

LISBURN & CASTLEREAGH CITY COUNCIL

Minutes of Planning Committee Meeting held in the Council Chamber and in Remote Locations on Monday, 2 September, 2024 at 10.21 am

PRESENT IN CHAMBER:

Alderman M Gregg (Chair)

Councillor S Burns (Vice-Chair)

Alderman O Gawith

Councillors P Catney, U Mackin, A Martin, G Thompson and N Trimble

IN ATTENDANCE:

Director of Regeneration and Growth
Head of Planning & Capital Development
Principal Planning Officer (RH)
Senior Planning Officers (MB, PMcF, GM, AS and PS)
Member Services Officers (CR and CH)

Mr B Martyn (Cleaver Fulton Rankin) – Legal Advisor

Commencement of Meeting

At the commencement of the meeting, the Chair, Alderman M Gregg, 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. He went on to outline the evacuation procedures in the case of an emergency.

1. **Apologies**

It was agreed to accept apologies for non-attendance at the meeting on behalf of Alderman J Tinsley and Councillors D Bassett and D J Craig.

2. **Declarations of Interest**

The following declarations of interest were made:

- Councillor A Martin declared an interest in respect of planning application LA05/2022/0538/F, given that he had had a conversation with the applicant, he shared a laneway with the proposed development and his farm ran alongside this one. Councillor Martin stated that he would be leaving the Council Chamber when this application was being considered;
- In respect of planning application LA05/2022/0033/F, Councillor P Catney stated that he had met with a representative of the residents but had not given an opinion at that meeting and did not consider that he had conflicted himself in any way; and

2. Declarations of Interest (Contd)

- Councillor U Mackin declared an interest in respect of planning application LA05/2022/0033/F given that he would be speaking on behalf of residents. He stated that he would be leaving the Council Chamber when this application was being considered.

3. Minutes of Meeting of Planning Committee held on 5 August, 2024

It was proposed by Councillor G Thompson, seconded by Councillor S Burns and agreed that the minutes of the meeting of Committee held on 5 August, 2024 be confirmed and signed.

4. Report from the Head of Planning & Capital Development

4.1 Schedule of Applications

The Chair, Alderman M Gregg, advised that there were 1 major and 8 local applications on the schedule for consideration at the meeting. He further advised that application LA05/2024/0291/F had been withdrawn from the schedule to allow Officers time to consider amended details which had been submitted by the agent on 29 August, 2024.

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) LA05/2023/0914/F – The development is seeking full retrospective planning permission for the retention of an earthen screening bund located along the western extents of the permitted quarry at Temple Quarry, 26 Ballcarngannon Road

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

The Committee received Mr C Tinsley who stated that he was in support of the application and was happy to address any Members' queries, of which there were none.

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

Debate

There were no comments made at the debate stage.

- (i) LA05/2023/0914/F – The development is seeking full retrospective planning permission for the retention of an earthen screening bund located along the western extents of the permitted quarry at Temple Quarry, 26 Ballcarngannon Road (Contd)

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.

- (ii) LA05/2022/0033/F – Erection of 17 dwellings in a mix of 15 detached and 2 semi-detached dwellings with associated parking, landscaping, site works and access arrangements from Quarterlands Road on lands between 58 and 66 Quarterlands Road, northeast of 54b-c & 56 Quarterlands Road north of 7-12 Rural Cottages and southeast of 4-7 Zenda Park, Drumbeg

Prior to the application being presented by Officers, the Chair, Alderman M Gregg, stated that it was necessary to go 'into committee' in order that legal advice could be sought.

"In Committee"

It was proposed by Alderman O Gawith, seconded by Councillor P Catney and agreed to go 'into committee' to consider this matter. Those members of the public in attendance left the meeting, as did Councillor U Mackin (10.41 am).

Legal advice was provided by the Legal Advisor in respect of this application.

Resumption of Normal Business

It was proposed by Councillor P Catney, seconded by Councillor S Burns and agreed to come out of committee and normal business was resumed (11.03 am).

When the members of the public returned to the public gallery, the Chair, Alderman M Gregg, stated that, as a result of legal advice received, it was necessary that this application be deferred to allow further written legal advice to be provided. It was anticipated that a meeting would be convened within the next few weeks to enable this application to be considered.

It was proposed by Alderman O Gawith, seconded by Councillor S Burns and agreed that the application be deferred, as outlined by the Chair.

Adjournment of Meeting

The Chair, Alderman M Gregg, declared the meeting adjourned at this point for a comfort break (11.05 am).

Resumption of Meeting

The meeting was resumed at 11.17 am.

Councillor U Mackin returned to the meeting at this time.

- (iii) LA05/2021/0789/F – Erection of 10 residential units comprising two-storey semi-detached dwellings, provision of hard and soft landscaping including retaining walls, provision of in curtilage car parking spaces, electric charging points and all associated site works on land to the north of 56 Magheralave Road, Lisburn

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

There was no-one registered to speak in respect of this application.

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

Debate

During debate:

- Alderman O Gawith referred to the number of houses being built and the provision of affordable housing units. He had been reassured by Officers during discussion that all 10 would be built, and presumably sold and occupied, and was not concerned about the condition in this instance; and
- the Chair, Alderman M Gregg, stated that he had concerns regarding trigger points in relation to affordable housing. He considered conditions should be written in such a way that there was no wriggle room for the rest of developments to be delivered prior to Section 76 or any other Agreements.

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.

The Chairman, Alderman M Gregg, advised that, to afford time for the next speaker to arrive, consideration of item 4.1 Schedule of Applications would be adjourned at this time and other report items would be considered.

- 4.2 Submission of an Application under Section 54 of the Planning Act (NI) 2011 to Vary Condition 8 of Planning Approval S/2014/0884/F to Allow Submission and Approval of a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) on a Phased Basis (Enabling Works and Main Works). If required, submission of a further application under Section 54 of the Planning Act (NI) 2011 to vary or remove condition 9 & 10 of planning approval S/2014/0884/F which relate to the requirement for noise insulation measures, subject to agreement of appropriate noise mitigation measures during construction on land east of Knockmore Road, south of 68-80 Addison Park and 8-10 Knockmore Road and north of Flush Park, Lisburn

It was proposed by Councillor P Catney, seconded by Alderman O Gawith and agreed to note information in respect of the above Pre-Application Notice and that it be submitted in accordance with the relevant section of the legislation and related guidance.

- 4.3 Site for New Cemetery including New Main Vehicular Access and Secondary Access, Parking and Associated Infrastructure Works on Lands Located circa 60m east of 10 Quarterlands Road, circa 80m west of 28 Quarterlands Road, circa 80m east of 27 Carnaghliiss Road and circa 150m east of 29 Carnaghliiss Road, Crumlin

It was proposed by Councillor N Trimble, seconded by Councillor P Catney and agreed to note information in respect of the above Pre-Application Notice and that it be submitted in accordance with the relevant section of the legislation and related guidance.

- 4.4 Proposed Redevelopment of the Poole's SuperValu Site in Moira Incorporating 1 Replacement Retail Unit and 3 Lettable Hot Food Units. Proposed Demolition of the Existing Retail Units and Associated Outbuildings. Proposed Adjustment of Site Entry and Exist Point Locations. Proposed Construction of Associated Car Parking including 3 DDA, 2 Parent & Child, 1nr Air/Water/Vac Spaces and 4 EV Car Charging Point. Proposed Pedestrian Footpaths with Protection Bollards and Landscaped Areas. Proposed Dedicated Secure Delivery Yard at 1 Main Street, Aughnafosker, Moira

It was proposed by Councillor G Thompson, seconded by Alderman O Gawith and agreed to note information in respect of the above Pre-Application Notice and that it be submitted in accordance with the relevant section of the legislation and related guidance.

The Chair, Alderman M Gregg, advised that consideration of item 4.1 Schedule of Applications would now resume.

- (iv) LA05/2023/0339/F – Erection of 8 dwellings (change of house type to site 398a-e and 400a-e previously approved under LA05/2018/0512/F), garages and all associated site on lands surrounding 9 Millmount Road comprising lands north east of Comber Greenway, east of Millmount Road and 150m west and south west of 60 Greengraves Road, Dundonald

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

The Committee received Mr N Salt to speak in support of the application and a query raised was responded to.

There were no Members' queries put to Planning Officers.

Debate

During debate:

- Alderman O Gawith welcomed the fact that obligations around wider roadworks would be fulfilled, as well as the obligation that 2 affordable housing units would be built and available for occupation before the sixth unit was occupied; and
- the Chair, Alderman M Gregg, welcomed work having started in relation to traffic lights. He also welcomed the provision of affordable housing which would be delivered through a Section 76 Agreement. However, Alderman Gregg was disappointed that the Council seemed to continually miss opportunities to provide developer-led improvements. There had been a perfect opportunity with this application for the developer to provide linkages to the Billy Neill Country Park, as well as footpath linkages into Greengraves, but that opportunity had been missed. Alderman Gregg stated that he was in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer 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.

- (v) LA05/2021/1181/O – Proposed new two storey detached dwelling on lands to the rear of existing houses on lands to the rear of 11a and 15 Wallace Avenue, Lisburn

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

There was no-one registered to speak in respect of this application.

There were no Members' queries put to Planning Officers.

- (v) LA05/2021/1181/O – Proposed new two storey detached dwelling on lands to the rear of existing houses on lands to the rear of 11a and 15 Wallace Avenue, Lisburn (Contd)

Debate

There were no comments made at the debate stage.

Vote

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

Adjournment of Meeting

The Chair, Alderman M Gregg, declared the meeting adjourned at this point for a comfort break (12.15 pm).

Resumption of Meeting

The meeting was resumed at 12.21 pm.

The Chairman, Alderman M Gregg, advised that, given the proximity to lunch break, consideration of item 4.1 Schedule of Applications would be adjourned at this time and other report items would be considered.

4.5 Northern Ireland Annual Statistics – Annual Statistical Bulletin (April 2023 – March 2024)

A number of Members' queries were responded to by the Head of Planning & Capital Development.

It was proposed by Councillor N Trimble, seconded by Councillor P Catney and agreed to note the contents of the Northern Ireland Statistics Bulletin, together with the analysis of the bulletin relative to Lisburn & Castlereagh City Council.

4.6 Statutory Performance Indicators – July 2024

It was proposed by Alderman O Gawith, seconded by Councillor P Catney and agreed that information relating to Statutory Performance Indicators for July 2024 be noted.

Adjournment of Meeting

The Chair, Alderman M Gregg, declared the meeting adjourned at this point for lunch (12.35 pm).

Resumption of Meeting

The meeting was resumed at 1.06 pm.

The Chair, Alderman M Gregg, advised that consideration of item 4.1 Schedule of Applications would now resume.

- (vi) LA05/2023/0022/F – Proposed 4 glamping pods including associated communal/recreation area, parking, access paths with new ranch type fencing to the site boundary 135m north of 14b Feumore Road, Lisburn

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

The Committee received Mr D Rooney, accompanied by Mr R Armstrong, 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:

- Councillor N Trimble stated that the applicant was a young entrepreneur who was keen to progress a tourism business that had become popular. He accepted comments made about the application not quite conforming with policy; however, his reading of policy was that the application was fluid enough to be approved through policy and not be an exception. The nature of this accommodation demanded that it be located outside of settlement limits as that was the appeal of glamping. Councillor Trimble was satisfied that there was enough of a tourism offering nearby, eg. Sandy Bay Marina, Rams Island, bird reserve and the lough itself, to warrant this type of self-catering accommodation. In respect of TOU3, he also considered there to be enough information to warrant that it had been demonstrated why it could not be within a settlement due to the nature of the accommodation. Whilst Councillor Trimble appreciated Officers' rationale, he deemed that this application could be approved through policy and was not in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to refuse planning permission. In respect of policies COU15 and COU16, they required that the proposal sympathetically integrate into the countryside and that it not have a detrimental impact on the rural character. Councillor Trimble believed that this proposal met both of those requirements. In relation to clustering, that was not specifically defined as being immediately adjacent to or restricted by a distance. There was an element of judgement whether there was a visual link or whether it was within the scope of existing buildings. Councillor Trimble saw no reason why he could not argue that this proposal clustered in. It was on the periphery of the settlement and to bring it any closer would negate the appeal of the proposal itself;

(vi) LA05/2023/0022/F – Proposed 4 glamping pods including associated communal/recreation area, parking, access paths with new ranch type fencing to the site boundary 135m north of 14b Feumore Road, Lisburn
(Contd)

- the Chair, Alderman M Gregg, concurred with Councillor Trimble's comments. The appeal of glamping pods was their isolation. He did not agree with Officers that the application should be refused and that it was an exception to policy. He considered that the application did fit with policy TOU3. By the nature of this accommodation, it was demonstrated that it would not be within a settlement. He stated that the car park element of the proposal did cluster with other buildings within the settlement and the pods were visually linked to the car park;
- Councillor U Mackin referred to the economic benefits associated with a new business venture such as this one and stated that this should be taken into account. He too considered that, by the nature of the accommodation being sought, it could not be located with the settlement. In respect of the conversion of other buildings, those may or may not be within the control of the applicant. Councillor Mackin stated that new businesses should be encouraged. In respect of the requirement that the proposal be associated with existing approved tourism accommodation, that was not possible as this was a new venture. Councillor Mackin considered that the application should be approved and that there was adequate justification for that. In respect of policies COU15 and COU16 around clustering, admittedly the site was on the edge of a development or close to it. The applicant had confirmed that the farm could be seen very clearly from the site and was within a 100 metre distance and, therefore, it did cluster. The overriding policies were TOU3 and TOU4;
- Councillor P Catney stated that, whilst he had sympathy for the applicant, he was in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to refuse planning permission. He knew the area very well and knew businesses that operated in the area. Taking on board tourist amenity, as defined by Tourism NI, the view of Lough Neagh was not considered as tourism, but Lough Neagh itself was tourism. Councillor Catney deemed that, with tweaking and working there was probably a viable tourism business in this proposal, but looking at the criteria as set out and delivered to the Committee, he was in agreement with the recommendation of the Planning Officer. He further voiced concern regarding the potential impact on surrounding wildlife and the fact that approval of this application could set a precedent;
- Councillor A Martin stated that the applicant had vision and it was good for a young person to have that. However, the application fell down on policy TOU4 in that it was not an extension of existing tourist accommodation. If this was approved, Councillor Martin could apply to site glamping pods on his farm. He was in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to refuse planning permission;
- Alderman O Gawith referred to policy TOU3 and the point made by Officers that it had not been demonstrated that there were no suitable opportunities by means of the conversion and reuse of a suitable building or the replacement of a suitable building for tourist accommodation. He stated that glamping pods were a very specific type of tourist accommodation and it was not possible to convert an old building into a glamping pod; therefore,

- (vi) LA05/2023/0022/F – Proposed 4 glamping pods including associated communal/recreation area, parking, access paths with new ranch type fencing to the site boundary 135m north of 14b Feumore Road, Lisburn (Contd)

that criteria did not apply. In respect of policy TOU4, Officers had laid out their objections to the surrounding tourism offers and considered an attraction 1.5 miles away to be too far. Alderman Gawith pointed out that the glamping pods were aimed at people who wanted to get away for a bit. They could walk, cycle or drive to Sandy Bay Marina, where there was parking available. He did not consider that the objection in respect of TOU4 applied and stated that he was not in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to refuse planning permission; and

- Councillor G Thompson stated that she was not in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to refuse planning permission. This proposal was for a glamping site and, by its nature, did not have to be sited within a settlement. A 1.5 mile walk to the nearest tourist attraction would not be a problem for the people this accommodation would attract;

At this point, it was proposed by Councillor P Catney and seconded by Councillor A Martin that the application be deferred to allow for a site visit. On a vote being taken, the proposal was declared 'lost', the voting being 2 in favour and 6 against.

With the indulgence of the Chair, a number of Members' queries were addressed by the Head of Planning & Capital Development.

"In Committee"

At this point, it was proposed by Councillor P Catney, seconded by Alderman O Gawith and agreed to go 'into committee' in order that legal advice could be sought. Those members of the public in attendance left the meeting (2.49 pm).

Legal advice was provided by the Legal Advisor in respect of this application.

Resumption of Normal Business

It was proposed by Councillor P Catney, seconded by Councillor G Thompson and agreed to come out of committee and normal business was resumed (3.16 pm).

When the members of the public returned to the public gallery, the Chair, Alderman M Gregg, stated that the meeting had gone 'into committee' to seek legal advice, which was good practice given that there seemed to be a level of disagreement with the Planning Officer's recommendation on this application.

Having listened to the legal advice given, Councillor G Thompson proposed that the application be deferred to allow for a site visit in order that clarification could be provided in respect of distance and clustering. This proposal was seconded by Councillor P Catney and, on a vote being taken, declared 'carried', the voting being 5 in favour and 3 against.

Adjournment of Meeting

The Chair, Alderman M Gregg, declared the meeting adjourned at this point for a comfort break 3.19 pm).

Resumption of Meeting

The meeting was resumed at 3.29 pm.

- (vii) LA05/2022/0538/F – Proposed farm dwelling adjacent to and south of 9a Pothill Lane

Having declared an interest in this application, Councillor A Martin did not return to the Council Chamber during its consideration.

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

The Committee received Mr A Johnson, accompanied by Mr M Malcolmson, to speak in support of the application and a number of Members' queries were responded to.

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

Debate

There were no comments made at the debate stage.

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, Alderman O Gawith, Councillor G Thompson, Councillor Trimble and the Chair, Alderman M Gregg **(6)**

Against: None **(0)**

Abstain: Councillor U Mackin **(1)**

Councillor A Martin returned to the meeting at 3.54 pm.

- (viii) LA05/2022/0226/O – Site for dwelling on land between 6 Ballykeel Road and 1 Glebe Road, Hillsborough

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

- (viii) LA05/2022/0226/O – Site for dwelling on land between 6 Ballykeel Road and 1 Glebe Road, Hillsborough (Contd)

The Committee received Mr N Coffey, accompanied by Mr A McCready, to speak in support of the application and a number of Members' queries were responded to.

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

Debate:

During debate:

- Councillor N Trimble stated that there was a cluster of development at this location that was clearly outwith the farm. The site itself was on a farm, albeit a disused farm for the last 5 years. If this application was approved, the outbuildings would go and the farm would cease to exist so the farm issue would totally disappear and the argument that the proposal would add to ribbon development would not apply. There was a cluster of development outside the farm, ie a crossroads, Orange Hall, etc. Councillor Trimble stated that he was not in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to refuse planning permission;
- Councillor U Mackin pointed out that policy COU2 (a) stated that the cluster of development lay outside a farm and consisted of 4 or more established buildings. It did mention the type of buildings that would be excluded. There were 4 buildings within this cluster, and many more, with the focal point of the crossroads and Orange Hall. At the site visit, Members had stood at the side of the road and could observe the crossroads, Orange Hall, a property at Glebe Road, a long building and numbers 6 and 8 Ballykeel Road, so there was clearly a cluster. Councillor Mackin did not believe that COU2 (a) referred to a cluster of buildings on a farm. The cluster of development here lay outside the farm. In relation to COU16, Councillor Mackin did not consider that the proposal would adversely impact the rural character. Given that the current buildings on the site were in a state of disrepair, this proposal would actually improve the rural character. Councillor Mackin also stated that there would be no addition to existing ribbon development. He was not in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to refuse planning permission.;
- Alderman O Gawith referred to one of the refusal reasons offered by the Planning Officer relating to COU8 and the creation of ribbon development. If the current outbuildings were taken away, there would be a space that would have to be built on and that would create ribboning on Ballykeel Road. Reference was also made to fact that the site was not a small gap, sufficient to accommodate 2 dwellings; therefore, the proposal did not meet that requirement of COU8;
- the Chair, Alderman M Gregg, stated that he understood the point made by Alderman Gawith regarding COU8, in that if the site was judged as a small gap, it would have to be large enough to accommodate 2 dwellings. However, the difference here was that there was already something on the site. He suggested that perhaps COU4 was the appropriate policy to measure against rather than COU8;

(viii) LA05/2022/0226/O – Site for dwelling on land between 6 Ballykeel Road and 1 Glebe Road, Hillsborough (Contd)

- Councillor N Trimble stated that, if seeking to approve the application under COU8, he would agree that there was not a sufficient gap to accommodate 2 dwellings. However, based on what had been presented, he considered that approval could be granted under COU2 – a new dwelling in an existing cluster; and
- Councillor A Martin stated that in relation to COU1, erecting a new house at this site would look very well. In respect of COU2, he pointed out that this was not an active farm, so that policy fell. In respect of COU8, there was already a ribbon of development in existence and in relation to COU16, he did not consider that the proposed development would have an adverse impact on the area's rural character. Councillor Martin was not in support of the recommendation of the Planning Officer to refuse planning permission.

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: None **(0)**

Against: Councillor S Burns, Councillor U Mackin, Councillor A Martin, Councillor G Thompson, Councillor Trimble and the Chair, Alderman M Gregg **(6)**

Abstain: Councillor P Catney and Alderman A Gawith **(2)**

Given that the Officer recommendation to refuse planning permission had fallen, it was proposed by Councillor N Trimble, seconded by Councillor U Mackin and, on a vote being taken, agreed that the application be approved, the voting being as follows:

Vote

In favour: Councillor S Burns, Councillor U Mackin, Councillor A Martin, Councillor G Thompson, Councillor Trimble and the Chair, Alderman M Gregg **(6)**

Against: None **(0)**

Abstain: Councillor P Catney and Alderman A Gawith **(2)**

- (viii) LA05/2022/0226/O – Site for dwelling on land between 6 Ballykeel Road and 1 Glebe Road, Hillsborough (Contd)

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

- In respect of COU2, the application met all the criteria of a new dwelling in an existing cluster. To engage with the recommended refusal reasons on COU2, in relation to (a) there was a clear demonstration that there was an existing cluster outwith the farm, complete with focal point; and (e) the consolidation of this cluster through rounding off would not intrude into the open countryside or create a ribbon of development;
- COU8 would fall away as a refusal reason if COU2 was met;
- In respect of COU16, the proposed development would not have an adverse impact on the rural character of the area, rather it would enhance the area as it would be removing dilapidated structures. The proposed development would not be unduly prominent on the landscape; would be sited to cluster with an established group of buildings; respected the traditional pattern of settlement in the area; did not mar the distinction between the development and surrounding countryside; would not adversely impact on rural character or residential amenity; all necessary services were available and could be provided without significant adverse effect on the environment or character of the facility; impact of ancillary works would not have an adverse impact on rural character; and access to the public road could be achieved without prejudice to road safety or significantly increasing the flow of traffic;
- COU1 as a refusal reason would fall away as refusal reasons under COU2, COU8 and COU16 had been addressed.

It was agreed that authority be delegated to the Head of Planning & Capital Development to formulate the precise wording of conditions relating to planning permission for this application.

4.7 Council Validation Checklist Requirements

It was proposed by Councillor P Catney, seconded by Councillor A Martin and agreed (a) to note the Council Validation Checklist Requirements document and associated validation matrix; and (b) that the document be presented to the September meeting of the Regeneration and Growth Committee for decision, published on the Council website and implemented with effect from the date on which the proposed legislation takes effect.

4.8 Notification by Telecommunication Operator(s) of Intention to Utilise Permitted Development Rights

It was proposed by Alderman O Gawith, seconded by Councillor P Catney and agreed to note from the report, information regarding notification by a telecommunication operator to utilise Permitted Development Rights at a location in the Council area.

4.9 Local Development Plan 2032 Quarterly Update

It was proposed by Councillor G Thompson, seconded by Councillor N Trimble and agreed to note the update information in respect of the Local Development Plan 2032, together with the contents of correspondence regarding NI Water economic constraints and wastewater treatment works capacity.

4.10 Enforcement Quarterly Update

It was proposed by Councillor P Catney, seconded by Councillor N Trimble and agreed to note the quarterly update in respect of enforcement cases.

5. Any Other Business

5.1 Date of Next Meeting

The Chair, Alderman M Gregg, advised that the next meeting of the Planning Committee would be held on Monday, 7 October. He also reminded Members that a special meeting would be convened before that date to consider planning application LA05/2022/0033/F, as agreed earlier.

Conclusion of the Meeting

At the conclusion of the meeting, the Chair, Alderman M Gregg, thanked those present for their attendance.

There being no further business, the meeting was terminated at 5.16 pm.

Chair/Mayor