

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

12.00

LA01/2020/1142/O – Site between 18a and 20 Beech Road, Dungiven

App Type: Outline Application

Proposal: Two detached houses with detached garages on a gap site.

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

Comments:

Viewed site from outside no 18a then walked down Beech Road along frontage of the site to view from in front of no 20. Officials commenced the meeting by showing the submitted maps and by outlining the proposal and identifying the boundaries, access position, the boundary of the development limit and surrounding context. Officials outlined the planning context of PPS21 especially CTY8. Officials explained that the properties to the NE of the site namely 10 and 18a were located within the SDL. The dwellings at 20 and 22 were outside the SDL. Explained that buildings in the SDL cannot be used for the purposes of contributing to a substantial and continuously built up frontage, all buildings making up the substantially and continuously built up frontage must exist within the countryside. Referred to Committee report and PAC decision 2015/A0221 that confirmed that the settled position of the Commission is that development within the SDL cannot be included when considering development proposals under CTY8 as it occupies a different context in planning terms. The site is therefore not a gap within a substantially and continuously built up frontage. Officials added that even if the site was within a substantially and continuously built up frontage the site does not respect the existing development pattern. The site frontage is 75m, but the gap building to building is 152m, as the average frontage is 33.6m the gap building to building could accommodate 4 plus dwellings. Officials referred to the settlement development limit of Gortnahey and pointed out that the site would extend development out from SDL into countryside and mar the distinction and result in urban sprawl.

Officials explained that no overriding reasons have been forthcoming therefore the proposal was contrary to CTY1. In addition, 2.4 x 70 m splays were required which DFI Roads had advised were currently obstructed, the removal of boundary vegetation would open the site and result in suburban development that would fail to integrate under policies CTY8 & CTY14. Members asked about planning history of the site opposite.

J McMath 23/08/2021