

**LISBURN & CASTLEREAGH CITY COUNCIL**

**Minutes of Meeting of the Planning Committee held in the Council Chamber, Lisburn & Castlereagh City Council Offices, Island Civic Centre, The Island, Lisburn on Monday 4 February 2019 at 10.00 am**

**PRESENT:** Councillor O Gawith (Vice-Chairman)

Aldermen J Dillon MBE JP, and T Jeffers  
Councillors N Anderson, J Craig, A Givan,  
B Hanvey, L Poots and N Trimble

**OTHER MEMBERS:** Alderman J Tinsley  
Councillors S Carson and A Redpath

**IN ATTENDANCE:./** Director of Service Transformation  
Head of Planning and Capital Development  
Principal Planning Officer (RH)  
Senior Planning Officer (MB)  
Senior Planning Officer (MCON)  
Member Services Officer  
Attendance Clerk

Legal Advisor:  
Brendan Martyn - Cleaver Fulton & Rankin

**Commencement of Meeting**

The Vice-Chairman, Councillor O Gawith, welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Introductions were made by the Vice-Chairman and some housekeeping and evacuation announcements were made by the Director of Service Transformation.

1. **Apologies**

It was agreed that apologies from the Chairman, Councillor D Drysdale, and Councillor A Girvin be recorded and it was noted that Councillor N Anderson would be arriving late.

2. **Declarations of Interest**

It was highlighted that, with reference to application LAO5/2018/0507/F where the applicant was the Council, all members had the same interest and therefore paragraph 6.6 of the Code of Conduct applied and it was therefore not necessary for individual declarations of interest to be made.

The Vice-Chairman sought Declarations of Interest from Members and reminded them to complete the supporting forms which had been left at each desk.

No Declarations of Interest were made. However, during the course of the meeting, Councillor N Trimble advised that, with regard to application LAO5/2018/0507/F, his mother was a member of the Lagan Navigation Trust which would have offices within Navigation House. He did not consider that this constituted an interest in the application and he would be participating in the discussion.

### 3. Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on Monday 7 January 2019

It was proposed by Councillor N Trimble, seconded by Alderman WJ Dillon, and agreed that the above Minutes as circulated be confirmed and signed.

Later in the meeting, Councillor Poots, who was not present at this stage, requested and it was agreed that the following amendments be made to the minutes:

- At Page 8 of the Minutes, application LAO5/2017/0926/F, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, 2<sup>nd</sup> sentence be amended to “He wished it to be put on record that neither he nor any member of his family had done business with the applicant or had used the facilities, despite allegations have been made to that effect, and that he had no interest to declare in respect of this application.”
- At Page 9 of the Minutes, an additional bullet point be added to the comments of Mr P Catney MLA to advise that there had been 54,000 tons of silage stored at the site and 6,000 vehicular movements.

### 4. Report of the Director of Service Transformation

It was agreed that the report and recommendations of the Director of Service Transformation be adopted, subject to any decisions recorded below:-

#### 4.1 Quarterly Budget Report - Planning Unit

The Committee was provided with copy and it was proposed by Councillor N Trimble, seconded by Alderman T Jeffers, and agreed to note the summary Budget Report for the Service Transformation Department for the year to 31 March 2019 as at 31 December 2018.

#### 4.2 The Agreement of Local Development Plan Policies

It was proposed by Alderman WJ Dillon, seconded by Councillor A Givan, and agreed that the Committee note an update regarding agreement of local development plan policies and agree to continue to support this work.

#### In Committee

It was proposed by the Vice-Chairman, Councillor O Gawith, seconded by Alderman T Jeffers and agreed to go into Committee in order to receive legal advice in the absence of press and public.

Further information was distributed to Members regarding one of the applications on the schedule and the Members noted the advice received from the Legal Adviser.

#### 4.3 Deferment of Item

At this stage, it was agreed to defer consideration of the next item on the Director's Report, Report of the Head of Service (Planning and Capital Development), until later in the meeting and to proceed to consider the Confidential Report.

#### 5. Confidential Report from the Director of Service Transformation

It was agreed that the report and recommendations of the Confidential Report of the Director of Service Transformation be noted, subject to any decisions recorded below.

The Vice-Chairman reminded Members that they were still 'in Committee' and it was noted that the following items would be discussed 'in Committee' for the reasons indicated on the meeting Agenda.

##### 5.1. Legal Updates

The Committee was provided with copy correspondence from Belfast City Council and it was agreed that the Committee note this correspondence as well as a verbal update on Court and PAC proceedings.

##### 5.2 Enforcement Cases with Court Proceedings

Having been provided with information on Enforcement Cases with Court Proceedings in January 2019, it was agreed that the Committee note the information provided within the Report.

##### 5.3 Quarterly Rolling Year Absence Figures for the Planning Unit

It was agreed that the Committee note information showing monthly absence figures for the Planning Unit and the steps being taken to address this.

#### Resumption of Normal Business

It was proposed by Councillor N Trimble, seconded by Councillor A Givan, and agreed to come out of committee and normal business was resumed.

(Councillor DJ Craig left the meeting at 10.40 am.)

In the absence of Councillor Craig, the meeting was inquorate. The Vice-Chairman adjourned the meeting at 10.40 am and indicated that it would reconvene in an hour's time when it was expected that, with the arrival of other Members, there would be a quorum.

(Councillor B Hanvey arrived at 11.40 am)

The meeting reconvened at 11.40 am.

#### 6. Report of the Head of Service (Planning and Capital Development)

## 6.1 Schedule of Applications to be Determined

The Vice-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 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.

The Vice-Chairman advised that there were a number of speakers in attendance making representation on some of the applications and therefore the Schedule of Applications would be taken out of order to enable these applications to be taken first.

- (1) LA05/2017/0922/F – Local Application (Called in) – Removal of condition no 2 of planning approval LA05/2015/0765/F (the dwelling shall be occupied by Arthur Stringer and any dependents only) on lands to the rear of 44 Halfpenny Gate Road, Lisburn.

The Principal Planning Officer (RH) presented this application as outlined within the circulated report.

The Committee received Mr Patrick Johnson who wished to speak in support of the applications, highlighting the following:

- Mr Johnson read a statement out on behalf of Mrs Stringer
- Mr Stringer's mental health had deteriorated over the past 2 years
- The couple were unable to finish the build as they could not raise a mortgage due to the condition attached to the planning approval
- They continued to live in a cold and damp mobile home which had aggravated Mr Stringer's other health problems –arthritis in his spine and wrists, a heart condition and he was on anti-depressants.
- They had approached several financial institutions including Danske Bank, Ulster Bank and Progressive Building Society but had been refused a mortgage due to the condition attached to the planning approval.
- Mrs Stringer was working two jobs; Mr Stringer was unable to work
- The condition attached to the approval was a life-time one; if it was limited to a period of, say, 5 years, the applicants could work with it.

Mr Johnson responded to Members' queries in which he clarified the following:

- When planning permission had been granted, the applicants had made some enquires about obtaining finance; they had opted to commence the build because of the poor conditions they were living in and in the hope of finding a bank or building society that would agree to lend money.
- At that time they did not fully understand the financial implications arising from the condition attached to the planning approval.

- The house was built to roof level but, having already borrowed from family to reach that stage, the couple had no further resources to complete the build.

(Councillor L Poots arrived at 12.05 pm)

The Committee received Alderman James Tinsley who wished to speak in support of the application highlighting the following:

- The building had proceeded with planning permission but the problem was the clause around personal circumstances.
- The family did not wish to be here having their financial situation laid bare.
- The couple had built as far as they could which was up to roof level.
- The house was there with planning permission and the couple wished to live in it; it was the condition around special circumstances that was the problem.
- Alderman Tinsley suggested that a site meeting might be helpful for Members.

It was proposed by Councillor A Givan and seconded by Alderman T Jeffers that a site meeting be held to consider the application further. On the proposal being put to the meeting, it was agreed by a majority of 4:2 with 0 abstentions not to proceed with a site meeting.

The Head of Planning and Capital Development responded to Members' queries, clarifying as follows:

- If CTY6 has not been invoked, the planning recommendation would be to refuse the application. The special circumstances was the material fact that had allowed the application to be approved.
- In response to a comment that most people, like the applicant, would not have sufficient funds to complete a build without seeking financial support, the Head of Service advised that planners were bound by the restrictions within the planning policy and affordability would not outweigh the policy condition.
- With regard to making the condition time limited, the Head of Service advised that there was no provision for this within the planning policy and officers had not found cases where such time limits had been applied.

(Councillor DJ Craig returned to the meeting at 12.20 pm)

During the debate which followed, Councillor A Givan and Alderman T Jeffers expressed sympathy with the applicant and indicated that they would be abstaining from the vote. Alderman WJ Dillon stated that, while all Committee Members were sympathetic to the applicant, the Committee had to comply with planning policy.

The Committee, having considered the information provided within the Report of the Principal Planning Officer and by those making representations, agreed by a majority of 4:0 with 2 abstentions to refuse application LA05/2017/0922/F as outlined in the Officer's report.

(Councillors DJ Craig and L Poots did not take part in the vote as they had not been in attendance for the entirety of the discussion.)

- (2) LA05/2018/0898/O – Local Application (Called in) – Proposed site for new dwelling and garage to round off the cluster in accordance with policy CTY2A on Lands adjacent and 35m south east of 44 Crumlin Road, Upper Ballinderry, Lisburn

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

The Committee received Mr Ryan McBirney who wished to speak in support of the application highlighting the following:

- The reason for the refusal was based on the assumption that the application did not comply with CTY2A.
- Planners had identified 3 key issues: that there was no cluster, there was no visual entity and the site was not surrounded on 3 sides.
- A cluster of development must lie outside a farm and consist of 4 or more buildings.
- This cluster comprised at least 10 buildings including an Orange Hall, older vacant dwellings and other buildings.
- The cluster did form a visual entity within the countryside; it focused around the cross roads with a community hub in the form of the Orange Hall.
- CTY2A required that the site provided a suitable degree of enclosure and was bounded on at least 2 sides by other development.
- The Planning Officer's report accepted that a dwelling on the site would not be a prominent feature and that there were natural boundaries around the site.
- The site was bounded by No 44 Crumlin Road to one side and a joinery workshop across the road opposite the site. He referred to a previous planning application which allowed property on the road opposite to be included in the cluster.
- He also referred to a decision by PAC which indicated that it was not always a requirement to meet all of the policy tests.
- In this particular case, the development around the crossroads was so significant that development on this site would constitute part of the cluster.
- The site was well enclosed and would not add to ribbon development.

(Councillor N Anderson arrived at 12.40 pm)

Mr McBirney responded to Members' questions providing clarification on the number and type of dwellings located around the crossroads.

The Committee received Alderman J Tinsley who wished to speak in support of the application highlighting the following:

- The issue was whether or not this group of buildings formed a cluster.
- There was very clearly a crossroads with community buildings, dwellings and other buildings.
- He did not believe that the proposed building would create ribbon development.

- This development around a crossroads ticked all the boxes to meet the criteria of a cluster.

The Committee received Councillor A Redpath who wished to speak in support of the application highlighting the following:

- The issues were whether you considered there to be a cluster and whether the site was bounded on two sides by development.
- There were a number of dwellings, in excess of 3 or 4, in close proximity to the crossroads.
- The crossroads was clearly a definite focal point with several dwellings in the proximity.
- With regard to development on two sides of the proposed site, the question was whether the road to the front was considered a break in development,
- He referred to a recent planning case where the Council did not consider a road to create a break in development.
- He considered this a strong application and would commend it to the Council for approval.

Mr Redpath responded to Members' questions regarding the cluster and whether the property across the road from the site could be considered development to one side.

The Senior Planning Officer responded to Members' questions regarding the make-up of the cluster and the issue of ribbon development.

During the discussion that followed, it was proposed by Councillor DJ Craig, seconded by Councillor N Trimble, and, by a majority of 8:0 with 0 abstention, it was agreed to have a site meeting.

(Councillor N Anderson did not take part in the vote as he had not been present for the entirety of the discussion)

#### Adjournment of Meeting

The Vice-Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 1.10 pm

#### Resumption of Meeting

The Vice-Chairman declared the meeting resumed at 1.41 pm

- (3) LA05/2017/0388/F – Local Application (Called in) – Extensions and alterations to existing nursing home class 3(b) of the schedule of the Planning (Use classes) Order (NI) 2015, to increase from 29 residents to 44 residents, increased dayroom/dining areas, enlarged kitchen (on three floors of accommodation), with new laundry, storage and staff facilities to basement below (amended proposal) at Parkside Private Nursing Home, 4 North Circular Road, Lisburn.

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

The Committee received Mrs Elizabeth Ramsey and Mr Raymond Lowry who wished to speak in opposition to the application highlighting the following:

- The planners had underestimated the impact of the proposed extension on neighbouring properties.
- The extension would be a very high 3 storey building right up to Mrs Ramsey's boundary fence.
- The proposed extension would lie 3.6 metres from Mrs Ramsey's boundary fence and 9.9 metre from her living area.
- The new building would be more than 19 metres long and would extend the whole length of her boundary line.
- The living area of Mrs Ramsey's house had large rooms with picture windows facing out to the nursing home.
- The planners had stated that existing trees and shrubs would be retained but there were no trees and shrubs on the nursing home side of the boundary and all planting was on Mrs Ramsey's side.
- The proposals included a massive car park on an already crowded site
- The proposal was out of character with the surrounding area; no other building was located so close to houses behind them; the general character of houses of the area was rear garden facing rear garden.
- Mrs Ramsey did not object in principle to an extension of the nursing home rather she objected to the scale of the proposed extension.
- She suggested that Members might wish to attend a site meeting to better assess the impact the proposed building would have on neighbouring properties.
- Mr Lowry stated that he had occupied his home for 45 years.
- There had been 4 or 5 extensions to the nursing home and there had been a pattern whereby once the owners obtained permission for an extension, they then sold up and new owners came in.
- The extension would be life changing for those living in adjacent properties.
- He indicated that the proposed building would be 60 ft long and 40 ft high.

Mrs Ramsey responded to Members' questions, clarifying the following:

- The proposed extension would completely fill the space behind the existing nursing home and Mrs Ramsey's property.
- Mrs Ramsey's view from her living areas would be a 3 storey high building.
- There would be loss of sunlight particularly in the winter months and loss of visual amenity.
- What screening currently existed between Mrs Ramsey's house and the nursing home had been planted by Mrs Ramsey; there would be no open space to the side of the proposed extension that would allow further screening.
- Other houses in the vicinity had garden areas, the proposed nursing home would have little open space on the site.

The Committee received Councillor S Carson who wished to speak in opposition to the application highlighting the following:

- The proposal would have adverse impact on the visual amenity of neighbouring properties.
- It was important to note that objectors were not opposed to an extension on the site; a previous application for a 2 storey extension along the full length of the site would have less impact than the current proposal.
- He stated that rooms which the planners said overlooked the courtyard would be also looking into Mrs Ramsey's property.
- Although additional landscaping was proposed, one would struggle to see where that could take place on the crowded site.
- The Creating Spaces document specified a minimum distance of 15 metres between the rear of a building and the shared boundary; in this case the distance was 9.9 metres between the nursing home and Mrs Ramsey's property – not even her boundary.
- There was a degree of open space associated with other properties in the area but Nos 2 and 4 North Circular Road had oversaturation which was out of character with the surrounding area.

The Committee received Trevor Lunn MLA who wished to speak in opposition to the application, highlighting the following:

- Mr Lunn would echo what other speakers had said.
- Planners had rejected all objections to the extension.
- He would challenge the planners' assessment that the distance from the proposed extension to Mrs Ramsey's boundary was acceptable.
- The proposal would be the 5<sup>th</sup> extension to the property in recent times.
- He stated that Wallace Park was an area of townscape character and that development should respect the character of the surrounding area.
- No 6 North Circular Road sat at a lower level than the nursing home and the extension would be overbearing in respect of that property.
- 9.9 metres was an unacceptable distance between the two properties.

Mr Lunn responded to Members' comments.

It was then proposed by Councillor DJ Craig, seconded by Councillor N Anderson, and agreed by a majority of 9:0 with 0 abstentions, to request that a site meeting be arranged to include a visit to the neighbouring properties as well as the applicant's site.

- (4) LA05/2017/1298/F – Local Application (previously deferred) – Single dwelling house CTY10 on lands opposite 21 and 23 Halftown Road, Lisburn.

The Senior Planning Officer (MB) presented this application as outlined in the circulated report. It was noted that this application had been considered by the Planning Committee on 3 December 2018 and had been deferred for a site meeting which had taken place on 8 January 2019.

The Committee received Mr John Hinds who wished to speak in support of the application highlighting the following:

- The application had been submitted by Mr Hinds' father but was to enable Mr Hinds to farm the lands.
- The planners' reasons for refusal were to do with siting of the dwelling and with farming activity.
- The Committee was provided with an outline of the flood plain.
- The site was located away from existing farm buildings which had been flooded on many occasions but it did use an existing farm access.
- The farm had been active for 6 years with maintenance of the land in good agricultural condition.
- Planning policy did not require participation in the single farm payment scheme.
- There has been a private agreement with a local farmer and that agreement was submitted to the planners with the planning application.
- DAERA had indicated that this agreement would confirm farming activity the agreement was submitted to the Planning Office in 2014 and was acceptable to them at that stage.
- DAERA were helping Mr Hinds to resubmit an application for the single farm payment.

The Committee received Councillor A Redpath who wished to speak in support of the application highlighting the following:

- The issues to be considered were the site of the proposed building and the nature of the farming business.
- Since the lands were liable to flooding, the prudent and most sensible course of action was to locate the proposed dwelling on the highest point of the site and away from the flood plain.
- The ongoing nature of the farm business was evidenced by the fact that the lands were in good condition and hedges had been maintained.
- There were in effect two agreements in place, one relating to the conacre arrangement and the other to the maintenance of the lands; but because these had been muddled into one agreement, the Planning Officers were stating that there was insufficient evidence of farming activity.

Councillor Redpath then responded to Members' queries clarifying as follows:

- A planning application submitted in 2018 was not refused for agricultural reasons but on siting reasons which would perhaps indicate that the decision in respect of the agricultural issue was finely balanced.

The Committee received Mr Trevor Lunn MLA who wished to speak in support of the application highlighting the following:

- This farm had been in the family's ownership since the late 1800s and there had been ongoing farming activity since that time.
- Since 2009, because of the age of Mr Hinds Snr, the land has been let out in conacre.
- The proposed site was located on the highest point of the land, about 1 metre above the level of the River Lagan.
- The site was as near as possible to the existing farm property but without encroaching on the flood plain.

- There were a lot of houses on the Halftown Road. This site had a natural boundary on 2 sides and would be visually integrated into the surrounding area.

The Head of Planning and Capital Development responded to Members' questions providing clarification on the flood plain and indicating that it was the planner's view that it was the person taking up the conacre rather than the applicant who would be eligible to benefit from the farming activity.

The Committee, having considered the information provided within the Report of the Senior Planning Officer and by those making representations, agreed by a majority of 6:3 with 0 abstentions that the recommendation of the Planning Officer to refuse the application would not be upheld.

#### In Committee

It was proposed by Councillor N Anderson, seconded by Councillor L Poots, and agreed to go into Committee in order to receive legal advice in the absence of press and public.

#### Adjournment of Meeting

While in Committee, the Vice-Chairman declared an adjournment at 3.50 pm

#### Resumption of Meeting

The Vice-Chairman declared the meeting resumed at 4.00 pm. The meeting continued in Committee.

The Members noted the advice received from the Legal Adviser.

#### Resumption of Normal Business

It was proposed by A Givan, seconded by Councillor DJ Craig, and agreed to come out of committee and normal business was resumed.

It was then proposed by Councillor N Anderson, seconded by Councillor A Givan and agreed that, in accordance with Para 55 of the Protocol for the Operation of the Planning Committee, further consideration of application LA05/2017/1298/F would be deferred for a period of 1 month.

- (6) LA05/2018/0388/O – Local Application (Called In) – Construction of a dwelling on a farm (Policy CTY10) on lands immediately North East of 4 Magheramesk Lane, Moira.

The Senior Planning Officer (MCON) presented this application as outlined in the circulated report.

The Committee received Mr Bleakney who wished to speak in support of the application highlighting the following:

- Evidence of active farming had been submitted and these included details of purchase and sale of bullocks in 2016 and tuberculosis results in 2016. Evidence of farm business insurance had been submitted recently.
- Whilst there had been no livestock on the farm in recent years, the land had been maintained and there had been silage production.
- He had submitted sufficient evidence to demonstrate that he was an active farmer.
- The alternative site was not an option as access was along a very narrow lane, one car wide and with no verges on either side.

(Councillor Poots left the meeting at 4.23 pm)

Mr Bleakney responded to Members' queries regarding farming activities on the land.

The Head of Planning and Capital Development responded to Members queries regarding the evidence submitted in respect of farming activity.

The Committee, having considered the information provided within the Report of the Senior Planning Officer and by those making representations, agreed by a majority of 8:0 with 0 abstentions to refuse application LA05/2018/0388/O as outlined in the Officer's report.

- (8) LA05/2017/0054/F – Local Application (Called In) – Proposed 2 no. agricultural sheds and retention of laneways and access on lands North West of St Patrick's Church, Barnfield Road, Lisburn.

The Principal Planning Officer (RH) presented this application as outlined in the circulated report.

The Committee received Ms Christina Skentos and Mr Matthew Johnson who wished to speak in support of the application highlighting the following:

- The application was made based on a precedent that had been established at appeal.
- The applicant wished to rear cattle on the land but DAERA would not allow a higher number of cattle unless there were two agricultural sheds.
- If planning permission for the sheds was granted, the applicant would then be in a position to purchase more land and to increase her livestock.
- The applicant currently had 25 sheep and 5 cattle on the land, which was the limit allowed by DAERA on her current land holding.
- The land was not suitable for crops.

(Councillor Poots returned to the meeting at 4.49 pm)

Ms Skentos and Mr Johnson responded to Members' questions, clarifying that the farm currently comprised 7.5 acres; the applicant was unable to get a DARD number until they had a larger herd; and the farm had a business ID for a Category 3 business.

The Head of Planning and Capital Development responded to Members' queries.

The Committee, having considered the information provided within the Report of the Principal Planning Officer and by those making representations, agreed by a majority of 6:1 with 1 abstention to refuse the application as outlined in the Officer's report.

(Councillor Poots did not take part in the vote as he had not been present for the entirety of the discussion)

- (9) LA05/2018/0255/F – Local Application (Called In) - 2 storey dwelling with attic conversion and re-use of existing non-residential building (CTY4) for use as a dwelling with 1no. double garage, landscaping and associated site works at Site 120m west of 24 Edentrillick Hill Road, Hillsborough.

The Principal Planning Officer (RH) presented this application as outlined in the circulated report.

The Committee received Mr David Law who wished to speak in support of the application highlighting the following:

- Mr Law gave some personal background details and advised that he was a Fellow of the Royal Institute of Chartered Surveyors.
- He advised that he had many years' experience of dealing with old buildings.
- He queried the planners assertion that, with regard to conversions, the planning policy never envisaged a new building wrapped around an old building.
- He stated that Mr Matthew Slocombe, Director of SPAB, supported this type of conversion and referred to one of the examples included in the planners' presentation which was an award winning conversion in the Midlands. This application followed along the same lines in wrapping a new building around a ruin.
- The application involved the retention in its entirety of what was already there.
- The extant approval involved the erection of a 3 metre retaining wall on the site whereas the current application was for a building that followed the differing ground levels.

Mr Law then responded to Members queries, providing clarification on the proposed height of the building and the topography of the site.

The Committee received Councillor S Carson who wished to speak in support of the application highlighting the following:

- The key issues were the definition of a conversion and the interpretation of planning policy.
- The planners held that concealing the ruin was not within the spirit of the policy but concealing the structure ensured its retention and maintenance.
- The structure on site was a ruin but it would be made safe within the confines of what was being proposed.
- The proposal involved the adaptation of a building for a new use.

- This was a unique application with unique features within it.

The Head of Planning and Capital Development responded to Members queries clarifying that it was the planners' view that the character of the existing building on the site should not be lost in the overall development scheme. He also advised that the building had been an agricultural outbuilding rather than a dwelling.

The Committee, having considered the information provided within the Report of the Principal Planning Officer and by those making representations, agreed by a majority of 7:2 with 0 abstention to refuse the application as outlined in the Officer's report.

## 7. Amendment to Minutes

At this stage, Councillor L Poots advised that he had not been present earlier in the meeting when the Committee had been considering the previous month's meetings.

At his request, it was agreed that the amendments detailed at Item 3 above should be included in the Planning Committee minutes of 7 January 2019.

(Councillor L Poots left the meeting at 5.50 pm)

### Adjournment of Meeting

The Vice-Chairman declared an adjournment at 5.50 pm

### Resumption of Meeting

The Vice-Chairman declared the meeting resumed at 5.55 pm

## 8. Report of the Head of Service (Planning and Capital Development) (Continued)

### 8.1 Schedule of Applications to be Determined (Continued)

- (5) LA05/2018/0507/F – Local Application (Mandatory) – Refurbishment and extension to stable block to provide educational workshop & classroom space. Proposed construction of new structure to partially cover existing courtyard to provide lobby/ flexible working space. Proposed change of use to Navigation House to provide office accommodation with provision of disabled parking at 148 Hillsborough Road, Lisburn.

The Senior Planning Officer (MCON) presented this application as outlined in the circulated report.

The Committee, having considered the information provided within the Report of the Senior Planning Officer, agreed by a majority of 8:0 with 0 abstentions to approve the application as outlined in the Officer's report.

- (10) LA05/2018/0402/O – Local Application (Called In) - Proposed 2 storey replacement dwelling with detached garage on a Site 80m NE of no.26 Comber Road, Hillsborough, BT26 6LN

It was noted that this application had been removed from the Schedule for consideration.

It was noted that the following application on the Schedule of Applications would be determined at a future meeting of the Committee.

- (7) LA05/2018/0390/O – Local Application (Called In) – Proposed storey and a half dwelling with detached garage on a site west of no. 75 Grove Road, Dromore

## 8.2 Pre-Application Notices (PANs) in respect of Potential Major Applications

- 8.2.1 Pre-Application Notice - Proposed mixed use development on a site to the north of no. 60 Rathfriland Road and south of no. 52 Rathfriland Road, Dromara, Dromore.

The Committee was provided with copy and it was agreed that Members note the information provided in relation to the above Pre-Application Notice.

- 8.2.2 Pre-Application Notice – Proposed erection of 66 no. dwellings (comprising detached and semi-detached dwellings) with garages, open space, landscaping, access and associated site works on lands immediately adjacent to and north of 104 to 120 Millreagh Avenue, Dundonald.

The Committee was provided with copy and it was agreed that Members note the information provided in relation to the above Pre-Application Notice.

- 8.2.3 Pre-Application Notice – Proposed redevelopment of Dundonald International Ice Bowl

The Committee was provided with copy and it was agreed that Members note the information provide in relation to the above Pre-Application Notice.

In response to a query by Councillor DJ Craig, the Legal Adviser provided clarification in respect of Declarations of Interest by Council Members.

## 8.3 Planning Appeal Decisions as at 23 January 2019

The Committee was provided with copy and it was agreed to note the findings of Planning Appeals Decisions & Costs Decisions dated 16 January 2019 in relation to the following planning applications:

- LA05/2016/1050/F for the erection of 4 no. detached dwellings with double garages including new vehicular accesses and all other associated site works on a site to the South West of No. 4 Beanstown Road, Aghnahough, Lisburn

- LA05/2016/0686/F for the erection of 5 no detached dwellings with double garages including new vehicular accesses and all other associated site works on a site to the east of No7 Beanstown Road, Aghnahough, Lisburn, BT28 3QS and to the north of 94-102 (evens) Sir Richard Wallace Walk, Aghalislone (Upper Massereene), Lisburn.

The Head of Planning and Capital Development responded to Members' comments and queries regarding application LAO5/2016/1050/F.

#### 8.4 Statutory Performance Indicators April-December 2018

The Committee was provided with copy and it was agreed to note a draft monthly performance indicator from the Department of Infrastructure.

#### 8.5 Further Consideration in respect of LA05/2017/0926/F

The Committee was provided with copy and it was agreed to note a report setting out further consideration in respect of a late representation received in relation to Front Road, Drumbo.

#### 9. Any Other Business

There were no matters of any other business arising.

There being no further business, the meeting concluded at 6.20 pm.

---

CHAIRMAN / MAYOR