

LISBURN & CASTLEREAGH CITY COUNCIL

Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting held in the Council Chamber and in Remote Locations on Monday, 2 February, 2026 at 10.06 am

PRESENT IN CHAMBER:

Alderman J Tinsley (Chair)

Councillor G Thompson (Vice Chair)

Aldermen O Gawith and M Gregg

Councillors S Burns, P Catney, D J Craig, A Martin and N Trimble

PRESENT IN REMOTE LOCATION:

Councillor N Trimble (prior to 12.01 pm)

IN ATTENDANCE:

Director of Regeneration and Growth
Head of Planning & Capital Development
Principal Planning Officer (PS)
Senior Planning Officers (MB, GM, PMcF and LMcC)
Member Services Officers (FA and EW)

Cleaver Fulton Rankin

Mr B Martyn, Legal Advisor
Ms C McPeake (remote attendance)
Mr P Lockhart (remote attendance)
Ms I Kelly (remote attendance)

Commencement of Meeting

At the commencement of the meeting, the Chair, Alderman J Tinsley, welcomed those present to the Planning Committee. He pointed out that, unless the item on the agenda was considered under confidential business, this meeting would be audio recorded. The Head of Planning & Capital Development outlined the evacuation procedures in the case of an emergency.

1. **Apologies**

It was agreed to accept an apology for non-attendance at the meeting on behalf of Councillor J Lavery BEM.

2. **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

The Vice Chair, Councillor G Thompson arrived at the meeting during this item (10.08 am).

3. Minutes of Meeting of Planning Committee held on 12 January, 2026

It was agreed that the minutes of the meeting of Committee held on 12 January, 2026 be confirmed and signed.

4. Report from the Head of Planning & Capital Development

4.1 Schedule of Applications

The Chair, Alderman J Tinsley, advised that there were 6 local applications on the schedule for consideration at the meeting.

4.1.1 Applications to be Determined

The Legal Advisor, Mr B Martyn, highlighted paragraphs 43-46 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.

- (i) LA05/2023/0316/F – Erection of 23 dwellings (amended layout and house types previously approved under reference Y/2009/0303/RM), landscaping and all other associated site works on lands to the west of nos.16-22, 30 and 32 Millmount Village Crescent and lands 40m to the south nos.11-22 Millmount Village Way

The Senior Planning officer (MB) presented the above application as outlined within the circulated report.

The committee received Mr N Salt accompanied by Mr S McKee, to speak in support of the application and a number of Members' queries were addressed.

A number of Members' queries were responded to by Planning Officers.

Debate

During debate:

- Alderman M Gregg expressed surprise at the response from the Department for Infrastructure, Roads (DfI Roads) and Police Service of Northern Ireland (PSNI) in relation to statistics on road traffic accidents at the junction of Old Mill Meadows and the Upper Newtownards Road. Alderman Gregg advised of three serious accidents at this junction in the past year, that he was aware of, two of which required occupants of vehicles to be taken to hospital via ambulance. Alderman Gregg spoke of information provided by Mr N Salt, in which Mr Salt had advised that the applicant had submitted a road safety audit to DfI Roads in the week prior. Alderman Gregg raised concerns with the timeframe for the installation of traffic light signalling at the junction in question. Alderman Gregg proposed that a condition be added to the approval of planning permission stating that no building work could commence until the installation of traffic lights at the

- (i) LA05/2023/0316/F – Erection of 23 dwellings (amended layout and house types previously approved under reference Y/2009/0303/RM), landscaping and all other associated site works on lands to the west of nos.16-22, 30 and 32 Millmount Village Crescent and lands 40m to the south nos.11-22 Millmount Village Way (Cont'd)

junction of Old Mill Meadows and the Upper Newtownards Road was completed. Alderman Gregg continued that the original planning permission for the greater Millmount Village development site had been conditioned that traffic lights should be installed at the junction once 218 homes had been built and that there were now over 700 homes on the site. Alderman Gregg concluded that he believed this was Members opportunity to compel the applicant to deliver on these traffic lights, which should have been delivered some years ago;

- Councillor P Catney queried whether it would be appropriate to implement any further conditions on the application given the advice received from DfI Roads and PSNI, and advised he would be content to support the recommendation of Officers on the application;
- The Chair, Alderman J Tinsley requested the Head of Planning and Capital Development give an overview of Alderman M Gregg's question and Mr N Salt's reply earlier in the meeting for the benefit of Councillor N Trimble as Councillor Trimble's internet connection had been unstable during this time; and
- Alderman O Gawith advised that given Alderman M Gregg's concern was entirely on the grounds of public safety, he was content to second the proposal as outlined by Alderman Gregg.

The proposal by Alderman M Gregg, which had been seconded by Alderman O Gawith, stating that a condition be added that no building works could commence prior to the installation of traffic lights at the junction of Old Mill Meadows and the Upper Newtownards Road, was put to the committee. On a vote being taken, the proposal was agreed, the voting being 7 in favour and 2 against.

Alderman M Gregg subsequently advised that the wording of the condition be delegated to Planning Officers.

The Head of Planning and Capital Development read from the Strategic Planning Policy Statement for Northern Ireland (SPPS), in particular paragraph 5.65 under Decision-taking Principles and Practices, Planning Conditions which states:

Planning authorities have the power to attach conditions to a grant of planning permission. This can enable planning authorities to approve development proposals where it would otherwise be necessary to refuse planning permission. However, conditions should only be imposed which are:

- *necessary;*
- *relevant to planning;*
- *relevant to the development being permitted;*
- *precise;*
- *enforceable; and*
- *reasonable.*

- (i) LA05/2023/0316/F – Erection of 23 dwellings (amended layout and house types previously approved under reference Y/2009/0303/RM), landscaping and all other associated site works on lands to the west of nos.16-22, 30 and 32 Millmount Village Crescent and lands 40m to the south nos.11-22 Millmount Village Way (Cont'd)

The Head of Planning and Capital Development continued that the advice of Officers was not to use a condition in this instance as the applicant had already engaged with DfI Roads on the junction improvements and that the issue was part of a separate regulatory process that is managed by DfI Roads.

The Head of Planning and Capital Development advised that the precise wording of a condition would need to be thought of in the following context:

1. the previous history of planning permission in light of this application being a modification of the original proposal;
2. that there had been ongoing engagement between the applicant and DfI Roads on the subject of the junction improvements;
3. the advice received from DfI Roads that highlighted there was no road safety issue at the junction in question; and
4. the proposed condition from Alderman Gregg stated no development should take place until the traffic lights had been installed and the Head of Planning and Capital Development queried if:
 - (a) this was necessary;
 - (b) what relevance this had to planning in light of the information already received from DfI Roads;
 - (c) the location of the proposed development was closer to an already signalised junction at the Comber Road and it was more likely traffic movements would gravitate in this direction.

The Head of Planning and Capital Development advised Members, in his professional opinion, the condition would not meet the requirements of paragraph 5.65 of the SPPS as in his opinion it could not be deemed reasonable.

The debate continued during which:

- Councillor D J Craig queried the lack of evidence of accidents at the junction in question from DfI Roads and PSNI given Alderman M Gregg's local knowledge of them. Councillor Craig advised that perhaps the Northern Ireland Ambulance Service may hold records of these, and raised concerns that a previous condition on the larger Millmount Village development as a whole for traffic lights at this junction had not been met;
- Councillor P Catney raised concerns with the addition of a condition given that no concerns of road safety had been raised by DfI Roads and advised that in his opinion, whilst public safety was paramount, consideration had to be given to the construction jobs at stake and the potential delay the condition could have on affordable housing; and
- Alderman M Gregg advised that he would be content for the wording of the condition to state that no dwellings should be occupied until the installation of traffic lights at the junction of Old Mill Meadows and the Upper Newtownards Road was complete. Alderman Gregg continued that he did not see how the condition would have an impact on the applicant unless the

- (i) LA05/2023/0316/F – Erection of 23 dwellings (amended layout and house types previously approved under reference Y/2009/0303/RM), landscaping and all other associated site works on lands to the west of nos.16-22, 30 and 32 Millmount Village Crescent and lands 40m to the south nos.11-22 Millmount Village Way (Cont'd)

applicant had no intention of following through with the installation of the traffic lights.

The Chair, Alderman J Tinsley, clarified with Alderman O Gawith, as seconder of the original proposal, if he would be happy with the amended wording of the condition to state that no dwellings should be occupied until the installation of traffic lights at the junction of Old Mill Meadows and the Upper Newtownards Road was complete. Alderman Gawith indicated he was content with this.

The Head of Planning and Capital Development clarified that the Council cannot pursue enforcement against the applicant while there was ongoing engagement between the applicant and DfI Roads, despite frustration at the length of time the process has taken. The Head of Planning and Capital Development continued that despite the change in wording of the condition, the advice from Officers remained the same, and that the challenge was that Members had made a decision, and Members must be clear why the condition is necessary in relation to the application. The Head of Planning and Capital Development warned that the condition could give rise to an appeal and that while Members had made a decision, he could only advise on the wording as of a condition that was necessary for the proposed development and which met the tests for a condition as set out in the SPPS.

Alderman M Gregg stated the wording could be amended from the original condition on the wider Millmount Village development regarding the upgrade of this junction. Alderman Gregg continued to advise the wording could be “No dwellings shall be occupied until the signalisation of the revised junction at the Upper Newtownards Road (A20)/Old Mill Meadows has been constructed generally in accordance with the agreed drawing, to ensure there are satisfactory means of access in the interest of road safety and the improvement of the road network for the convenience of road users”.

“In Committee”

At this stage, it was proposed by Councillor P Catney, seconded by Councillor D J Craig and agreed to go ‘into committee’ to consider this matter. Those members of the public and press in attendance left the meeting (11.02 am).

Members were provided with legal advice in respect of the matters raised by the Head of Planning & Capital Development, which were in response to Members’ reasoning for adding a condition to the approval of the planning application.

Resumption of Normal Business

It was proposed by Alderman M Gregg, seconded by Alderman O Gawith and agreed to come out of committee and normal business was resumed (11.49 am).

- (i) LA05/2023/0316/F – Erection of 23 dwellings (amended layout and house types previously approved under reference Y/2009/0303/RM), landscaping and all other associated site works on lands to the west of nos.16-22, 30 and 32 Millmount Village Crescent and lands 40m to the south nos.11-22 Millmount Village Way (Cont'd)

Alderman M Gregg advised that while in his opinion the traffic lights were necessary, on reflection a condition may not have been the best way to ensure that the junction upgrade is implemented. Alderman Gregg continued that given the junction in question was outside of the proposed area of development, an addition to the Section 76 Agreement was deemed to be a better fit. Alderman Gregg outlined his reasons for the need for the traffic lights, which were:

1. He was aware of at least three serious accidents at the junction in the past year; and
2. The applicant was already in breach of a previous condition compelling them to provide traffic lights at the junction in question once 218 dwellings at the wider Millmount Village development were occupied and there were now approximately 700 occupied.

Alderman M Gregg made a new proposal to supersede his original. The new proposal gave delegated authority to Officers, to include wording to compel the applicant to provide the traffic lights at the junction of Old Mill Meadows and the Upper Newtownards Road before any dwellings are occupied, within the Section 76 agreement.

Councillor P Catney raised concerns on the legality of the proposal to include the wording in the Section 76 agreement.

The new proposal, which had been seconded by Alderman O Gawith, was put to the committee and the proposal stood, the vote being 7 in favour and 2 abstained.

Vote

On a vote being taken, it was unanimously agreed to adopt the recommendation of the Planning Officer to approve this application with the addition of Alderman M Gregg's amendment to include wording to compel the applicant to provide the traffic lights at the junction of Old Mill Meadows and the Upper Newtownards Road before any dwellings are occupied, in the Section 76 agreement.

Adjournment of Meeting

The Chair, Alderman J Tinsley, declared the meeting adjourned at this point for a comfort break (12.01 pm).

Councillor N Trimble left the meeting from a remote location during the comfort break and would later return to the meeting in person in the Council Chamber.

Resumption of Meeting

The meeting was resumed at 12.11 pm.

- (ii) LA05/2024/0768/F - Erection of 16 dwellings (social/affordable) and associated/ancillary development to include new accesses, roadways, landscaping and other siteworks on lands adjacent to 9 Bridge Cottages, Moybrick Road, Dromara

The Principal Planning Officer (PS) presented the above application as outlined within the circulated report.

No-one was registered to speak on this application.

A number of Members' queries were responded to by Planning Officers.

Debate

During debate:

- Alderman M Gregg advised that he was nervous about the proposed development given its close proximity to the floodplain. Alderman Gregg advised that while he would be more comfortable if the two properties closest to the floodplain were moved closer to the road by a couple of metres, overall he was in agreement of the assessment by Officers and welcomed the addition of more social housing to the area; and
- Councillor D J Craig concurred with Alderman Gregg's statement. Councillor Craig advised that due to three serious flooding incidents in the past five years in Dromara he was reluctant, however, he trusted that Officers had taken this into consideration when assessing the application.

Vote

Having considered the information provided within the report of the Planning Officer, the Committee agreed unanimously to adopt the recommendation to approve this application.

Adjournment of Meeting

The Chair, Alderman J Tinsley, declared the meeting adjourned for lunch at this point (12.57 pm).

Resumption of Meeting

The meeting was resumed at 1.36 pm.

Councillor N Trimble arrived to the meeting in person during the lunch break.

- (iii) LA05/2023/0494/F – Conversion of and single storey extension to disused mill to a dwelling with associated site works on lands approximately 33 metres southwest of 18 Gransha Close, Comber

The Senior Planning Officer (PMcF) presented the above application as outlined within the circulated report.

- (iii) LA05/2023/0494/F – Conversion of and single storey extension to disused mill to a dwelling with associated site works on lands approximately 33 metres southwest of 18 Gransha Close, Comber (Cont'd)

The committee received Mr J Harkness to speak in opposition of the application and a number of Members' queries were addressed. Ms K Brown was available remotely to assist Mr Harkness with Members queries.

The committee received Mr T Bell accompanied by Mr H Jess, to speak in support of the application and a number of Members' queries were addressed. Mr D Fletcher was available remotely to assist Messrs Bell and Jess with Members queries.

Planning Officers responded to questions from Members.

Debate

During the debate:

- Alderman M Gregg advised that his initial concerns regarding the floodplain, trees, and visibility splays at the entrance to the site had been alleviated. Alderman Gregg stated that he was supportive of the application but requested that close attention is paid to the application to ensure that conservation of the existing building is observed. Alderman Gregg welcomed the proposed addition of new trees on the site and advised he felt they would improve the integrity of the soil on the floodplain;
- Councillor P Catney advised that, having attended the site visit in relation to the application, he was in favour of Officers recommendation to approve planning permission. Councillor Catney continued that in his opinion, reinstating and converting derelict buildings was positive for planning in general; and
- Councillor N Trimble welcomed the changes, and the additional information provided by the applicant. Councillor Trimble advised he was content to accept the Officers recommendation to approve planning permission.

Vote

Having considered the information provided within the report of the Planning Officer, the Committee agreed unanimously to adopt the recommendation to approve this application.

- (iv) LA05/2023/0170/F – Proposed infill dwelling and garage at 92 Glenavy Road, Lisburn

The Senior Planning Officer (GM) presented the above application as outlined within the circulated report.

The Committee received Mr A Stephens to speak in support of the application and a number of Members' queries were addressed.

Planning Officers responded to questions from Members.

- (iv) LA05/2023/0170/F – Proposed infill dwelling and garage at 92 Glenavy Road, Lisburn (Cont'd)

Debate

During the debate:

- Councillor N Trimble spoke of the change in policy from CTY8 to COU8 and how the application would have been acceptable under the old policy but that the wording of the new policy created challenges. Councillor Trimble advised that the size of the gap, 46.5m, between the two buildings on either side of the proposed site, was in his opinion sufficient to accommodate two dwellings. Councillor Trimble continued that having been at the site visit in relation to this application, he felt there would be a visually linked ribbon of development and that the proposed dwelling would be in keeping with the existing neighbouring properties. Councillor Trimble concluded that whilst in the past he felt they had been heavy handed with similar applications, in this instance, with the reasons he had outlined he would be happy to vote against the recommendation of the Officers;
- Alderman M Gregg stated that he agreed with a number of Councillor N Trimble's points, however, disagreed that Planning Officers and the committee had been heavy handed with previous applications when applying policy in relation to infill dwellings. Alderman Gregg continued that while he agreed with most of the application it did not fit with policy COU8 in that the plot size was not large enough to accommodate two dwellings; and
- Alderman O Gawith advised that the policy states the gap between buildings must be sufficient for two dwellings, not the plot of land, and while it would be illogical to build two dwellings on the site it could be possible. Alderman Gawith agreed with the points raised by Councillor N Trimble and advised that as a result of these reasons, he disagreed with the recommendation of the Officers.

Vote

On a vote being taken, it was agreed to adopt the recommendation of the Planning Officer to refuse planning permission, the voting being:

In favour: Councillor S Burns, Councillor P Catney, Councillor D J Craig, Alderman M Gregg, Councillor G Thompson and the Chair, Alderman J Tinsley (6)

Against: Alderman O Gawith, Councillor A Martin and Councillor N Trimble (3)

- (v) LA05/2025/0539/F – Retention of existing container for hairdressers at Sideburns Barber Lounge, Carryduff Business Park, Comber Road, Carryduff

The Senior Planning Officer (LMcC) presented the above application as outlined within the circulated report.

- (v) LA05/2025/0539/F – Retention of existing container for hairdressers at Sideburns Barber Lounge, Carryduff Business Park, Comber Road, Carryduff (Cont'd)

The Committee received Mr M Hanvey accompanied by Ms R McDaid, to speak in support of the application and a number of Members' queries were addressed.

Planning Officers responded to questions from Members.

Debate

During the debate:

- Alderman M Gregg expressed a concern with the safety of the electrical supply to the building. Alderman Gregg advised that he felt the sequential test of policy TC1 had been met and that the alternative properties identified by Officers were not suitable, and loss of employment land was not applicable as the only loss was two car parking spaces on a site with ample parking spaces available. Alderman Gregg stated that for these reasons he was content to vote against the recommendation of Officers;
- Alderman O Gawith advised that he would be unable to vote in favour of the Officers recommendation given that in his opinion policies TC1 and TC3 had been complied with. Alderman Gawith continued that in his opinion policy ED7 did not apply as the site was only a couple of car parking spaces;
- Councillor P Catney stated that the proposal was modest in scale, particularly in comparison to the neighbouring warehouses and that he would vote against the recommendation of the Officers;
- Councillor N Trimble stated that he believed the reasons for refusal put forward by Officers could be challenged successfully. Councillor Trimble continued that in his opinion it would be extremely difficult to find a similar sized property in Carryduff town centre that would be suitable for the needs of the business and agreed with Alderman O Gawith's statement that policy ED7 did not apply as the site was only two car parking spaces. Councillor Trimble queried whether the structure could be considered temporary and advised that given the application was for permanent planning permission he felt he could not vote for or against the recommendation of the Officers and as a result would abstain from the vote; and
- Councillor G Thompson advised that she felt the application had met the sequential test of policy TC1 and that she would vote against the recommendation of the Officers.

The Chair, Alderman J Tinsley asked the Head of Planning and Capital Development for some clarity on Councillor N Trimble's point that it could be deemed a temporary structure but that permanent permission was being sought from the applicant, and if Members had sufficiently engaged with policy if they were to vote against the recommendation of the Officers. The Head of Planning and Capital Development advised that while policies TC1 and TC3 had been explored, policy ED7 had not been fully examined regarding land zoned for economic development/employment but that it did contain an exception for retailing and commercial leisure development which is ancillary in nature. On the point of whether or not the building could be deemed a permanent structure the

- (v) LA05/2025/0539/F – Retention of existing container for hairdressers at Sideburns Barber Lounge, Carryduff Business Park, Comber Road, Carryduff (Cont'd)

Head of Planning and Capital Development advised that Members could defer the application and request further clarity on the point. Alderman M Gregg advised that he felt the building could qualify for the exception in policy ED7 and be deemed ancillary in nature, and that should Members vote against the recommendation of Officers, a condition could be added to the planning permission stating that should any alterations to the structure be required, including removal, new permission must be sought.

Vote

On a vote being taken, it was agreed not to adopt the recommendation of the Planning Officer to refuse planning permission, the voting being:

In favour: Councillor A Martin (1)

Against: Councillor P Catney, Alderman A Gawith, Alderman M Gregg, and Councillor G Thompson (4)

Abstain: Councillor S Burns, Councillor D J Craig, Councillor N Trimble and the Chair, Alderman J Tinsley (4)

Given that the Officer recommendation to refuse planning permission had fallen, the Chair, Alderman J Tinsley, stated that a new proposal was required. It was proposed by Alderman M Gregg and seconded by Councillor P Catney that planning application LA05/2025/0539/F be approved.

The proposal by Alderman M Gregg, seconded by Councillor P Catney was put to the committee and, on a vote being taken, agreed that the application be approved, the voting being as follows:

In favour: Councillor P Catney, Alderman A Gawith, Alderman M Gregg, and Councillor G Thompson (4)

Against: Councillor S Burns, Councillor D J Craig and Councillor A Martin (3)

Abstain: Councillor N Trimble and the Chair, Alderman J Tinsley (2)

In agreeing to approve the application, the following reasons were offered:

- In respect of policy TC1 the sequential test had been met for the property, including that the Saintfield Road was just 300 metres away and was a main bus route. The alternative premises identified by Officers were not suitable and failed the sequential test of policy TC1. One of the alternative premises was beside an existing barbershop and still under ownership of Henderson Group and therefore unavailable, the other was not suitable as it was a shared building and a ground floor, accessible unit was not guaranteed;

(v) LA05/2025/0539/F – Retention of existing container for hairdressers at Sideburns Barber Lounge, Carryduff Business Park, Comber Road, Carryduff (Cont'd)

- Policy TC3 was met as it states “Beyond a designated town centre boundary proposals for town centre uses will only be granted planning permission in accordance with the sequential approach of Policy TC1 and where there would be no adverse impact on adjacent land uses.”;
- There was no impact on land zoned for employment as only two parking spaces were used for the site and the Officers report acknowledged that ample parking was available on site, therefore policy ED7 had been satisfied;
- The scale of the building was small in comparison to neighbouring units and the barbershop was largely used by employees of the neighbouring units, therefore the building could be considered ancillary in nature. This would compound compliance with policy ED7 which states “A further exception will apply to retailing and commercial leisure development which is ancillary in nature”.

It had been agreed that on approval of planning permission, authority be delegated to the Head of Planning & Capital Development to formulate the precise wording of conditions stating that any change in scale, use or purpose of the property would require further planning permission. Permission was only granted for a sole trader cutting hair, with no fresh water or wastewater connection.

Adjournment of Meeting

The Chair, Alderman J Tinsley, declared the meeting adjourned at this point to allow Members to join a pre-arranged confidential briefing remotely. Council Officers, press and members of the public left the meeting (4.01 pm).

Resumption of Meeting

The meeting was resumed at 4.30 pm.

Councillors A Martin and N Trimble did not return to the meeting after the adjournment.

(vi) LA05/2024/0638/F – Proposed replacement of 15metre high monopole with 22metre high lattice tower, 3 existing antennas to be removed and replaced, existing 1 300mm transmission dish to be relocated to new tower, proposed 1 300mm transmission dish to be fixed to headframe, proposed installation of 1 equipment cabinet and all other ancillary apparatus thereto on lands to the side of 7 Begny Hill, Dromara

The Senior Planning Officer (GM) presented the above application as outlined within the circulated report.

- (vi) LA05/2024/0638/F – Proposed replacement of 15metre high monopole with 22metre high lattice tower, 3 existing antennas to be removed and replaced, existing 1 300mm transmission dish to be relocated to new tower, proposed 1 300mm transmission dish to be fixed to headframe, proposed installation of 1 equipment cabinet and all other ancillary apparatus thereto on lands to the side of 7 Begny Hill, Dromara (Cont'd)

The Committee received Alderman A McIntyre to speak in opposition to the application and a number of Members' queries were addressed.

Councillor G Thomson, having stated that she would benefit from viewing the location of the development site, proposed that this application be deferred for a site visit. This was seconded by Alderman O Gawith and agreed on a vote being taken, the voting being 5 in favour and 2 against.

4.2 Statutory Performance Indicators – December 2025

It was agreed that information relating to Statutory Performance Indicators for December 2025 be noted.

4.3 Quarter 2 Statistical Bulletin – July to September 2025/26

Members were provided with information in relation to Quarter 2 planning statistics. Members agreed that the information be noted.

4.4 Appeal Decision – LA05/2020/0991/O

Members agreed that the report and decision of the Planning Appeals Commission in respect of the above appeal be noted.

- 4.5 Pre-application Notice (PAN) for proposed development of additional sport, leisure and tourism facilities at the Let's Go Hydro resort comprising a centre of excellence for padel tennis (with ancillary lounge and bar), new gym and wellbeing facility, replacement of existing marquee padel tennis building with purpose built steel frame padel tennis building, golf driving range and indoor golf simulator facilities, together with internal signage, relocation of existing glamping pods/safari lodges/house boat and associated access, parking, fencing, netting, floodlighting, landscaping and site works at Lets Go Hydro 1 Mealough Road, Belfast.

It was proposed by Alderman O Gawith, seconded by Councillor D J Craig and unanimously agreed that information on the pre-application notice be noted and that it be submitted in accordance with the relevant sections of the legislation and related guidance.

4.6 Notification by telecommunication operator(s) of intention to utilise permitted development rights

It was agreed that information regarding notification by telecommunication operators of intention to utilise Permitted Development Rights at locations in the Council area be noted.

4.7 NILGA Planning Learning and Engagement Programme – Request for Nominations

The Head of Planning and Capital Development outlined the request for nominations from NILGA. Councillor P Catney expressed an interest in being a nominee. It was agreed that the Member Services Officer contact the Members of the committee regarding the matter as a number of Members were not present at the meeting.

5. Any Other Business

5.1 Requirement for Special Planning Meeting – February 2026
Head of Planning and Capital Development

The Head of Planning and Capital Development advised Members that in order to process as many of applications as possible before the end of the financial year, he proposed holding a Special Meeting of the Planning Committee on the afternoon of 18th February, 2026. It was agreed that the Member Services Officer survey Members of the committee to ensure the quorum could be met before putting arrangements in place.

Conclusion of the Meeting

At the conclusion of the meeting, the Chair, Alderman J Tinsley, thanked those present for their attendance. There being no further business, the meeting was terminated at 4.54 pm.

Chair/Mayor