

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 3 April 2017 at 2.00 pm

PRESENT:

Councillor A Redpath (Chairman)

Councillor N Anderson (Vice-Chairman)

Aldermen J Dillon MBE JP, D Drysdale, G Rice MBE
Councillors T Beckett, A Girvin, U Mackin, L Poots

OTHER MEMBERS:

The Right Worshipful the Mayor, Councillor R B Bloomfield
Aldermen W Leatham, J Tinsley
Councillors B Hanvey, J Craig, B Mallon, V Kamble

IN ATTENDANCE:

Lead Head of Planning & Building Control
Principal Planning Officers (RH and LJ)
Senior Planning Officers (RT, AS and MB)
Committee Secretary
Attendance Clerk

Cleaver Fulton & Rankin
Kate McCusker (Legal Advisor)

Commencement of Meeting

The Chairman, Councillor A Redpath, welcomed everyone to the meeting.

Introductions were made by the Chairman and some Housekeeping and Evacuation announcements were made by the Lead Head of Service (Planning & Building Control).

1. **Apologies**

Apologies for non-attendance at the Meeting were accepted and recorded on behalf of Councillor M Tolerton.

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.

The following Declarations of Interest were made:

2. Declarations of Interest (Contd)

- During the course of the meeting, Councillor N Anderson stated that he would be declaring an interest in Y/2015/0002/F and would be making representations in support of the application and therefore he would be withdrawing from the meeting during the determination of that application.

3. Minutes

It was proposed by Alderman G Rice seconded by Alderman J Dillon and agreed that the following Minutes be signed.

- Minutes of Meeting of Planning Committee held on Monday 6 March 2017.

4. Report from the Lead Head of Planning and Building Control

It was agreed that the report and recommendations of the Lead Head of Planning and Building Control be adopted, subject to any decisions recorded below:-

4.1 Report from the Planning Manager

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

Items for Decision

4.1.1 Schedule of Applications:

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

The Legal Adviser highlighted paragraphs 46 - 48 of the Protocol for the Operation of the Lisburn & Castlereagh City Council Planning Committee which, she advised, needed to be borne in mind when determinations were being made.

The 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) LA05/2016/0542/F – Local Application (Judicial Review decision quashed) – Proposed temporary surface level car park (for a maximum of 2 years) (Additional information) on lands at 24 Antrim Street, Lisburn.

The Chairman advised that this application had been removed from the schedule to allow additional information to be considered and clarity sought as appropriate.

- (2) LA05/2015/0338/F – Major Application – The development of 219 houses, comprising 90 no. 3 & 4 bedroom semi-detached houses and 129 no. 3 & 4 bedroom detached houses, with associated garages and landscaped open space (amended number of houses and sit layout) on lands to the north of 21 Knockbracken Road, Belfast and adjoining Brackenhill Crescent and Brackenhill Avenue to the east, Laurelgrove Avenue, Laurelgrove Crescent and Laurelgrove Dale to the north and Croft Hill, Brooke Hall Avenue and Brooke Hall Heights to the west.

The Senior Planning Officer (AS) presented this application as outlined within the circulated report and advised that additional conditions had been recommended by Transport NI and Natural Heritage for inclusion in any decision issued.

(Councillor U Mackin arrived at 2.06 pm)

At this stage Alderman G Rice said that in her opinion, there had been a distinct lack of Community Consultation in respect of this application and that, in her opinion, it was not Article 40 compliant.

The Senior Planning Officer responded that there had been an Article 40 in place for the wider area however, he considered that the obligations were to provide a spine road which had been done, he considered that all obligations had been met.

It was proposed by Alderman G Rice, Seconded by Councillor N Anderson and by a majority vote it was agreed to defer the determination of this application for a period of one month for clarification on the matters for deferral to be provided to the Planning Unit.

- (3) Y/2015/0002/F – Major Application – Application under Article 28 of the Planning (NI) Order 1991 to vary conditions 1 & 2 of permission Y/2000/0506/F (Appeal ref 2000/A278) (as amended by Permission Y/2010/0292/F) and Y/2000/0130/F (Appeal ref 2000/A277) to allow for the construction of an internal mezzanine and the sale of mixed use comparison goods with no more than 75% of the net sales area used for the sale of clothing, footwear and fashion accessories at Unit 1, Drumkeen Retail Park, Upper Galwally, Belfast.

(The Planning Officer MB left the meeting)

(Councillor N Anderson left the meeting at 2.20 pm having declared an interest in this application).

The Senior Planning Officer (AS) presented this application as outlined within the circulated report. He advised that additional information had been received in the form of a customer survey. He stated that the postal codes of respondents to the survey had indicated that 50% of those who responded had resided outside the applicant's target catchment area.

The Committee received Ms T Harbinson, Mr G McGhee and Mr M Kelly who wished to speak in opposition to the application highlighting the following:

- They supported the recommendation of the Planning Officer
- Drumkeen Retail Park was outside the District Centre and had a complimentary role and the control of Forestside was strictly enforced.
- Approval of this application would be to the detriment of Forestside.
- Approval of this application would set a precedent as there were many retailers who would fit this format.
- Approval would not enhance Forestside.
- Approval would be contrary to BMAP and would circumvent its recommendations.
- Strategic Planning oppose the application for the above reasons as well.
- The catchment area would include East Belfast.
- It would be contrary to the SPPS.
- Other options were available for example at Connswater.
- Local infrastructure at Connswater would also support it being located there.
- This would threaten protected sites.
- The application for Homebase was similar and the view expressed was that this application was similar and should be rejected.

A question and answer session ensued.

The Committee received Mr E Loughrey, Mr S Beattie QC , Mr G Woods and Mr N Stephens who wished to speak in support of the application and who highlighted the following:

- Mr Beattie stated that R2 is the only suitable/appropriate policy which the proposal complies with as the proposal will not undermine the distinctive nature of Belfast City Centre. The proposal is policy compliant.
- There is no impact on the city centre, only 6% impact at worst on Forestside comparison excluding Marks & Spencer and Sainsbury Food.
- TK Maxx could not locate to an industrial estate.
- 6% is not harmful on any sites or centres. The vitality of Belfast City Centre will not be harmed.
- He was surprised at the absence of policy assessment.
- Conditions can control the development – this would not set a precedent.
- The survey was to demonstrate that there would be no impact on Forestside and people will continue to use Forestside.
- In relation to alternative sites, Connswater is also a District Centre, however a Forestside location is preferable.
- The Tesco site is a greenfield site and is not suitable either.

A question and answer session ensued.

The Committee received Councillor N Anderson who wished to speak in support of the application and who highlighted the following:

- He wants the best for the areas under discussion and would not want them to be impacted.
- There would be negligible impact and Forestside may actually benefit from this development.

- Recent customer survey would support the above as 98% say they would use Forestside more frequently.
- The alternative option at Lowes Industrial Estate is unsuitable.
- The Carryduff Centre would be unsuitable as there is not enough space.
- There would be limited impact on Belfast City Centre.
- The independent retail assessment suggests that to refuse the application would be unwise. The expert agrees the application complies with policy.
- He then read out a section of the independent retail expert's report which was supportive of the application.

A question and answer session ensued.

The Committee received Councillor B Mallon who wished to speak in support of the application and who highlighted the following:

- Regarding the Regional and local centres, Belfast and Lisburn already had TK Maxx stores. Carryduff was unsuitable as the centre is closed and will eventually be a mixed use scheme. It is a town centre but its future role does not meet the requirements of the end user. Lowes is not an option and there are no other alternatives, the future of Carryduff will not be impacted.
- Regarding Drumkeen, the unit has been vacant since 2012 and no rates have been generated, if this application is approved there will be a significant increase in rates income. TK Maxx is committed to Drumkeen and research shows it would benefit Forestside as a shopping destination.
- There is a £1.75m investment.
- It will generate 30/40 full and part time jobs.
- Research has been carried out and is supportive.
- He feels this is the correct site for the application.

A question and answer session ensued.

The Committee received Councillor B Hanvey who wished to speak in support of the application and who highlighted the following:

- The site is a good location for the store, as it is an established retail area.
- The unit has been vacant since 2012 and this has resulted in a loss in rates.
- There will be a £1.75m investment.
- It will generate 30/40 full/part-time jobs.
- The catchment area is growing and there will be a requirement for increased retail floor space.
- This application encourages the use of sustainable transport given its location.
- There will be no impact on Carryduff, the mixed use is intended for smaller shops and could not accommodate this development.
- Other locations alluded to are unsuitable and local residents are already concerned at traffic at that location.
- The Tesco site referred to is also unsuitable.
- There is no alternative site.

A question and answer session ensued.

At the culmination of further discussion and ensuing debate, the decision was put to a vote and by a majority of 8:0 with 0 abstentions, it was agreed that the recommendation of the Planning Officer would not be upheld.

The Chairman stated that the Professional Officer's recommendation to refuse planning permission had fallen and that a new motion was now under consideration. Section 45 of the 2011 Planning Act states that in dealing with planning applications, the Council must have regard to the local development plan, so far as material to the application, and to any other material considerations.

It was then proposed by Councillor L Poots, seconded by the Chairman Councillor A Redpath and agreed that the reasons cited for the approval of the application would be:

- In the interpretation of the R1 and R2 the Committee differs with the Planning Officer. The development complies with policy R2.
- The Committee consider that the sequential test has been met.
- The Committee consider that this approval would not create a precedent.
- There would be substantial economic benefit derived

It was agreed that a Section 76 Agreement be obtained to restrict the occupier to T K Maxx.

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

The Chairman then highlighted that because the application had been recommended for refusal, no conditions had been drafted. Conditions would now need to be discussed and the Committee agreed that the precise wording of conditions be delegated to the Planning Unit.

It was proposed by the Chairman, Councillor A Redpath, seconded by Alderman D Drysdale and agreed that, whilst the Committee considered that this application would not significantly prejudice the implementation of the local development plan's objectives and policies, it should be referred to the Department of Infrastructure because previous applications, which were not referred to the Department by the Committee, have been referred to the Department at a later date by other persons outside of the Council, therefore, in order to give the applicant certainty on timescales etc, the application should be referred.

Adjournment of Meeting

The Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 3.45pm

Resumption of Meeting

The Chairman declared the meeting resumed at 4.05 pm

(Councillor N Anderson returned to the Chamber at 4.05 pm)

- (4) LA05/2016/0414/O – Local Application (Previously deferred) – Dwelling on a farm (amended plans) on lands opposite 11 Kilcorrig Road, Lisburn.

The Chairman advised that this application had been withdrawn by the Agent.

- (5) LA05/2016/0676/F – Local Application (previously deferred) – An infill site for 2 no. two storey detached dwellings, associated garages and landscaping (Design and Statement received/amended site layout plan) on a site between 245 and 251 Hillhall Road, Lisburn

The Senior Planning Officer (AS) presented this application as outlined within the circulated report advising that it had been previously deferred pending the provision of additional information. He also advised that an additional Letter of Objection had been received.

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

- Information had been provided to address the issues raised previously.
- He had found that Planning Officers were reluctant to enter into discussions and were difficult to work with.
- He felt he would be able to demonstrate that the buildings were separate and that both fronted the main road and a topological survey had been provided to demonstrate this.
- Significant design changes had been incorporated to make the dwellings more compliant and suitable for the surrounding area.
- He had offered to replace the hipped roof but no response had been received from planners.
- Planting was now in place to reduce the size of the site.
- He outlined why a third dwelling could not be incorporated into the site and provided some examples of similar applications which had been approved and which created a precedent

A question and answer session ensued.

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

- He welcomed the additional photographs being shown.
- There were clearly two separate dwellings fronting the road.
- There was a high garden wall but clearly two separate buildings.
- The topographical survey demonstrated the two buildings were lower so the scale and size issues were non-issues.
- LVRP was not an issue and neither were the roads issues raised if others are met.
- A garden wall surrounding two buildings does not make it one building.
- These were infill dwellings and met policy requirements.

A question and answer session ensued.

At the culmination of further discussion and ensuing debate, the decision was put to a vote and by a majority of 4:3 with 2 abstentions, it was agreed that the recommendation of the Planning Officer would not be upheld.

The Chairman stated that the Professional Officer's recommendation to refuse planning permission had fallen and that a new motion was now under consideration. Section 45 of the 2011 Planning Act states that in dealing with planning applications, the Council must have regard to the local development plan, so far as material to the application, and to any other material considerations.

It was then proposed by Councillor L Poots, seconded by Alderman G Rice and by a majority of 5:3 with 1 abstention it was agreed that the reasons cited for the approval of the application would be:

- That in the opinion of the Committee, the site met the infill policy requirements.

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

The Chairman then highlighted that because the application had been recommended for refusal, no conditions had been drafted. Conditions would now need to be discussed and it was agreed by the Committee that the precise wording of conditions be delegated to the Planning Unit.

(6) LA05/2016/0692/O – Local Application (Called in) – Infill dwelling and garage on land adjacent to 128 Ballynahinch Road, Carryduff, Belfast.

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

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

- The only reason for refusal was one of access.
- Transport NI had issues as this is a protected route.
- The stretch of road was 150m long and approval for other dwellings has been granted which creates inconsistency.
- The application proposes to use an existing agricultural access which has been used for agricultural traffic on a daily basis, the use of this as access to the property would improve on the status quo.
- Based on precedent in the area, this application should be approved.

A question and answer session ensued.

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

- This is purely about vehicular access.
- He highlighted road safety stating that there already was a vehicular access, albeit for farming.

- He felt this would improve road safety and urged better use to be made of pre-planning discussions within the planning process.

A question and answer session ensued.

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

- Vehicular access is there, there are no alternatives so the criteria is met
- The application should be approved.

A question and answer session ensued.

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

- PPS21 is met.
- The issue is AMP3 and whether this qualifies.
- He read out Section (d) of AMP3 which he felt would allow the application to proceed.
- Spays installed would improve road safety.
- There would be no major increase in traffic.
- A precedent was set in March with a similar approval.

A question and answer session ensued.

At the culmination of further discussion and ensuing debate, the decision was put to a vote and by a majority of 9:0 with 0 abstentions, it was agreed that the recommendation of the Planning Officer would not be upheld.

The Chairman stated that the Professional Officer's recommendation to refuse planning permission had fallen and that a new motion was now under consideration. Section 45 of the 2011 Planning Act states that in dealing with planning applications, the Council must have regard to the local development plan, so far as material to the application, and to any other material considerations.

It was then proposed by Councillor N Anderson, seconded by the Chairman, Councillor A Redpath and by a majority of 9:0 with 0 abstentions it was agreed that the reasons cited for the approval of the application would be:

- That there was already a vehicular access in place and that the Committee consider that road safety would be improved by the application being approved. The proposal was therefore considered to be compliant with Policy AMP3.

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

The Chairman then highlighted that because the application had been recommended for refusal, no conditions had been drafted. Conditions would now need to be discussed and it was agreed that the precise wording of conditions be delegated to the Planning Unit.

Adjournment of Meeting

The Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 5.34pm advising that refreshments were available in the Members' Suite.

Resumption of Meeting

The Chairman declared the meeting resumed at 6.15 pm.

- (8) LA05/2015/0815/F – Local Application (Called in) – Erection of one no. dwelling and all associated site works on lands adjacent to 23 Culcavy Road, Hillsborough.

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

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

- He considered that the application did meet CTY2.
- The cluster was outside a farm, there were three dwellings and a barn, one of which was a replacement dwelling.
- It was visible from various viewpoints which were outlined.
- It was a well known historical landmark – both Culcavy House and the Millpond were widely known in the area.
- It provides enclosure and would be surrounded by development on all sides.
- Recent changes made to the occupancy requirements of local cottages was a material consideration.
- He urged approval

A question and answer session ensued.

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

- He outlined the history of the millpond which he considered made it a focal point.
- He advised of locations from where the buildings were a visible entity.
- The adjacent Golf-club resort had obtained approval.
- There were strong domestic reasons why this could be approved.

A question and answer session ensued.

At the culmination of further discussion and ensuing debate, the decision was put to a vote and by a majority of 6:3 with 0 abstentions, it was agreed that the recommendation of the Planning Officer would not be upheld.

The Chairman stated that the Professional Officer's recommendation to refuse planning permission had fallen and that a new motion was now under consideration. Section 45 of the 2011 Planning Act states that in dealing with

planning applications, the Council must have regard to the local development plan, so far as material to the application, and to any other material considerations.

It was then proposed by Councillor L Poots, seconded by Councillor N Anderson and agreed that the reasons cited for the approval of the application would be:

- That the Committee consider that the focal point required by the policy is met by the mill pond and therefore it meets the requirements of CTY2.
- That the Committee do not believe that the style of the development is suburban nor that it would ruin rural character.

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

The Chairman then highlighted that because the application had been recommended for refusal, no conditions had been drafted. Conditions would now need to be discussed and it was agreed by the Committee that the precise wording of conditions be delegated to the Planning Unit.

(9) LA05/2016/0627/F – Local Application (Called in) – Two no. proposed dwellings on land 50m West of 4 Back Road, Drumbo.

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

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

- The Council needs to ensure that there is a supply of housing land – this is not the case in Drumbo where no land has been made available
- This has resulted in significant losses – shop, post-office, school have all had to close.
- This will not set a precedent as the set of circumstances will not be replicated elsewhere.
- This is not an area of outstanding natural beauty.
- There are no objections to the scheme.

A question and answer session ensued.

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

- Drumbo has not been well served by development.
- This has significantly impacted the village – loss of shop, post-office and school.
- The need for housing is clearly evident.
- He explained the lay-out of the village.
- This development would not do demonstrable harm and would actually benefit the village.

A question and answer session ensued.

At the culmination of further discussion and ensuing debate, the decision was put to a vote and by a majority of 8:1 with 0 abstentions, it was agreed that the recommendation of the Planning Officer would not be upheld.

The Chairman stated that the Professional Officer's recommendation to refuse planning permission had fallen and that a new motion was now under consideration. Section 45 of the 2011 Planning Act states that in dealing with planning applications, the Council must have regard to the local development plan, so far as material to the application, and to any other material considerations.

It was then proposed by Councillor L Poots, seconded by Councillor U Mackin and agreed that the reasons cited for the approval of the application would be:

- That the application meets the requirement of CTY2a
- That there is a clear housing need in the area.
- The area was previously zoned for housing and this application would not be detrimental to the area.

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

The Chairman then highlighted that because the application had been recommended for refusal, no conditions had been drafted. Conditions would now need to be discussed and it was agreed by the Committee that the precise wording of conditions be delegated to the Planning Unit.

(7) LA05/2016/1195/O – Local Application (Called in) – Proposed development of a chalet bungalow adjacent to existing main dwelling under BTY6 – Personal and domestic circumstances on land adjacent to no. 5 Megarrystown Road, Moira.

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

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

- A letter he had sent to the Planning Unit had clearly stated the age of the parents referred to and the gentleman's diagnosis.
- Ms Thompson needs to be close to her parents and they currently reside in Antrim.
- As a single parent she also has caring responsibilities at home.
- The conversion of the garage was considered but it was decided that it would not be a suitable alternative.
- There will be no impact on rural character, the development would be rural in nature and this could be considered at the full planning permission stage – this is for outline permission only.

A question and answer session ensued during which questions were asked about the nature of the applicant's father's illness.

At the culmination of the discussion it was proposed by Councillor U Mackin, seconded by Councillor T Beckett and agreed that the determination of this application be deferred pending additional medical information being provided.

Items for Noting

It was proposed by Councillor N Anderson, seconded by Councillor R T Beckett and agreed that items 4.1.2 – 4.1.5 of the Planning Manager's Report be noted subject to any decisions recorded below:-

4.1.2 Department for Infrastructure (DfI) in February 2017 on Hazardous Substances Controls.

It was agreed that the Committee note information circulated within the above Development Management Practice Note.

4.1.3 Tourism NI – Letter explaining approach to Planning Consultation requests.

It was agreed that the Committee note the contents of the circulated copy of correspondence dated 15 March 2017 from Tourism NI.

4.1.4 Development Management – Appeal Decisions 23 March 2017

It was agreed that the Committee note information circulated in relation to the following Planning Appeals Decisions:

- (a) Planning Appeals Decision dated 6 March 2017 for planning application Y/2015/0079/F. The appeal was dismissed.
- (b) Planning Appeals Decision dated 10 March 2017 for planning application reference LA05/2016/0371/F. The appeal was allowed with full planning permission being granted, subject to conditions.
- (c) Planning Appeals Decision dated 14 March 2017 for planning application S/2014/0895/F. The appeal was dismissed.
- (d) Planning Appeals Decision dated 15 March 2017 for planning application LA05/2015/0770/F. The appeal was dismissed.

4.1.5 Development Management – Live appeals 23 March 2017

It was agreed that the Committee note the information circulated in respect of Appeals received as at 23 March 2017.

4.2. Conference – Rebuilding Ireland : An integrated Approach Through Local Government

It was proposed by Councillor L Poots, seconded by Alderman G Rice and agreed that the Chairman and/or Vice Chairman together with two Officers attend the above conference which has been organised by The All-Island Local Authority Forum and will take place in Dunboyne Castle, Co Meath on Thursday 27 April 2017.

4.3 Northern Ireland Planning Statistics 2016/17 – Third Quarterly Statistical Bulletin

It was proposed by Alderman G Rice, seconded by Alderman J Dillon and agreed that Members note information circulated in respect of the above information and were provided with a link to access the Report online.

During the above item, Councillor N Anderson left the meeting at 7.41 pm.

4.4 Budget Report – Planning Unit

It was agreed that the Committee note information provided on the Budget Report for the Planning Unit for the year to 31 March 2017 as at 28 February 2017.

5. Confidential Report from the Lead Head of Planning and Building Control

It was agreed that the reports and recommendations of the Confidential Report of the Lead Head of Planning and Building Control be adopted, subject to any decisions recorded below.

(The Legal Advisor left the meeting at 7.38 pm).

The Chairman advised that the following items would be discussed 'in Committee' for the reasons indicated:

'In Committee'

It was proposed by Alderman D Drysdale, seconded by Alderman G Rice and agreed that the items in the Confidential Report be considered 'In Committee', in the absence of press and public being present.

5.1.1 Enforcement Cases with Court Proceedings in April 2017.

It was noted that this item was confidential for reason of information relating to any individual; information which is likely to reveal the identity of an individual; and information in relation to which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings.

Having been provided with information on Enforcement Cases with Court Proceedings in April 2017, it was agreed that the information provided within the Report should be noted.

5.1.2 Rolling Year Absence Figures for the Planning Unit

It was noted that this item was confidential for reason of information relating to any individual.

Having been provided with information on rolling year absence figures for the Planning unit, it was agreed that the information be noted.

Resumption of Normal Business

It was proposed by Councillor A Girvin seconded by Alderman G Rice and agreed to come out of committee and normal business was resumed.

7. Any Other Business

(i) Forthcoming Events Lead Head of Planning and Building Control

The Lead Head of Planning and Building Control advised of the following two events:

- (a) An invitation from Mid Ulster District Council to take part in the setting up of a forum which will meet to consider Lough Neagh on 27 April 2017 at 10.30 am.

It was agreed that the Chairman Councillor A Redpath and Councillor R T Beckett, or their nominees attend the above event as they represented the area.

- (b) NILGA Planning Working Group event on 17 May 2017 at Riddell Hall.

It was agreed that the Chairman, Vice-Chairman or their nominees attend the above event or any other member who would like to attend.

(ii) Speakers at Planning Committee Meetings Councillor T Beckett

Councillor R T Beckett requested that, in future, speakers at Committee meetings be seated at the front of the Council Chamber to facilitate discussion.

It was agreed that this would be the procedure moving forward.

There being no further business, the meeting concluded at 7.50 pm.

CHAIRMAN / MAYOR