

**PLANNING COMMITTEE WEDNESDAY 22 AUGUST 2018**

**Table of Key Adoptions**

<b>No</b>	<b>Item</b>	<b>Summary of Key Decisions</b>
1.	Apologies	<b>Alderman Robinson</b>
2.	Declarations of Interest	<b>Councillor Baird Councillor McCaw</b>
3.	Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting held 27 June 2018	<b>Confirmed</b>
4.	Order of Items and Registered Speakers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LA01/2017/1183/F 95 and 97 Prospect Road, Portstewart</li> <li>• C/2011/0158/F Croaghan TD, Macosquin, Coleraine</li> <li>• LA01/2017/1129/O, Lands 187m SW of No. 293 Clooney Road, Greysteel</li> </ul>	<b>Approved</b>  <b>Withdrawn from Schedule</b>  <b>Deferred and arrange a site visit</b>
5.	Schedule of Applications	
5.1	LA01/2017/0280/F Lands to North and East of 30 Haw Road, Bushmills	<b>Approved</b>
5.2	LA01/2017/0760 HSC OBD Lands to North and East of 30 Haw Road, Bushmills	<b>Granted</b>
5.3	LA01/2015/0349/O Lands situated adjacent and south of The Church of Christ the King Parochial House, 4 Scroggy Road, Limavady	<b>Approved</b>
5.4	LA01/2017/1368/F Site of the Former Dunluce Centre, 10 Sandhill Drive, Portrush	<b>Approved</b>
5.5	LA01/2017/1233/F	<b>Approved</b>

	110m SW of 36 Straw Road, Dungiven	
<b>5.6</b>	LA01/2017/1270/O Immediately West or No's 57, 59 & 59A Brisland Road, Eglinton	<b>Deferred</b>
<b>5.7</b>	LA01/2017/1580/O Lands adjacent to 64 Coleraine Road, Garvagh	<b>Deferred</b>
<b>5.8</b>	LA01/2017/1522/O Lands between 316a and 318 Foreglen Road, Dungiven	<b>Deferred</b>
<b>5.9</b>	LA01/2018/0380/O Public Realm Improvement Scheme	<b>Approved</b>
<b>5.10</b>	LA01/2018/0578/F 27-29 Main Street, Portrush	<b>Approved</b>
<b>5.11</b>	LA01/2018/0607/LBC 27-29 Main St, Portrush	<b>Consent</b>
<b>5.12</b>	B/2008/0405/F Land 180m SE of 92 Clooney Road, Limavady	<b>Approved</b>
<b>6.</b>	Development Management Performance	
<b>6.1</b>	Development Management & Enforcement Statistics Period 01/04/18 – 31/07/18	<b>Noted</b>
<b>6.2</b>	Planning Department Annual Report	<b>Noted</b>
<b>6.3</b>	Review of 'Protocol for the Operation of the Planning Committee'	<b>Deferred</b>
<b>7.</b>	Development Plan	
<b>7.1</b>	NI Minerals Working Group – Draft Terms of Reference	<b>Noted content of the letter; agreed to a Terms of Reference along the lines of that contained within Appendix 2; agreed to the Head of Planning submitting a response on behalf of Council</b>
<b>8.</b>	Correspondence	<b>Noted</b>

	<b>8.1</b> NIEA Confirmation of Gortycavan Area of Special Scientific Interest	
	<i>IN COMMITTEE</i>	
<b>9.</b>	Legal Issues	<b><i>Verbal Update Noted</i></b>
	<b>9.1</b> Alexander Judicial Review judgement	<b><i>Discuss at workshop</i></b>
	<b>9.2</b> Consideration of Stop Notice	<b><i>Authorise Head of Planning, in principle, to research and consider issuing a Stop Notice.</i></b>
<b>10.</b>	Development Management Performance: Business Case for Additional Staff	<b><i>Recruit 2 additional Planning Officers on a permanent contract; ensure a Legal Adviser is available to support Officers in the preparation for and attendance at planning appeals, judicial reviews and other court proceedings.</i></b>
<b>11.</b>	Any Other Relevant Business (Notified in Accordance with Standing order 12 (o))	
	<b>11.1</b> PAC Decision 2017/A0147 Lands adjacent to 142 Tullaghans Road, Dunloy	<b><i>Information</i></b>
	<b>11.2</b> Enforcement against unauthorised advertisements	<b><i>Information</i></b>

**MINUTES OF THE PROCEEDINGS OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING  
COMMITTEE HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CIVIC HEADQUARTERS  
on WEDNESDAY 22 AUGUST 2018 AT 2:00 PM**

- In the Chair:** Alderman S McKillop
- Committee Members Present:** Alderman Cole, Finlay, King, McKeown;  
Councillors Baird, Fielding, Hunter, Loftus, McCaw,  
McGurk, McLaughlin, McKillop M A, Nicholl and P  
McShane
- Officers Present:** D Dickson, Head of Planning  
S Mathers, Development Management &  
Enforcement Manager  
E Hudson, Senior Planning Officer  
D Hunter, Council Solicitor  
E Keenan, Council Solicitor  
J Lundy, Senior Planning Officer  
R McGrath, Senior Planning Officer  
J McMath, Senior Planning Officer  
S Mulhern Development Plan Manager  
M Wilson, Senior Planning Officer  
S Duggan, Civic Support & Committee & Member  
Services Officer
- In Attendance:** A Gillen, DFI Roads Representative
- D Thompson, MBA Planning  
S Curtin, 2Plan NI  
J Dallat, MLA  
D Donaldson, Donaldson Planning  
C Egan, Old Bushmills Distillery  
P Glackin, Old Bushmills Distillery  
H Harrison, JUNO Planning  
A Heasley, JUNO Planning  
A Hunter, Applicant  
M Kennedy, MKA Planning  
Fr McCanny, Applicant  
M McKeown, Healey McKeown Architects  
T Stokes, TSA Planning
- Press (1 No)  
Public (10 No)

## 1. APOLOGIES

Apologies were recorded for Alderman Robinson.

## 2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Declarations of Interest were recorded for:

- Councillor Baird in LA01/2017/0280/F lands to North and East of 30 Haw Road Bushmills and LA01/2017/0760/HSC OBD;
- Councillor McCaw in LA01/2017/0280/F lands to North and East of 30 Haw Road Bushmills and LA01/2017/0760/HSC OBD.

## 3. MINUTES OF PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING HELD WEDNESDAY 27 JUNE 2018

Proposed by Alderman Finlay

Seconded by Councillor Loftus and

**AGREED** – that the minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held on Wednesday 27 June 2018 be confirmed as a correct record.

## 4. ORDER OF ITEMS AND CONFIRMATION OF REGISTERED SPEAKERS

The Head of Planning advised the following applications had been withdrawn from the agenda:

- LA01/2017/1183/F 95 and 97 Prospect Road, Portstewart – amended plans received;
- C/2011/0158/F Croaghan TD, Macosquin, Coleraine – application withdrawn

The Chair advised it had been verbally recommended to Committee that consideration be deferred of Application LA01/2017/1129/O, Lands 187m SW of No. 293 Clooney Road, Greysteel to arrange a site visit.

Proposed by Alderman McKillop

Seconded by Councillor Loftus

– that Committee defer consideration of LA01/2017/1129/O, Lands 187m SW of No. 293 Clooney Road, Greysteel and arrange a site visit.

The Chair put the proposal to the Committee to vote, 9 Members voted For, 0 Members voted Against, 3 Members Abstained.

The Chair declared the proposal carried:

**AGREED** – that Committee defer consideration of LA01/2017/1129/O, Lands 187m SW of No. 293 Clooney Road, Greysteel and arrange a site visit.

**AGREED** – to receive the Order of Business as follows:

- LA01/2017/0280/F Lands to North and East of 30 Haw Road, Bushmills;
- LA01/2017/0760 HSC OBD Lands to North and East of 30 Haw Road, Bushmills;
- LA01/2015/0349/O Lands situated adjacent and south of The Church of Christ the King Parochial House, 4 Scroggy Road, Limavady;
- LA01/2017/1368/F Site of the Former Dunluce Centre, 10 Sandhill Drive, Portrush;
- LA01/2017/1233/F 110m SW of 36 Straw Road, Dungiven;
- LA01/2017/1270/O Immediately West of No's 57, 59 & 59A Brisland Road, Eglinton;
- LA01/2017/1580/O Lands adjacent to 64 Coleraine Road, Garvagh;
- LA01/2017/1522/O Lands between 316a and 318 Foreglen Road, Dungiven;
- LA01/2018/0380/O Public Realm Improvement Scheme including Ramore Avenue, Lansdowne Rd, Bath Rd, Bath Terrace, Bath St Church Pass, Atlantic Ave, Main Street, Eglinton St (from Causeway St to Train Station) Dunluce Ave (Eglinton St to Dunluce Car Park), Causeway St (Main St to Library);
- LA01/2018/0578/F 27-29 Main Street, Portrush;
- LA01/2018/0607/LBC 27-29 Main St, Portrush;
- B/2008/0405/F Land 180m SE of 92 Clooney Road, Limavady.

## **5. SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS**

- \* **Councillor McCaw, having declared an Interest withdrew from the table and left the Chamber at 2.04PM.**
- \* **Councillor Baird, having declared an Interest, withdrew from the table and left the Chamber at 2.07PM.**
- \* **Councillor Fielding, being absent from the earlier Site Visit, withdrew from the table and from voting on Applications LA01/2017/0280/F and LA01/2017/0760/HSC.**
- \* **J Lundy arrived at the meeting at 2.06PM.**
- \* **E Hudson arrived at the meeting at 2.06PM.**

## 5.1 LA01/2017/0280/F Lands to North and East of 30 Haw Road, Bushmills

**App Type:** Full Planning

**Proposal:** Proposed Development of Maturation Facility comprising 29 maturation warehouses; fire water retention lagoon, sprinkler pump house and tanks; landscaping; and a new access road from Haw Road.

Report and site visit details circulated.

R McGrath, Senior Planning Officer, presented the application, reminding Members that the application had been subject to the earlier Pre-Determination meeting. He advised that an Erratum, Addendum and site visit report were circulated to Members. R McGrath summarised the key issues as outlined in the Planning Committee Report including the need for the proposed development, site selection, visual impact, access, phasing, COMAH and relevant planning policy.

**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 notes this Erratum and agrees with the recommendation to Approve as provided in the Committee report.

The Chair invited D Thompson to present to Committee in objection to the application.

D Thompson advised that she remained of the opinion that available storage capacity had been underestimated and the need for storage overestimated. D Thompson queried the figures in the TAF form. She acknowledged the site had been visited by a Senior Planning Officer. D Thompson welcomed the amended Condition 2, whilst stated concerns over Condition 3, querying who would define a cessation of works? She considered the two applications would be required to be tied with a Planning Agreement or negative conditions and the sheds should not be used until the new distillery comes into operation. D Thompson referred to the COMAH site and application of societal risk report and objectors should be given sight of the applicant's safety report. She stated that the development should be restricted and there was no evidential proof of need for the development in the countryside.

The Chair invited C Egan, P Glackin, H Harrison and A Heasley, to address Committee in support of the application.

C Egan advised of the minimum legislative requirement of an oak barrel to sit for 3 years, to a maximum of 50 years on the site; there were barrels from 1975, 43 and 44 years old. C Egan advised it had been demonstrated 11 warehouses had been built, distillation on the site verified and with a development investment of £43m and spend of £13m within the next two years, the Bushmills Distillery would not spend unless it was required. C Egan clarified location of the site, and that Distillery Brand and micro-climate were considered factors. The Companies House information cited earlier coincided with a change of ownership with no reference to actual production within those records. The application was sympathetic to the landscape, local people and the Village, which were inherently linked and the application necessary to sustain current business.

No further questions were posed to the Speakers.

Proposed by Councillor P McShane  
Seconded by Alderman King

- that owing to the amount of qualitative and quantitative information delivered, and to further consider all of the information that determination is deferred for 1 month.

The Head of Planning advised Councillor P McShane and Alderman King they could no longer vote on the application if the Motion should fall.

The Chair put the proposal to the Committee to vote. 3 Members voted For, 8 Members voted against, 1 Members abstained.

The Chair declared the motion fallen.

Proposed by Councillor Loftus  
Seconded by Councillor MA McKillop

- 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;  
- that the Committee notes the Erratum and agrees with the recommendation to Approve as provided in the Committee report.



The Chair put the proposal to the Committee to vote, 9 Members voted for, 0 Members voted against and 0 Members abstained. Those who voted in favour of the previous motion did not vote.

The Chair declared the proposal carried:

**AGREED** - 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; that the Committee notes the Erratum and agrees with the recommendation to Approve as provided in the Committee report.

- \* **Councillor McLaughlin left the meeting at 2.20PM.**
- \* **Councillor P McShane left the meeting at 2.20PM.**

## **5.2 LA01/2017/0760/HSC, Lands to North and East of 30 Haw Road, Bushmills**

**App Type:** Hazardous Substance Consent  
Report and Site Visit details circulated.

- \* **Councillor McLaughlin re-joined the meeting at 2.21pm.**
- \* **Councillor P McShane re-joined the meeting at 2.21pm.**

M Wilson, Senior Planning Officer, presented the Application, reminding Members that the application had been discussed at the earlier Pre-Determination Hearing. He provided a summary of the key issues including consultation responses.

**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 **GRANT** hazardous substance subject to the conditions set out in section 10.

The Chair invited D Thompson to speak in objection to the Application. D Thompson referred to the need for a safety report and for objectors to view this report. D Thompson stated she had made her points already.

The Chair invited C Egan, P Glackin, H Harrison and A Heasley, to address Committee in support of the application. The invitation was declined.

The Chair invited Elected members to pose questions to the Officers.

Members referred to paragraph 8.10 within the Report circulated, “*the safety report is not a requirement of the planning process and it would not **generally** be prepared ahead of the grant of consent*”. Members sought clarification if this was normal practice.

R McGrath, Senior Planning Officer, advised he had spoken with the Principal Officer within HSENI who advised, that such a report is not normally prepared until after grant of consent. He advised the site would be regulated by IPRI, Fire Authority and HSENI under the COMAH Regulations and the provision of a safety report would be under those Regulations rather than Planning. D Dickson, Head of Planning, advised that cannot condition something that is required outside of Planning legislation and regulated under other legislation.

Proposed by Councillor Nicholl  
Seconded by Councillor Loftus

- 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 **GRANT** hazardous substance subject to the conditions set out in section 10.

The Chair put the proposal to the Committee to vote, 9 Members voted For, 0 Members voted Against and 2 Members Abstained.

The Chair declared the proposal carried:

**AGREED** - 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 **GRANT** hazardous substance subject to the conditions set out in section 10.

\* **Councillors Baird, Fielding, McCaw, re-joined the meeting.**

### **5.3 LA01/2015/0349/O Lands situated adjacent and South of the Church of Christ the King Parochial House, 4 Scroggy Road, Limavady**

**App Type:** Outline Planning

**Proposal:** Proposed residential development and open space with access onto Scroggy Road (rationalisation of housing and open space lands as identified under DNAP 2016 resulting in an overall increase in the provision of open space)

Report circulated.

S Mathers presented the Report, referring to the site, its context and aerial view of the area. He described the site as incorporating 2 playing fields, zoned housing land. He advised of objections and support for the application highlighting issues in relation to pedestrian linkage with the existing adjacent residential development. S Mathers advised Members that the existing playing fields were being exchanged for new provision of open space and although smaller in size would have benefits in terms of relationship with other existing open space and better provision of open space as a result. He advised the ownership was within the control of the applicant. S Mathers advised Members of the requirement for 20% social housing provision within the site, provision of 10% open space including an equipped children's playground, retention of key boundaries, limitation on ridge height adjacent Scroggy Road and that traffic and access provision was considered acceptable.

**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 Chair invited T Stokes and Fr McCanny to speak in support of the application.

T Stokes outlined community culture and education uses, bound by the Church, a rationale of LYH 18 Housing Zoning and adjacent Open Space, the layout would give greater legibility to open space in a linear form. Objections had referred to the link from Shanreagh Park and after having discussed with Officers and the Community, a revised concept plan removed the link from Shanreagh Park, following which, 112 letters of gratitude were received, and no final objections. T Stokes outlined a rationale of clear benefits to support the WolfHounds Football Club and consultees satisfied subject to conditions.

Proposed by Councillor Baird  
Seconded by Councillor Loftus

- 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 proposal to the Committee to vote, Committee voted unanimously in favour.

The Chair declared the proposal carried:

**AGREED** - 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.

#### **5.4 LA01/2017/1368/F The site of the Former Dunluce Centre, 10 Sandhill Drive, Portrush**

**App Type:** Full Planning

**Proposal:** Proposed remodelling, refurbishment and extension to existing family entertainment centre to create additional indoor recreation areas comprising a surf centre and wet play area, children's play areas, restaurant and bar, coffee dock with external seating, staff facilities and community spaces. Creation of new entrance lobby with replacement viewing tower, recladding and redressing of existing elevations, hard and soft landscaping, installation of sculpture and other associated site works. Replacement of coach parking bays from Sandhill Drive to Dunluce Avenue.

Report circulated.

M Wilson presented the Report. He described the proposed development, site, context and previous use of the Dunluce Centre, previously owned by Council. He showed and explained the key views of the proposed development and explained the proposed elevational drawings.

**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.

No questions were posed to the Officer.

The Chair invited D Thompson to address Committee in support of the application.

D Thompson thanked the Planning Officers for their helpful interventions and constructive criticisms for Phase1. She advised Members that a PAN had been submitted for Phase 2 of the development for accommodation and aim to submit Phase 2 application in the Autumn. D Thompson outlined an appropriately significant tourist amenity to include a surf facility, having a significant tourism role, the facility would be open

all year round and include climbing areas, rest area, coffee shop. The design had taken account of the need for sensitive design, addressing the road network, its reuse sensitive to the area and have no detrimental impact on residential amenity. D Thompson stated a total investment for the overall project of £11M with 80 new full and part time staff, a contribution to rates, 120 construction jobs and sustainability with the expectation of 200,000 footfall and £3M annual benefit.

Members sought clarification of the objections to the utility vent system onto Crocknamack Street, the Public Realm and sand dunes.

D Thompson advised the development did not interfere with the open space area nor the sand dunes. She advised that odour installation equipment would be reused and upgraded, an odour impact assessment had been submitted and Environment Health were content.

In response to a query from Members, D Thompson advised the facility would be open all year round, be demand lead however would not be open 24 hours per day.

Members sought clarification of the height of the viewing tower; and clarification that it did not look directly onto residents properties.

D Thompson advised it had an extra floor to address the corner, was relocated to a better position within the building and created the landmark for the building and was approximately 3m higher. The existing tower was 19m high and the proposed tower another 2 ½m higher. She advised that it would not result in direct overlooking into residential properties.

The Chair invited questions to the Officers.

Members queried the drainage assessment and whether Condition 11 was sufficient, considering Phase 2 was imminent.

M Wilson advised the existing development on the site has drainage infrastructure in place and content that Condition 11 is sufficient. He advised Phase 2 was currently at Pre Application and drainage will be considered for the additional development under that application.

Members sought assurance the tower would not be out of character.

M Wilson advised the existing tower is to be removed and a new tower would be located at the entrance to draw the eye towards the entrance of the building. He advised the site abuts open space, Dunluce Avenue, carparking, Primary School; that Crocknamack Road and Eglinton Street are a distance away. He advised that the proposed development is not considered to result in an overbearing impact, considering the site.

Proposed by Alderman Cole  
Seconded by Alderman King

- 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 proposal to the Committee to vote, Committee Voted unanimously in Favour:

**AGREED** - 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.

\* **Councillor P McShane left the meeting and did not return.**

#### **5.5 LA01/2017/1233/F 110m South West of 36 Straw Road, Dungiven**

**App Type:** Full Planning

**Proposal:** Proposed dwelling, carport and domestic garage/stores with loft storage above.

Report circulated.

J McMath, Senior Planning Officer, presented the Report and site visit report. She advised Members that the application had previously been presented to Planning Committee at the meeting held in June and that a site visit had taken place. She reminded Members that the application had been deferred to facilitate amended plans reducing the proposed development to 1 ½ storey dwelling and reduction on ground levels. She described the site and its context and described the proposed development. J McMath advised Members that the size and scale of the development failed to integrate into the landscape. The garage and store had not been changed, the amended ridge height of the dwelling is 7.65m and a further 0.5m reduction in proposed finished ground levels resulting in 3m of a cut-in and resulting in an engineered site that is contrary to the planning policy. J McMath advised Members that the proposed development would still sit 5.1m above the adjacent farm buildings, was visible from Straw Road, would be prominent in the landscape, dominant and lacks integration. She advised that Planning Officers had asked for further reduction in the ridge height but the applicant had declined to reduce further. She advised the application is contrary to policies CTY 13 and CTY14 of PPS 21 as it failed to integrate and would be prominent in the landscape.

Members asked how much further officers had considered the ridge height should be reduced by.

J McMath advised that a 1½ storey dwelling of 6.5m would be more acceptable and the proposed ridge height of 7.65m was very close to that of a 2 storey dwelling.

The Chair invited D Donaldson to speak in support of the Application. D Donaldson advised the ridge height had been reduced to 7.65m and floor level further reduced by 0.5m, 1 ½m was a second significant reduction. D Donaldson stated Officers had stated it was inadequate and a further 0.95 reduced usability. D Donaldson outlined presumption in favour of development, that there was very little consequence of further reduction as the site is set back 120m from the proposed access. He advised Members that there are no critical views of the development from the Drumrane Road and the site sits in a natural saucer with the Sperrins acting as a backdrop. He advised that there are no significant views from the south along Straw Road and that the site is not located within an AONB. D Donaldson advised Members that the thrust of PPS21 was to group with existing buildings on the farm and that the proposed development would be well integrated with the farm buildings.

In response to a query from Members, D Donaldson advised the ground floor level had been reduced by 0.5m, that the dwelling will be sited 150m back from access point and is a well integrated site. He advised Members that a 1 ½ storey dwelling ridge height is not clearly defined but that the eaves should be below the window line; normally 6.5m-7.6m in ridge height. D Donaldson advised the sheds were in a cutting and referred to Paragraph 8.14 within the Report, dwelling would be 5.1m above ridge line of sheds, however, this is not of great consequence.

Members queried the limit of the accommodation on level 1 of the current ridge height versus that of 6.5m ridge. D Donaldson advised it would reduce the square foot of the building, bringing the eaves height down, the area around the edges reduced and usability of the first floor reduced by 30%.

The Chair invited questions to the Officers.

Members queried the visual impact of the proposed dwelling given the 120m setback from the road and whether this minimised the impact of the proposed dwelling.

J McMath advised the views of the proposed dwelling from Straw Road, the character of the area is that of houses was a lower level and lower ridge; the elevated nature of this site compared to adjacent farm

buildings; and that the setback did not overcome these concerns; still prominent, unacceptable visual impact and 2 boundaries undefined.

Members, referring to a 1 ½ storey dwelling and the ridge height reduced, questioned why Officers were seeking a further reduction.

J McMath advised 7.65m high very close to a 2-storey dwelling, 6.5m or 6.7m was the average for a storey and a half dwelling and taking account of the specifics of the site the lower ridge height was considered necessary by Officers. She advised Officers had sought further reductions but the applicant had declined to amend further. J McMath advised that the levels had been cut in by 3m, which would not normally be supported under policy, this view is supported by PAC. J McMath advised that in considering integration, more weight would be given to existing hedge lines and it would be matter for the Committee to consider if they consider the proposal acceptable.

D Dickson, Head of Planning, read an extract from policy CTY13 to Members outlining the criteria that is required to be met. She advised that officers considered the proposal would be a prominent feature, lacked long established natural boundaries, relied primarily on new landscaping for integration, the ancillary works do not integrate with their surroundings, engineering works, the design is inappropriate for the site, fails to blend with the landform.

Proposed by Alderman Finlay  
Seconded by Councillor Fielding

- That the Committee has taken into consideration and disagrees 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.

The Head of Planning sought Planning reasons for going against the Officer recommendation.

Alderman Finlay and Councillor Fielding set out the following reasons:

- the proposed site has long established boundaries in the form of farm buildings;
- The 3M cut into the site is acceptable;
- The ridge height had been reduced;
- Will not be a blur on the landscape;
- It fits in with the agricultural buildings;
- Cut-in to the landscape is acceptable



The Chair put the proposal to the Committee to vote. 11 Members voted For, 0 Members voted against, 3 Members abstained. The Chair declared the proposal carried:

**AGREED** - That the Committee has taken into consideration and **DISAGREES** 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 for the reasons set out:

- the proposed site has long established boundaries in the form of farm buildings;
- The 3M cut into the site is acceptable;
- The ridge height had been reduced;
- Will not be a blur on the landscape;
- It fits in with the agricultural buildings;
- Cut-in to the landscape is acceptable

Members agreed to delegate the consideration of conditions and informatives to be included in the approval decision to officers.

**AGREED** – that Committee hold a comfort break from 3.40PM- 4.07PM.

#### **5.6 LA01/2017/1270/O Immediately west of no's 57, 59 & 59A Brisland Road, Eglinton**

**App Type:** Outline Planning

**Proposal:** Erection of farm dwelling

Report circulated.

J McMath presented the Report and Addendum. J McMath explained the location of the site in relation to the farm buildings; that the site was not originally part of the farm but during the processing of the application was included within the farm holding; however the site does not cluster or visually link with a group of buildings on the farm. She advised that the applicant argues that the adjacent dwellings are buildings on the farm and that the dwellings within the applicant's ownership at this location were subject to tenancies that were not classified as agricultural. J McMath advised Members that the application fails criteria c of policy CTY10 was contrary to Policies CTY 8 and 14 and contrary to Policy AMP2 of PPS 3.

**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** planning permission subject to the reasons set out in section 10.

**Addendum Recommendation** - That the Committee notes the contents of the Addendum and agrees with the recommendation to refuse, as set out in paragraph 9.1 of the Planning Committee Report.

Members queried whether there was a need for the dwelling?

J McMath advised it had been accepted that the farm was active and established and stated the policy required the proposed dwelling to be visually linked with a group of buildings on the farm, however the dwellings identified were not considered to be part of the farm business. She advised there were 4 buildings, 3 owned by the farmer.

Members requested clarification of the protected tenancies and what the Rent Officer had stated.

J McMath advised the buildings were resided in by workers on the farm some years ago, paying protected rent, however, the current occupants did not work on the farm.

The Chair invited A Hunter to speak in support of the Application.

A Hunter advised he was disappointed his email was not circulated to the Planning Committee. He advised that he had not been asked to address the roads issues but that Roads were now satisfied. A Hunter advised that the sites are not visible and therefore would not result in ribbon development. A Hunter provided details and names of the current occupiers and workers who paid tied agricultural tenancies and further advised the Executive were incorrect. A Hunter advised of a diversification house, cotter houses and outlined rent payments of a tied tenancy of a family of a next of kin worker and did not accept what had been said.

The Chair advised an Addendum had been issued with the further information supplied by the Applicant.

Members queried the issue of clustering with an established group of buildings on a farm and policy CTY10 and the DAERA Farm map whereupon subsidy had been paid. They further queried whether the issue of the rent being tied to the farm, or otherwise, because of agriculture.

M Kennedy, in support of the applicant, advised the houses were built to house farm workers. He stated that they were protected tenancies and outlined reductions in rent.

Members queried whether work on the farm was still active?

A Hunter advised there were potatoes and cattle farming and his sons were coming onto the farm also.

Members sought clarification of the ribbon development consideration.

M Kennedy advised that policies CTY8 and CTY 13 were competing policies.

J McMath advised that officers had been advised that these were not protected agricultural tenancies. J McMath confirmed the Addendum circulated included the Applicant's additional information.

Members queried whether the clarification of the access provision that had been made by the Applicant at the meeting now negated the objection and refusal reason?

J McMath advised that the amendments had not been submitted through Planning and were therefore outwith the planning process. She advised the applicant must submit amendments through Planning for consideration and consultation with DfI Roads.

Proposed by Alderman King  
Seconded by Alderman Finlay

- That Committee defer determination and arrange a Site Visit.

The Chair put the proposal to the Committee to vote, 14 Members voted For, 0 Members voted against and 0 Members abstained.

The Chair declared the proposal carried unanimously:

**AGREED** - That Committee defer determination to arrange a Site Visit.

## **5.7 LA01/2017/1580/O Lands adjacent to 64 Coleraine Road, Garvagh**

**App Type:** Outline Planning

**Proposal:** Proposed infill site for 2 no. detached two storey dwellings and detached garages.

Report and Addendum circulated.

J Lundy presented the Report and described the site, its context and views of the site. She advised the Application relied on features of the settlement of Garvagh, and referred to Paragraph 8.10 and 8.11 of the Report, circulated. She advised that under policy CTY8 buildings within the settlement limit to form a ribbon of development for the purpose of an infill cannot be considered.

**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** planning permission subject to the reasons set out in section 10.

**Addendum recommendation** - That the Committee notes the contents of the Addendum and agrees with the recommendation to refuse, as set out in paragraph 9.1 of the Planning Committee Report.

Members referred to a recent application turned down by Committee outside Dunloy and whether the Application was similar.

J Lundy advised it was and also referred to another at Coast Road, Glenarriffe.

The Chair invited H McKeown to present in support of the Application.

H McKeown advised that there is not much economic activity in Garvagh. He advised that the application site was within the 30mph speed restriction, and there is an existing footpath and street lighting. He advised that DfI Roads had provided conditions as proposed to use existing access; archaeological survey would be carried out after the resolution of this meeting. H McKeown advised the site should be within the settlement limit and there would be no increased burden on services as they already exist. He stated that there is a conflict between rural development and the settlement with houses on north and south side with no distinction between settlement and rural area. H McKeown referred to the PAC appeal on Dunloy allowed by PAC as there was no detriment to rural character and settlement limits were notional.

Members queried was the PAC decision on Appeal approved?

H McKeown advised it had been allowed on 9<sup>th</sup> May.

Proposed by Councillor Loftus

Seconded by Councillor McCaw and

**AGREED** – that Committee recess to receive details of the PAC decision.

\* **Recess 4.45PM-4.52PM.**

D Dickson, Head of Planning, advised Committee that Council would be writing a letter of complaint to the PAC on the Dunloy decision. She advised Members that settlement limits are not notional as they are adopted through the Northern Area Plan 2016; development limits can only be amended through the development plan process.

Cllr Hunter proposed that Committee defer consideration until the correspondence had been sent to PAC and response to it received.

Proposed by Councillor Loftus  
Seconded by Alderman Finlay

- That Committee defer consideration and arrange a Site Visit.

Councillor Loftus wished to read, digest and understand what was being said, that determination should not be held pending a response from PAC. Alderman Finlay and Councillor Hunter concurred.

Councillor Hunter withdrew her proposal.

The Chair put the proposal by Councillor Loftus to the Committee to vote, Committee voted unanimously in Favour.

The Chair declared the proposal carried:

**AGREED** - that Committee defer consideration and arrange a Site Visit.

J Lundy, Senior Planning Officer, agreed to circulate the PAC decision.

#### **5.8 LA01/2017/1522/O, Lands between 316a & 318 Foreglen Road, Dungiven**

**App Type:** Outline Planning

**Proposal:** Proposed infill site for dwelling and detached garage

Report circulated.

J McMath presented the Report and advised Members that the site was located on a laneway off the Foreglen Road. She described the site and its context and showed Members the concept drawing for the proposed dwelling but disagreed with the frontage lengths annotated within this drawing. J McMath explained the assessment of the frontages; the location of a watercourse and bridge and that it was not considered a substantially built-up frontage. In terms of policy CT2YA she advised that there was no focal point or crossroads and would result in intensification of access onto a Protected Route.

**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** planning permission subject to the reasons set out in section 10.

Members queried why the Application was presented to Committee.

D Dickson, the Head of Planning, clarified the application was referred in accordance with the Protocol by an Elected Member and supported by 2 Planning Committee Members.

The Chair invited S Curtin to present to Committee in support of the Application.

S Curtin advised that the land was family owned land and there were no objections; consultees including DfI Roads were content in principle with the application if it meets planning policy. S Curtin stated that the built frontage from No.314 - No.318 Foreglen Road was substantial, referring to 4 houses that fronted the laneway, No. 314, the second a detached, the third was a 1 ½ farm development and the fourth a bungalow at no.318. S Curtin agreed no. 316a did not have frontage and was surplus to the application. S Curtin described the application site as a smaller gap. She stated that the PAC interpretation of policy CTY 8 as abuts or shares a boundary to the road. She advised that frontage to laneway is acceptable under policy CTY8; it can be set back and staggered and that the application site was compliant with policy CTY8.

Members queried S Curtin's interpretation of curtilage and frontage and CTY8.

S Curtin stated PAC considered curtilage and amenity space within the frontage. There is a domestic garage which is a separate entity, frontage of no.314, no. 318 rectangular and gap site. She advised that the gap site reflects the frontages and should be approved. S Curtin outlined the dimensions - No. 314 - 25m, next 20m, North 15m and no. 318 24m.

Councillor Baird stated she would like to have a Site visit.

Proposed by Councillor Baird  
Seconded by Councillor Loftus

- That Committee defer determination and arrange a Site Visit.

The Chair put the proposal to the Committee to vote, 13 Members voted For, 1 Member voted Against, 0 Members Abstained.

The Chair declared the proposal carried:

**AGREED** - That Committee defer consideration and arrange a Site Visit.

**5.9 LA01/2018/0380/F, Public Realm Improvement Scheme including Ramore Avenue, Lansdowne Road, Bath Road, Bath Terrace, Bath Street Church Pass, Atlantic Avenue, Main Street, Eglinton Street (from Causeway Street to Train Station), Dunluce Avenue (Eglinton Street to Dunluce Car Park), Causeway Street (Main Street to Library)**

**App Type:** Full Planning

**Proposal:** Variation of Condition No. 5 (Archaeological Programme of Work) on Planning Decision LA01/2017/0379/F (Public Realm Improvement)

Report circulated.

M Wilson, Senior Planning Officer, presented the Report explaining that this application was solely to vary condition 5 of the previous approval, explained what the condition referred to and the proposed amendment, solely based on archaeological works; advised consultation with Historic Environment Division raised no concerns in agreeing to vary the condition.

**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.

Proposed by Alderman King  
Seconded by Councillor Hunter

- 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 proposal to the Committee to vote, Committee voted unanimously in Favour.

The Chair declared the proposal carried:

**AGREED** - 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.

\* **Councillor Nicholl left the meeting at 5.16PM during consideration of the above Item and returned.**

## 5.10 LA01/2018/0578/F, 27 – 29 Main Street Portrush

**App Type:** Full

**Proposal:** Minor works to front façade of no. 27 & 29 of repair nature and repainting in connection with Portrush revitalisation grant. Existing use as retail shop continued

Report circulated.

E Hudson presented the Report describing the proposed development, site and context. She advised Members that Historic Environment Division had been consulted and were content.

**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** full planning permission for the reasons set out in section 10.

Proposed by Councillor Loftus  
Seconded by Alderman Finlay

- 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** full planning permission for the reasons set out in section 10.

The Chair put the proposal to the Committee to vote, Committee voted unanimously in Favour.

The Chair declared the proposal carried:

**AGREED** - 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** full planning permission for the reasons set out in section 10.

## 5.11 LA01/2018/0607/LBC, 27 – 29 Main Street Portrush

**App Type:** Listed Building Consent

**Proposal:** Repairs to upper storey windows. Replaster front façade & repaint. Work in connection with Portrush Revitalisation scheme.

Report circulated.

E Hudson presented the Report describing the proposed development, site and context. She advised Members that Historic Environment Division had been consulted and were content.



**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 **GRANT** listed building consent for the reasons set out in section 10.

Proposed by Alderman Finlay  
Seconded by Councillor MA McKillop

- 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 **GRANT** listed building consent for the reasons set out in section 10.

The Chair put the proposal to the Committee to vote, Committee voted unanimously in favour.

The Chair declared the proposal carried:

**AGREED** - 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 **GRANT** listed building consent for the reasons set out in section 10.

#### **5.12 B/2008/0405/F Lands 180m S.E. of 92 Clooney Road, Limavady**

**App Type:** Full Planning  
**Proposal:** Proposed extraction of Sand and Gravel, adjacent to existing approved site, including Washing Plant, Mobile Sand Screener, Water Flocculation Plant, Clean Water Pond and Silt Pond.

Report, Addendum and Erratum circulated.

S Mathers presented the Report. He described the proposed development, the site and its context. He advised that the access is in place and there are no critical views of the extracted area, showing photographs of the main critical approaches. S Mathers advised Members that the proposed development was acceptable in terms of noise and dust having consulted with Environmental Health who were content. He advised that the site had been reduced to remove an area of protected plant species from the application and HED were consulted and content. S Mathers advised Members that the site location plan will have an area shaded pink to ensure that there is no extraction in the area of the protected plant species.

**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** - Noted.

**Addendum Recommendation** - That the Committee notes the content of this addendum and agrees with the recommendation to approval as set out in paragraph 9.1 of the Planning Committee Report.

Proposed by Alderman King  
Seconded by Councillor Nicholl

- 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;

- that the Committee notes the erratum,

- that the Committee notes the content of the addendum and agrees with the recommendation to approval as set out in paragraph 9.1 of the Planning Committee Report.

The Chair put the proposal to the Committee to vote, Committee voted unanimously in Favour.

The Chair declared the proposal carried:

**AGREED** - 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;

- that the Committee notes the erratum.

- that the Committee notes the content of the addendum and agrees with the recommendation to approval as set out in paragraph 9.1 of the Planning Committee Report.

## **6. DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT PERFORMANCE:**

### **6.1 Update on Development Management & Enforcement Statistics, Period 01 April 2018 – 31 July 2018**

D Dickson, Head of Planning, delivered the report, a list of planning applications received and decided respectively by Causeway Coast and Glens Borough Council in the month of July 2018. Pre-Application Discussions; Certificates of Lawful Development – Proposed or Existing;

Discharge of Conditions and Non-Material Changes, have been excluded from the reports to correspond with official validated statistics published by DFI. She advised Members of the increase in more complex applications and that officers were issuing more decisions than had been received. D Dickson advised Members that the number of over 12 month applications and referrals to Planning Committee remained an area for concern.

**IT IS RECOMMENDED** that the Planning Committee note the update on the development management statistics.

**AGREED** - that the Planning Committee note the update on the development management statistics.

## **6.2 Planning Department Annual Report**

D Dickson, Head of Planning, presented the report in detail.

It was concluded, performance within the Planning Department remains steady in terms of applications received and enforcement activity. However areas of concern remain with the number of applications in the system over 12 months and the length of time taken to process local applications. Actions have been put in place in an attempt to improve performance in these areas. Nevertheless, caseloads of Planning Officers remain extremely high. Action is therefore required to address this issue.

**IT IS RECOMMENDED** that the Planning Committee note the Planning Departments Annual report.

**AGREED** - that the Planning Committee note the Planning Departments Annual report.

## **6.3 Review of 'Protocol for the Operation of the Planning Committee'**

D Dickson, Head of Planning, presented the report.

The Protocol was previously reviewed and agreed on 25th October 2017 and took effect on 8th November 2017. The Scheme of Delegation was last revised on 7th November 2016 (Appendix 1).

Concerns related to the increase in the number of requests to refer delegated planning decisions to Planning Committee for determination and the impact this is having on staff resources and length of Committee meetings.

At the Planning Committee meeting held 12th March 2018, it was requested that the 'Protocol for the Operation of the Planning Committee' be reviewed via a workshop and a report brought back to Planning Committee for agreement (Appendix 2). A workshop with Members was

held on 20<sup>th</sup> April 2018 and this Report includes proposals from that workshop.

**IT IS RECOMMENDED** that the Committee agree that the Head of Planning amends the Protocol for the Operation of the Planning Committee and Scheme of Delegation attached at Appendix 3 and 4 inserting agreed amendments.

Proposed by Councillor Baird  
Seconded by Alderman Finlay and

– that Committee defer consideration and arrange a Workshop to go through in detail.

The Chair put the proposal to the Committee to vote, 6 Members voted For, 0 Members voted Against, 7 Members abstained.

The Chair declared the proposal carried:

**AGREED** – that Committee defer consideration and arrange a Workshop.

## **7. DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

### **7.1 NI Minerals working Group – Draft Terms of Reference**

S Mulhern, Development Plan Manager, presented the report.

Committee was informed that the Council's Planning Department were currently preparing a Local Development Plan (LDP) for the Borough. Members will also be aware of the Minerals background paper presented and agreed at the Planning Committee in July 2016 and the Minerals Workshop held for Members in August 2017.

Planning officers are currently updating the information available on this topic as part of the ongoing LDP preparation. Planning officials have been in discussion with the following stakeholders in relation to the Minerals Topic.

A Northern Ireland Minerals Working Group has been established to enable all 11 NI Councils to work together and in conjunction with all relevant stakeholders, to gather information on the future demand over the Local Development Plan period (see DfE letter circulated at Appendix 1).

**IT IS RECOMMENDED** that Elected Members note the content of the letter attached at Appendix 1 and agree to a Terms of Reference along the lines of that contained within Appendix 2, and agree to the Head of Planning submitting a response on behalf of Council.

Proposed by Councillor Hunter  
Seconded by Councillor Nicholl and

**AGREED** – that Committee note the content of the letter attached at Appendix 1 and agree to a Terms of Reference along the lines of that contained within Appendix 2, and agree to the Head of Planning submitting a response on behalf of Council.

Committee voted unanimously in Favour.

## **8. CORRESPONDENCE**

### **8.1 NIEA Confirmation of Gortycavan Area Special Scientific Interest**

**AGREED** – that Committee note the correspondence.

#### **MOTION TO PROCEED ‘IN COMMITTEE’**

Proposed by Alderman McKeown  
Seconded by Alderman Finlay and

**AGREED** – that the Committee proceed to conduct the following business ‘In Committee’.

## **9. LEGAL ISSUES**

Council’s Solicitor provided a verbal update in relation to ongoing legal proceedings.

### **9.1 Alexander Judicial Review judgement**

Proposed by Councillor Baird  
Seconded by Councillor Hunter and

**AGREED** – that the Craigahulliar decision is discussed at the Workshop to be held for the review of the Protocol.

Committee voted unanimously in favour.

### **9.2 Consideration of Stop notice**

D Dickson, Head of Planning outlined the history of an ongoing enforcement case and advised Members that officers are currently at the stage of consideration of issuing a Stop Notice in relation to the unauthorised activities.

Proposed by Alderman Cole  
Seconded by Alderman King

- that Committee authorise the Head of Planning, in principle, to research and consider issuing a Stop notice in discussion with Council's solicitors.

The Chair put the proposal to the Committee to vote, 11 Members voted For, 0 Members voted Against, 1 Member abstained.

The Chair declared the proposal carried:

**AGREED** - that Committee authorise the Head of Planning to research and consider a Stop notice, in principle.

The Head of Planning advised a further update would be provided at the next Planning meeting.

#### **10. Development Management Performance: Business Case for Additional Staff**

D Dickson, Head of Planning delivered the report in detail.

**IT IS RECOMMENDED** that Members agree to the recruitment of 2 additional Planning Officers on a permanent contract and ensure a Legal Adviser is available to support Officers in the preparation for and attendance at planning appeals, judicial reviews and other court proceedings.

Proposed by Alderman Finlay  
Seconded by Councillor Hunter and

**AGREED** – that Committee agree to the recruitment of 2 additional Planning Officers on a permanent contract and ensure a Legal Adviser is available to support Officers in the preparation for and attendance at planning appeals, judicial reviews and other court proceedings.

Committee voted unanimously in favour.

The Head of Planning agreed to check whether the decision should now be onward referred to the Corporate Policy & Resources Committee.

\* **Councillor MA McKillop left the meeting at 6.37PM.**

## **11. ANY OTHER RELEVANT BUSINESS (NOTIFIED IN ACCORDANCE WITH STANDING ORDER 12 (O))**

The Chair Agreed to a verbal submission of AORB from Alderman Finlay.

### **11.1 PAC Decision 2017/A0147 Lands adjacent to 142 Tullaghans Road, Dunloy**

Alderman Finlay referred to the above PAC Decision referred to during consideration of Application LA01/2017/1270/O earlier in the meeting, which had been allowed on Appeal.

D Dickson, Head of Planning, in conjunction with D Hunter, Council's Solicitor, advised Committee that Council would be writing to the PAC to raise concerns that the Commissioner had disregarded planning policy and the statutory development limits for Dunloy as adopted through the Northern Area Plan in its overturning of the determination.

### **11.2 Enforcement against unauthorised advertisements**

The Chair Agreed to a verbal submission of AORB from Alderman King.

In response to a query from Alderman King, S Mathers provided an update on proceedings.

\* **Councillor Loftus left the meeting at 6.40PM.**

### **MOTION TO PROCEED 'IN PUBLIC'**

Proposed by Alderman Finlay  
Seconded by Councillor Baird and

**AGREED** – that the Committee proceed to conduct the following business 'In Public'.

There being no further business, the Chair thanked everyone for their attendance and the meeting concluded at 6.41pm.

---

Chair