

SITE VISIT REPORT: Monday 25th November 2024

Committee Members: Alderman, Boyle, Callan, Coyle, Hunter (Chair), Scott, Stewart, S McKillop and; Councillors Anderson, C Archibald, Kennedy, McGurk, McMullan, Nicholl, Peacock, Storey and Watton(Vice Chair)

LA01/2022/1118/F Land 25m West of 24 Creamery Road, Coleraine

App Type: Full

Proposal: Proposed Single Storey Dwelling

Present: Ald Hunter, Boyle, Coyle, Councillors, McGurk, Watton

Officials: M Wilson

Comments: The site visit commenced on the lane just to north of the site's boundary. The Official identified the site and explained this differs from the 2011 approval which was a smaller site and included land that is not part of this application. The Official continued by explaining the principle concern with the proposal was that unlike in 2010/2011 when Ballyrashane had no settlement limit, the adoption of the NAP 2016 designated Ballyrashane as a settlement. Therefore, any buildings within the settlement limit cannot be relied upon for the purposes of PSS21. The extent of the settlement limit was discussed and the official confirmed it is a matter of fact these buildings are within a settlement limit. Therefore the development cannot be a cluster for the purposes of CTY2a, as buildings are either in a settlement or not. Furthermore, it was explained that the proposed site extends development rather than consolidating or rounding off development and approving development on the edge of a settlement limit sets an undesirable precedent.

Cllr Watton asked if this was for a farm dwelling and the Official confirmed that no information has been submitted in this regard and rather reliance is on the area being a *cluster* under CTY2a.

Members queried the vacant land on the opposite side of the lane from the subject site which previously had buildings and Ald Hunter asked about the history of this site. The Official commented that obviously the status of the land in question differs from the subject site as that land is within the settlement limit and was previously developed. However, the Official wasn't aware of any

specific history but would check this and provide an update at the Committee Meeting.

Members then moved to the existing gate and viewed the site and its extent, and that the proposal was on the higher part of the land making it more prominent, and the proposal was a split-level dwelling, being split internally. Members commented on the views being on the higher part of the land.

There was a query if the Creamery was the planning applicant, and the Official confirmed the Creamery was not the applicant on the application form.

The site visit was concluded.

M Wilson

26.11.24