

LISBURN & CASTLEREAGH CITY COUNCIL

Minutes of Meeting of the Planning Committee held remotely and in the Council Chamber, Island Civic Centre, The Island, Lisburn, on Monday 4 October 2021 at 10.30 a.m.

PRESENT:

Present in Chamber:

Councillor A Swan (Chairman)

Alderman J Tinsley (Vice-Chairman)

Aldermen WJ Dillon, O Gawith and A Grehan

Councillors J Craig, U Mackin, J McCarthy

Present in remote location:

Councillors M Gregg, J Palmer

IN ATTENDANCE:

Present in Chamber:

Head of Planning and Capital Development

Member Services Officer (PS)

Member Services Officer (BF)

Legal Adviser - B Martyn - Cleaver Fulton & Rankin

Present in remote location:

Director of Service Transformation

Principal Planning Officer (RH)

Senior Planning Officer (MB)

Senior Planning Officer (RT)

Commencement of Meeting

The Chairman, Councillor A Swan, welcomed everyone to the meeting which was being live streamed to enable members of the public to hear and see the proceedings.

He stated that Planning Officers, and those speaking for or against the applications would be attending the meeting remotely.

The Head of Planning and Capital Development advised on housekeeping and evacuation procedures. He updated the Committee that recent legislative changes now allowed members to fully participate in meetings when attending from a remote location. The Member Services Officer then read out the names of the Elected Members in attendance at the meeting.

1. Apologies

It was agreed that apologies for non-attendance at the meeting would be recorded from Alderman D Drysdale and it was noted that Councillor J Palmer would be late.

2. Declarations of Interest

The Chairman sought Declarations of Interest from Members and reminded them to complete the supporting forms which had been left at each desk. He indicated that a form could be downloaded from Decision time for those Members attending remotely.

The following Declarations of Interest were made:

- Councillor J McCarthy referred to LA05/2020/0971/F advising that as the applicant was known to him he would be withdrawing during its determination.
- The Chairman, Councillor A Swan referred to LA05/2017/0021/F advising that he had been contacted in relation to it but had not commented and had not pre-determined the application.
- During the course of the meeting Alderman J Dillon referred to LA05/2020/0952/F stating that he had been contacted regarding the application but had not commented and had not pre-determined the application.
- After the meeting through the completion of a completed Declaration of Interest form, Councillor U Mackin referred to LA05/2017/0021/F stating that he had been contacted regarding the application but had made no comment.
- The Chairman, Councillor A Swan, then advised that Members of the Planning Committee (by virtue of being Members of the Council) had significant private or personal non-pecuniary interest in Planning Application LA05/2021/0813/F. However, the dispensation under paragraph 6.6 of the Code of Conduct applied and therefore Members might speak and vote on this application. He advised that, as all Members had the same interest in this case, it was not considered necessary for each Member to individually declare their interest.

3. Minutes of the Planning Committee Meeting held on 6 September 2021

It was proposed by Alderman J Dillon, seconded by Alderman O Gawith, and agreed that the minutes of the Committee meeting held on 6 September 2021 as circulated be signed.

4. Report from the Head of Planning and Capital Development

4.1 Schedule of Applications

The Chairman reminded Members that they needed to be present for the entire determination of an application. If absent for any part of the discussion they would render themselves unable to vote on the application.

The Legal Adviser highlighted paragraphs 51 - 53 of the Protocol for the Operation of the Lisburn & Castlereagh City Council Planning Committee which, he advised, needed to be borne in mind when determinations were being made.

(The Head of Planning and Capital Development left the meeting at 10.46 am).

- (i) LA05/2017/0021/F – Demolition of existing buildings and erection of care home (Class 3(b) of the schedule of the Planning (Use Class) order (NI) 2015, comprising 86 bedrooms, day rooms, kitchens, offices, stores and ancillary accommodation (on three floors of accommodation), modification of an existing access to Saintfield Road and provision of car parking (in the basement), visitor parking and servicing at 531 Saintfield Road, Belfast.

Prior to the presentation being delivered to Members, Councillor M Gregg proposed that the determination of the application be deferred to allow for a site visit to be arranged so that the Committee could view the site and context of the application particularly in light of the detail of the officers report and by third parties submitted and speaking against the application. The proposal was seconded by Councillor J Craig who said that he felt there were contradictions between some of the roads related information circulated which required clarification.

Having been proposed and seconded, on a show of hands it was agreed that the above planning application be deferred pending a site visit being arranged to view the site and context and to obtain additional traffic information.

Adjournment of Meeting

The Chairman, Councillor A Swan declared the meeting adjourned at 10.50 am to allow for arrangements to be made to bring speakers on the next items to be brought in earlier to the meeting.

Resumption of Meeting

The Chairman, Councillor A Swan declared the meeting resumed at 11.06 am (The Head of Planning and Capital Development returned to the meeting at 11.06 am).

- (ii) LA05/2020/0952/F - Stables for keeping of horses (for domestic purposes) including access and paddock on land opposite and south east of 123 Ballynahinch Road, Dromore

The Senior Planning Officer (RT) presented this application as outlined within the circulated report.

The Committee received Mr Andrew McCready who wished to speak in support of the application. A written submission provided in advance of the meeting and highlighted the following:

- This was an application for modest stables to keep and breed horses.
- He outlined the site layout and clarified distances.
- He said this would not create a ribbon of development, there was not a line of three or more buildings and they were not visually linked.
- He outlined a similar application which had been approved.
- He explained the needs of the daughter of the applicant who competes at a high level in equestrian events.
- He outlined historic issues where the health of two foals had been affected by disease due to them being located too close to the farm.
- He said this development could be successfully integrated.

Mr McCready then responded to Members' queries as follows:

- Alderman J Tinsley referred to the access and asked whether there was an opportunity to create any other sites, he also asked if there were any differences between this application and the example referred to which had been approved. Mr McCready responded that DfI Roads had accepted the proposals but the issue appeared to be integration associated with the removal of the hedge. He explained that proposals were in place to carry out planting as a form of re-instatement. He said that he could see no difference between this application and the one which had previously been approved by the Council.
- Alderman J Dillon asked Mr McCready if he had been involved with the previous example referred to and asked if he could explain any differences. Mr McCready responded that he had been involved with that application and confirmed that he could not see any differences that would result in one being approved and the other being refused. He went on to outline a second similar example which he had become aware of in the area. He stated that he did not see how the proposed stables would add to ribbon development. He also expressed the view that there was an issue of consistency.
- Alderman J Dillon asked whether the stable could be incorporated into the farm as had been suggested. Mr McCready outlined issues that had arisen in the past with antibiotic use on the farm which had resulted in problems arising whilst treating foals. He also explained that that a letter of support had been provided by the vet involved at the time and advised that the applicant, for those reasons, did not want to locate this stable close to the farm.
- Councillor U Mackin sought clarification of CTY14 and why Mr McCready considered this did not create a ribbon of development. Mr McCready advised that the proposed stable was so small and in such a large gap that a ribbon would not be created.

There then followed a question and answer session with the planning officers during which the following issues arose:

(Councillor J Palmer arrived at 11.30 am but was unable to participate in the determination of this application as he had not been present for the entire discussion).

- Councillor J Craig referred to the approval of similar applications and asked whether this was an example of inconsistency, he also sought clarification on what constituted ribbon development. The Head of Planning and Capital Development outlined the differences between the two applications. Members were advised that the applicant for this application lived in the open countryside in a dwelling with a large domestic curtilage whereas the applicant for other proposal lived in an urban area whereby there was inadequate space within their curtilage to accommodate stables. An explanation was also provided as to what constituted ribbon development with reference to the buildings at the location, the access and visibility splays. Members were also advised that the stable block associated with the other application was set back from the road side and that it was a matter of planning judgement as to whether a ribbon of development had been created or not. The Planning Officers had exercised their judgement and decided that it differed from the previous example.
- Councillor J Craig asked whether weight had been given to the veterinary issues raised which provided a reason for locating the stable away from the farm. The Head of Planning and Capital Development advised that this was new information and that it would appear that animals had shared the same field at some stage and that this had led to the illness. He said that another solution was for the foals to have their own field in the future but that this was a question of farm management rather than a justification for a domestic stable being located outside the curtilage of the dwelling. He said that he did not think this issue alone was sufficient reason and the only option open to the applicant and that there may be other locations within the wide land holding which might be suitable.
- Alderman J Tinsley asked whether advice on the veterinary issues could be sought. The Head of Planning and Capital Development explained it was not normal practice for the Planning Unit to seek independent veterinary advice to be sought but that further clarification could be sought from the Agent.
- Members were reminded that the application was presented as one for stables for the keeping of domestic horses rather than commercial horses. The view was expressed that domestic stables should be located within or close to the domestic curtilage. Alternative arrangements that could be put in place to allow for safe foaling were detailed and it was further explained that members had heard similar cases for isolating other animals and that the distance of separation in relation to building was not significant.
- Councillor U Mackin sought clarification on references made to the planning context of the application, and asked whether it would be accurate to say that if the applicant lived in Dromore this would have been approved, he wondered whether this was not discrimination against the rural dweller. The Head of Planning and Capital Development explained that each application was considered on its own merits. The matters to be weighed in

the assessment of this particular application relative to another were outlined previously. He said that if something was to be used as precedent then it must sit on all fours with what is proposed.

- Councillor J McCarthy sought clarification on the planning history at the site and asked whether an infill dwelling had been sought for this specific location. The Senior Planning Officer (RT) confirmed that it had.
- Alderman O Gawith asked whether the applicant controlled the surrounding fields and was advised by the Head of Planning and Capital Development that the field ownership was unknown however the red line boundary would indicate that they owned the remainder of a field but not the area beyond.

During the ensuing debate, the following comments were made:

- Alderman J Dillon said that he always believed in consistency however if we refuse this application we will have been inconsistent. He said he had been made aware of the similar application which had been approved and had driven to the two sites and could see no difference. He referred to the letter of support from the veterinary surgeon and said that it had been stated by him that horses could not be bred on the dairy farm. He said he did have concerns at the removal of the hedge but felt it could be replaced. He said that his was a matter of judgement and he felt there would be no ribbon development created and he would therefore be voting for approval.
- Councillor J Craig said that the planning officers had outlined the differences, if the applicant had not lived close by the application would have been approved, he said that he considered this to be discriminatory. He said that he felt he was in no position to argue against a vet, he accepted the new evidence and felt that consistency was important and therefore he felt that this application should be approved as it did not constitute a ribbon of development.
- Councillor J McCarthy said that taking on board all comments made he could see how this application differed from the example referred to and he would be supporting the recommendation. He said he considered that the comments from the veterinary surgeon were not specific enough and proposed deferring the determination of the application pending the receipt of further information. The proposal was seconded by Alderman O Gawith.
- Councillor A Swan said that he felt that independent veterinary advice would be important.
- The Head of Planning and Capital Development responded stating that it would not be normal practice for the Planning Unit to seek advice from vets. He said that it would be necessary for the vet to clarify whether other options could not be considered and why this field is the only field the stable could be located in.
- Alderman J Dillon then proposed an amendment to Councillor McCarthy's proposal which was to add the arrangement of a site visit to the reasons for deferral. This proposal was put to the Committee and by a show of hands it fell.
- The proposal made by Councillor J McCarthy and seconded by Alderman O Gawith was then put to the Committee and by a show of hands was approved.

Having been proposed, seconded and voted upon it was agreed by the Committee that the determination of the application be deferred pending receipt of additional veterinary information.

Adjournment of Meeting

The Chairman, Councillor A Swan declared the meeting adjourned at 12.10 pm

Resumption of Meeting

The Chairman, Councillor A Swan declared the meeting resumed at 12.15 pm

(Councillor J McCarthy did not return to the meeting at this stage as he had declared an interest in the next application).

(iii) LA05/2020/0971/F – Proposed detached dwelling to rear garden of 65 Antrim Road, Lisburn

The Senior Planning Officer (RT) presented this application as outlined within the circulated report.

The Committee was advised that representatives from DfI Roads were present to respond to any queries they might have.

The Committee received Ms Louise Johnston, and Mr Patrick Johnston who wished to speak in opposition to the application and who had provided the Committee with a written submission in advance of the meeting and highlighted the following:

- She advised that she was speaking on behalf of neighbours who were in opposition to the application.
- She said that the application did not meet criteria set out in Creating Places and she outlined the deficit in the width of the access laneway.
- She highlighted the safety issues that this development would bring.
- She highlighted the planning history at the site.
- She highlighted issues she had experienced trying to navigate the narrow laneway.
- She highlighted the issues that would arrive when this laneway became a works entrance and referred to issues of land ownership.

Ms Johnston and Mr P Johnston then responded to Members' queries as follows:

- Councillor J Craig sought clarification on regulations referred to asking why the objector felt that DfI Roads had given their approval for the access arrangements. Ms Johnston highlighted the lack of consistency in their approach.
- Alderman J Tinsley referred to some space available at the location which could intensify development further and asked for the objector's thoughts on this and he was advised that this area could be developed by one house on the right hand side.
- Alderman J Dillon referred to issues of ownership asking if this was not a civil matter. The objector responded that it was their opinion that the application was not valid as the applicant did not own all of the land involved.

The Committee received Councillor S Carson who wished to speak in opposition to the application and who had provided the Committee with a written submission in advance of the meeting and highlighted the following:

- Regarding the access arrangements, the two applications were identical however the first application had been refused due to Road Safety concerns. He said that he felt the same reason could equally apply to the current application and said he considered this to be inconsistent and failed to see what had changed.

There were no questions from Members' for Councillor Carson.

There then followed a question and answer session with the planning officers during which the following issues arose:

- Alderman J Tinsley sought clarification on the legal correspondence received regarding ownership and validation. The Head of Planning and Capital Development outlined the issues raised by objectors and asked the Senior Planning Officer (RT) to clarify. Officers outlined how Title Deeds had been checked by the Planning Unit. The Head of Planning and Capital Development explained that the comments within the circulated report were accurate, clarification had been sought and provided and the application was deemed valid.
- Councillor J Craig raised issues of consistency and asked what had changed since the 2016 application regarding access arrangements to make this application acceptable. The Head of Planning and Capital Development referred to the historic application which had been for two houses and explained that this had been deemed to be intensification by DfI Roads.
- Councillor J Craig then sought further clarification on the arrangements which was provided by the Head of Planning and Capital Development with the aid of a map and he went on to advise which properties at the location had access via the laneway.
- Councillor J Palmer asked whether the fact that No 65 was on the market had any bearing on the decision and was advised by the Head of Planning and Capital Development that that issue would be dealt with my way of a negative condition.
- Councillor J Palmer asked whether officers were confident regarding a potential Judicial Review should a challenge to the decision arise. He was advised by the Head of Planning and Capital Development that until the detail of a Judicial Review challenge was known it was difficult to comment. However he was confident that all the policy and other material considerations used to inform the recommendation were in front of the members for consideration.
- Alderman J Tinsley posed a question to DfI Roads officials and asked why they had approved an access which was below normal standards, he also asked whether the driving manoeuvre referred to in the report was actually possible. Mr Bryan Finlay from DfI Roads responded that the drawing showing the driving manoeuvre was for illustrative purposes only in actual

fact it would be achievable, he said that this had been deemed as being an improvement on the 2006 decision.

During the ensuing debate, the following comments were made:

- Alderman O Gawith said that he had some distaste at this application however he could see no valid reason for refusal.
- Councillor M Gregg said that the application did not sit easily with him, it was a sub-standard access but Dfl (Roads) have approved it. He felt pedestrian safety and visibility splays also needed to be considered. He highlighted issues of visibility and said he did not consider that Dfl Roads were correct and he could not support the recommendation.
- Councillor J Palmer said he concurred with the comments made by Councillor M Gregg. He referred to the number of schools in the local area stating that the narrow laneway was unsafe and he could not support the recommendation.
- Alderman J Dillon said that he had found the site meeting to be of benefit, he said he felt this was a natural site, Dfl Roads were supportive of the access and he felt there were no reasons to refuse it, he would be supporting the recommendation.
- Councillor J Craig said he felt there was a contradiction by Dfl Roads, either the access arrangements are substandard or not. He felt there may be inconsistencies in how the guidelines have been applied and felt that it had only been approved because it had been approved in the past, he said he could not support the recommendation.
- Alderman J Grehan voiced her concerns at the approval of Dfl Roads. She said she had not been able to attend the site visit but had viewed the site independently and had needed to reverse out of the site onto the road. She said she concurred with the comments made by Councillor J Craig and would not be supporting the recommendation.
- Alderman J Tinsley said he felt that Dfl Roads had approved the access arrangement because they had done so in the past, he felt the arrangements were sub-standard and he could not support the recommendation.
- The Chairman, Councillor A Swan said that he concurred with comments made by Alderman O Gawith, he could see no reason for refusal and therefore he would be supporting the recommendation, the application would be approved on appeal in any case.

Alderman J Dillon requested that a recorded vote be taken on the determination of this planning application.

The Head of Planning and Capital Development drew attention to the relevant policy AMP2 and asked that it to be put onto the screen to remind members of the content of the policy. He said that if the Committee felt that specific bullet points in the policy had not been met they could refer to these during their determination.

Alderman O Gawith said that he did not see how any of the reasons could be used to refuse the application.

Alderman J Tinsley said he felt the narrow access arrangement would prejudice road safety as it may be necessary to reverse out of the laneway onto the road as was experienced by Alderman A Grehan during her visit to the site. He drew attention to schools in the area and the fact that Dfl Roads had admitted it did not meet standards.

At the culmination of further discussion and ensuing debate, the decision was put to vote and by a majority of 3:5 with 1 abstention, it was agreed that the recommendation of the Planning Officer to approve would not be upheld.

A recorded vote had been requested and voting was as follows:

Those voting in favour of the recommendation to approve:

Alderman O Gawith, Councillor A Swan, Alderman J Dillon

Those voting against the recommendation to approve:

Councillor J Craig, Alderman A Grehan, Councillor M Gregg, Alderman J Tinsley and Councillor J Palmer

Those abstaining:

Councillor U Mackin

The Chairman stated that the Professional Officer's recommendation to approve planning permission had fallen and that a new motion was now under consideration.

The refusal reasons were then considered. Alderman J Tinsley stated that the access arrangements prejudiced road safety due to the proximity of several schools and The Jolly Rodger Day Nursery, he said that it did not meet standards and he felt there would be passing issues even when houses were removed.

Councillor M Gregg stated that this was an access onto a protected route and he considered it fell short of AMP3. Dfl Roads had stated that it was a sub-standard access.

Councillor J Craig referred to DCAN15, and expressed the view that it was clear and that paragraph 9.3 provided minimum access standards. The proposed access was deficient by half a metre, and that to intensify where this minimum was not complied with did prejudice road safety.

Based on discussions, the Head of Planning and Capital Development acknowledged that Members had expressed the view that members had engaged with the guidance and that the proposal was not in compliance with policy AMP 3 as the access onto a protected route was not in accordance with the standards set out in paragraphs 10.2 and 10.6 of DCAN 15.

As the requirement of policy AMP 3 were not met members were also indicating that criteria (b) of policy AMP 2 was also not met. Members had also engaged

bullet points 1, 2 and 3 of policy AMP 2 in relation to the creation of a quality environment and that it was also their opinion that criteria a) of this policy was not met because the access was substandard and would impede the flow of traffic into and out of the site.

He confirmed that the policy had been fully and properly engaged in terms of the reasons for not agreeing with the officer's recommendation and the advice of DfI Roads. It was then proposed by Alderman J Tinsley, seconded by Alderman J Grehan and by a majority of 5:1 with 3 abstentions it was agreed that the reasons cited for the approval of the application would be:

- That the Committee consider that the proposal does not create a quality environment and the requirements of policy AMP 2 was not met.
- That the nature and scale of the development would not be to the standard to meet a safe means of access onto a Protected route and the requirements of policy AMP 3 were not met.

The detail of the actual reasons would be delegated to the officers. Voting was as follows:

Those voting in favour:

Councillor J Craig, Alderman A Grehan, Councillor M Gregg, Alderman J Tinsley, Councillor J Palmer

Those voting against:

Alderman J Dillon

Those abstaining:

Councillor U Mackin, Alderman O Gawith and Councillor A Swan

The Head of Planning and Capital Development advised the Committee that it was his consideration that both of the relevant policies had been engaged with by the Committee during their determination of the application.

The Chairman declared the application refused for the reasons stated above.

Adjournment of Meeting

The Chairman, Councillor A Swan declared the meeting adjourned at 1.30 pm

Resumption of Meeting

The Chairman, Councillor A Swan declared the meeting resumed at 2.06 pm

(Councillor J McCarthy also returned at this stage).

- (iv) LA05/2021/0813/F - Relocation and amendment of lamp sculpture within previously approved sculpture trail (planning reference LA05/2019/1127/F) at Hillsborough Forest Park, Park Street, Hillsborough.

The Senior Planning Officer (MB) presented this application as outlined within the circulated report.

There were no speakers on this application.

The Committee, having considered the information provided within the Report of the Senior Planning Officer, agreed by a unanimous vote to approve the application as outlined in the report and subject to the conditions stated therein.

The Chairman, Councillor A Swan advised that the following application had been withdrawn from the schedule following the submission of additional information.

- (v) LA05/2019/0893/F - Retrospective application for the installation of mechanical extract system from hot food premises at Unit C, 636 Saintfield Road, Belfast.

4.2 Planning Advice Note (PAN) on Implementation of Strategic Planning Policy for Development in the Countryside.

Members were provided with information issued by the Chief Planner and Director of Regional Planning in respect of Strategic Planning Policy for Development in the Countryside as contained in the SPPS which sought to clarify certain extant provisions of it. A verbal update was provided by the Head of Planning and Capital Development and it was highlighted that it was planned to hold a workshop later in the month which would address the implications of the publication.

Councillor U Mackin stated that he was concerned that this advice had not yet been before the Northern Ireland Assembly, he felt that the Minister and the Assembly Committee should be made aware of concerns.

During the ensuing discussion the Director of Service Transformation confirmed that correspondence had been received from Mr J Buckley and he confirmed that a response would be issued after the workshop had taken place.

After further consideration it was proposed by Councillor J Craig, seconded by Alderman O Gawith and agreed that approval be granted by the Committee to write to the NI Assembly and the Assembly Committee to draw attention to concerns regarding this Planning Advice Note, should it be deemed necessary by the Committee after the matter is discussed at the forthcoming Workshop.

4.3 (a) Appeal Decision in respect of Planning Application LA05/2020/0113/O

Members were provided with information on the above appeal which was dismissed.

(b) Appeal Decision in respect of Planning Application LA05/2019/0944/O

Members were provided with information on the above appeal which was dismissed.

- (c) Appeal Decision in respect of planning applications Y/2009/0407/F, LA05/2015/0466/F and LA05/2016/0985/F

Members were provided with information on the above appeals which were allowed.

Councillor Craig voiced his concern that new information had been introduced at the appeal stage in respect of LA05/2009/0407/F, the Head of Planning and Capital Development outlined the process and decision taken by the Commissioner, he also confirmed that concerns at the introduction of this new information had been fed back.

Councillor U Mackin referred to LA05/2015/0466/F and stated that he had been involved in this application and that there had only been two issues raised one of road safety and one of traffic progression. He highlighted that it had taken eleven months for the appeal to be heard and a further eleven months for the decision to be issued.

He said that those in public life were subject to Codes of Conduct to maintain credibility however he considered that a lack of credibility was written all over this appeal decision.

He referred to specific paragraphs within the decision document which he felt were concerning and which raised questions of credibility. He felt this was an issue which should be addressed by a report going to a forthcoming meeting of the Development Committee which should seek to discuss measures to address the matter including consideration being given to a legal challenge.

“In Committee”

It was proposed by Councillor U Mackin, seconded by Councillor J McCarthy and agreed that the meeting go “in committee” to obtain legal advice in the absence of members of the press and public being present. The livestream was paused.

Legal advice was obtained and noted after which it was agreed by the Committee that the Planning Appeal Decision in respect of LA05/2015/0466/F should be considered further by a report going to a forthcoming meeting of the Development Committee and that members of the Planning Committee should be invited to attend.

Resumption of Normal Business

It was proposed by Councillor J Craig, seconded by Councillor J McCarthy and agreed to come out of committee and normal business was resumed. The livestream re-started.

It was proposed by Councillor U Mackin, seconded by Councillor J Craig and agreed that the information circulated in respect of the above Planning Appeal

Decisions be noted and that the Planning Appeal Decision in respect of LA05/2015/0466/F be considered further by a report going to a future meeting of the Development Committee with members of the Planning Committee being invited to attend.

4.4 Statutory Performance Indicators – July and August 2021

Members were provided with information on Statutory Performance Indicators for the two periods indicated and it was proposed by Councillor J Craig, seconded by Alderman J Dillon and agreed that the information circulated be noted.

Report Items 4.5 – 4.9

It was proposed by Alderman O Gawith, seconded by Councillor J McCarthy and agreed that the Committee note the information circulated in connection with items 4.5 – 4.9 inclusive as outlined below.

4.5 Notification by telecommunication operator of intention to utilise permitted development rights at site at East Link Road, Dundonald

Information from Magdalene on behalf of EE Ltd and Hutchison 3G Ltd of their intention to utilise permitted development rights at East Link Road Dundonald.

In response to a question from Councillor J Craig, the Head of Planning and Capital Development agreed to respond with clarification on the planning process in respect of Mobile Phone Equipment masts in due course.

4.6 Notification by telecommunication operator of intention to utilise permitted development rights at site at 38 Ballyhanwood, Gilnahirk, Belfast, BT5 7SN

Information from Magdalene on behalf of EE Ltd and Hutchison 3G Ltd of their intention to utilise permitted development rights at 38 Ballyhanwood, Gilnahirk, Belfast, BT5 7SN.

4.7 Notification by telecommunication operator of intention to utilise permitted development rights at Thiepval Barracks, Kirkwoods Road, Lisburn.

Information from Taylor Patterson on behalf of Cornerstone of their intention to utilise permitted development rights at Thiepval Barracks, Kirkwoods Road, Lisburn.

4.8 Notification by telecommunication operator of intention to utilise permitted development rights at Down Royal, 60 Ballinderry Road, Lisburn

Information from Taylor Patterson on behalf of Cornerstone of their intention to utilise permitted development rights at Down Royal, 60 Ballinderry Road, Lisburn.

4.9 Notification by telecommunication operator of intention to utilise permitted development rights at Lisburn Centre North Street on Magheralave Road, Lisburn

Information from Taylor Patterson on behalf of Cornerstone of their intention to utilise permitted development rights at Lisburn Centre North Street on Magheralave Road, Lisburn.

4.10 Notification of Public Consultation – Conservation Principles – Guidance for the Sustainable Management of the Historic Environment in Northern Ireland

Members were provided with information on the above Consultation and were advised that a further report would issue on the Council's response.

After further discussion it was agreed that this response could be brought to the forthcoming meeting of the Development Committee referred to at 4.3 above.

It was proposed by Councillor J Craig, seconded by Alderman O Gawith and agreed that the information circulated be noted.

4.11 Submission of Pre-application Notice (PAN) for a new two chapel crematorium (two 200 seat ceremony rooms), refurbishment of the existing crematorium and associated works to provide landscaping, car parking and access at Roselawn Cemetery, 127 Ballygowan Road, Belfast.

Members were provided with information on the above PAN and it was proposed by Councillor J Craig seconded by Alderman J Dillon and agreed that the information circulated be noted.

4.12 Northern Ireland Annual Statistics – Annual Statistical Bulletin (April 2021 – March 2021)

Members were provided with information on the following:

Analysis of 2020/2021 Bulletin relative to LCCC
 NI Statistics Annual Statistical Bulletin (April 2020 – March 2021)
 Infograph summary of key statistics relative to LCCC

It was proposed by Alderman O Gawith, seconded by Councillor J McCarthy and agreed that the information circulated be noted.

4.13 Planning Application LA05/2018/1187/F - Update

Members were provided with an update on the above application, specifically a Section 76 agreement which was presented to the Planning Committee on 17 June 2020. The Head of Planning and Capital Development advised that the planning decision previously presented had not changed. Instead it was subject to provision of pedestrian/cycle way and that it was the mechanism for delivery of this that required further consideration. It was proposed by Councillor J McCarthy, seconded by Alderman J Dillon and agreed that the Committee note that a legal agreement in the form of a public path agreement is no longer

required as DfI Roads has agreed that for consistency in this development that the adjoining section will also be adopted and maintained by the Department.

5. Any Other Business

1. Head of Planning and Capital Development
Update on LA05/2019/0748/F – guard house at 211 Moira Road, Lisburn

The Head of Planning and Capital Development referred to the above application which had been discussed at the September 2021 Committee Meeting. He updated that the information awaited had been forthcoming however a response had not yet been received from Rivers Agency. He stated that once received, the information would be considered and the Committee appraised.

2. Alderman A Grehan
Update on Knockmore Link Road and Blaris Housing Section 7
Agreement

At the request of Alderman A Grehan, the Head of Planning and Capital Development provided an update that it was his understanding that a report had been prepared by the Department for the Minister's consideration on this matter.

3. The Chairman, Councillor A Swan
Starting time for future meetings

The Committee was asked to consider bringing forward the starting time for future meetings to either 10.00 am or 9.30 am. After consideration it was agreed by the Committee that the November 2021 meeting would start at the current starting time of 10.30 am and that discussions would take place between those involved in the preparation for meetings to establish the most appropriate earlier starting time.

4. Head of Planning and Capital Development
Date of January 2022 Planning Committee Meeting

It was highlighted by the Head of Planning and Capital Development that the scheduled date for the January 2022 Committee Meeting would fall on a bank holiday. It was agreed by the Committee that the meeting should take place on Monday 10 January 2022.

There being no further business, the meeting concluded at 4.00 pm.

CHAIRMAN / MAYOR