion about surrounding development and the relevant history pertaining to these, and the example of a similar site that was approved which the agent has submitted. Members asked for a larger scale map showing development in a wider context, the PAC Decision referred to, and the relevant planning history. It was agreed this information will be provided. Officials

explained that the proposal failed to comply with CTY 2a, there are no overriding reasons why this development is essential, and the proposal is contrary to CTY1 as it is not a gap site, would result in ribbon development and erode rural character under policies CTY8 & CTY14.

M Wilson 23/08/2021