

# Planning Committee

Tuesday, 16th February, 2021

## MEETING OF PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD REMOTELY VIA MICROSOFT TEAMS

Members present: Councillor Hussey (Chairperson);  
Councillors Brooks, Matt Collins,  
Garrett, Groogan, Hutchinson,  
Maskey, McCullough, McKeown,  
Murphy, Nicholl and O'Hara.

In attendance: Mr. A. Thatcher, Director of Planning and  
Building Control;  
Mr. E. Baker, Planning Manager  
(Development Management);  
Ms. N. Largey, Divisional Solicitor;  
Ms. C. Donnelly, Democratic Services Officer; and  
Mrs. L. McLornan, Democratic Services Officer.

### Apologies

Apologies for inability to attend were reported from Councillors Carson and Hanvey.

### Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of 19th January were taken as read and signed as correct. It was reported that those minutes had been adopted by the Council at its meeting on 1st February, subject to the omission of those matters in respect of which the Council had delegated its powers to the Committee.

### Declarations of Interest

Councillor Maskey declared an interest in item 6g, LA04/2020/1417/F – Forthriver Linear Park, in that he was an employee of Intercomm Ireland Ltd, who had partnered with Sustrans on the PEACE IV Project to recruit and train volunteers for both the Cycle and Walking leads at Forthriver Linear Park. He left the room for the duration of the discussion on the item and did not participate in the vote.

### Restricted Items

**The information contained in the report associated with the following 3 items is restricted in accordance with Part 1 of Schedule 6 of the Local Government Act (Northern Ireland) 2014.**

Resolved – That the Committee agrees to exclude the members of the Press and public from the Committee meeting during discussion of

these items as, due to the nature of the items, there would be a disclosure of exempt information as described in Section 42(4) and Section 6 of the Local Government Act (NI) 2014.

**Revenue Estimates & District Rate 2021/22**

(Mr. R. Cregan, Director of Finance and Resources, attended in connection with this item).

The Committee considered a report, which had been prepared by the Director of Finance and Resources, in relation to the establishment of the District Rate and the compilation of the Estimates of Revenue Expenditure for the year 2021/2022.

The Director outlined that the paper would not be subject to call-in as it would cause an unreasonable delay which would be prejudicial to the Council and the public's interest in striking the district rate by the legislative deadline of 1st March, 2021.

He referred to the cash limit for the Planning Committee for 2021/2022, as recommended by the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee, at its meeting on 22nd January, and outlined the next steps in the rate setting process leading to the setting of the district rate by Council at its meeting in March 2021.

Following consideration, the Committee noted the next steps in the rate setting process and:

- agreed that the report would not be subject to call-in, given that it would cause an unreasonable delay and would be prejudicial to both the Council and the public's interests in striking the district rate by the legislative deadline of 1st March, 2021; and
- agreed a cash limit for the Planning Committee for 2020/21 of £1,362,893 and the individual service cash limits.

**Finance Update**

The Committee was provided with an update on the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on the Council's financial position, and a strategy to address the forecast deficit and the mitigation measures which had and would be taken as the situation evolved.

Noted.

**Recruitment of Director (Operational)  
of Planning and Building Control**

(Mr. J. Tully, Director of City and Organisational Strategy, attended in connection with this item).

The Director of City and Organisational Strategy advised the Committee that Mr. A. Thatcher, Director of Planning and Building Control, would be leaving the Council

in a few months time to take up the post of Assistant Director (Growth & Housing) in Wigan Council.

He explained that a report would be tabled at the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee later that month, requesting permission to recruit the replacement post of Director (Operational) of Planning and Building Control on a permanent basis, and for the selection panel for the post to comprise three Elected Members from the Planning Committee.

The Committee was advised that the post would be publicly advertised in line with normal practice and that Chairperson (or his nominee), the Deputy Chairperson (or his nominee) and a third Elected Member, from a different political party, would be required to attend four selection panel meetings as part of the recruitment exercise.

The Committee agreed that:

- three Elected Members from the Planning Committee who, along with the Chief Executive (or her nominee) and a Council Director, would balance the selection panel for the post in terms of gender and community background;
- the selection panel would comprise the Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson of the Planning Committee (or their nominees) and Councillor Groogan; and
- a targeted and timely proactive executive search approach be initiated to ensure a strong and competent applicant field was secured for this specialist post.

#### **Pre-Emptive Site Visits**

The Committee agreed to undertake pre-emptive site visits in respect of the following applications:

- **LA04/2020/1943/F and LA04/2020/1944/LBC** - Residential conversion of the existing listed structures to form 57 apartments, including maisonettes and loft style studios ranging from 1-3 bedrooms in size to include 20% social housing at 3-19 (Former Warehouse) Rydalmere Street; and
- **LA04/2020/1158/F** - Demolition of existing building and erection of 65No Apartments including 20% social housing at 1-5 Redcar Street.

#### **Planning Decisions Issued**

The Committee noted a list of decisions which had been taken under the delegated authority of the Director of Planning and Building Control, together with all other planning decisions which had been issued by the Planning Department between 12th January and 8th February.

#### **Planning Appeals Notified**

The Committee noted the receipt of correspondence in respect of a number of planning appeals which had been submitted to the Planning Appeals Commission,

together with the outcomes of a range of hearings which had been considered by the Commission.

### Planning Applications

**THE COMMITTEE DEALT WITH THE FOLLOWING ITEMS IN PURSUANCE OF THE POWERS DELEGATED TO IT BY THE COUNCIL UNDER STANDING ORDER 37(e)**

**LA04/2020/0659/F and LA04/2020/0669/DCA – Refurbishment of existing four storey terrace including alteration, extension to rear, partial demolition and reinstatement. Part change of use from art galleries to two cafes at ground floor. Retention of offices within existing building at second, third and fourth floor. Erection of new 13 storey aparthotel building to rear and associated works including public realm improvements at 29-33 Bedford Street**

The Planning Manager provided the Committee with an overview of the details of major application.

He outlined the key issues which had been considered in the assessment of the proposed development, including the principle of hotel and café use at the location, the impact on built heritage and the principle of demolition in the conservation area, scale, height, massing and design, the impact on traffic and parking, site drainage, the consideration of economic benefits, amenity and developers contributions.

The Members were advised that the site was located within the city centre, the Commercial Character Area and the Linen Conservation Area.

He reminded the Committee that it had previously considered the application at its meeting on 13th October, 2020, when it had resolved to approve it, subject to notification to the Department for Infrastructure (DFI). The Members were reminded that, the notification had been necessary because the resolution to approve the application was contrary to the views of a statutory consultee, the Historic Environment Division (HED).

DFI had since advised the Council that it did not consider it necessary for the application to be referred to it for determination and nor did the associated application for Conservation Area Consent. He pointed out that the Committee had held a Pre Determination Hearing on the application immediately prior to the commencement of the monthly meeting.

The Planning Manager reminded the Committee that, since its meeting of 13th October, 2020, one additional objection had been received from Belfast Civic Trust, raising issues regarding the height of the new build portion of the proposal, the design of the new build portion and that the proposal detracted from the streetscape of the Linen Conservation Area. He advised that the issues had been addressed within the Case Officers report.

The Committee was advised that DfI Roads, Environmental Health, the NI Environment Agency, Rivers Agency, Historic Environment Division (HED) and NI Water had all been consulted, in addition to the Urban Design Officer, the Conservation Officer, the Economic Development unit and the City Regeneration and Development Team within BCC.

The Planning Manager explained that both HED and the Conservation Officer were content with the design and proposed interventions to the front terrace, however, they maintained an objection to the 13-storey element on the basis of height, in that they felt it was too dominant on the existing listed building. The Committee was advised that officers felt that the design was respectful to its surrounding environment.

The Committee's attention was drawn to the Late Items pack, whereby the applicant had advised that it was no longer objecting to the proposed noise condition and understood that it would be included on any decision notice issued by the Council.

The Chairperson welcomed Mr. B. McKerverey, Historic Environment Division (HED) to the meeting. He advised that HED felt that the impact of the 13 storey element would be very dominant, particularly on the approach from Ormeau Avenue, and that it was inappropriate.

A number of Members stated that they had concerns regarding the proposed materials to be used for the tall tower and that they felt due regard had not been given to the concerns raised by the Conservation officer and HED.

The Planning Manger explained that the Council, as part of the discharge of condition process, would consult HED, the Conservation officer and the Urban Design officer in relation to the materials proposed and that the samples would be required to be viewed on site.

In response to a further Member's comments regarding the conditions which were attached to planning permission in relation to the materials used, the Director of Planning and Building Control assured the Committee that enforcement action by officers in respect of the materials to be used had increased over the past number of years. He added that a condition in relation to seeing a sample of the materials on site was to ensure that the sheen and tone of the material, for example, would fit in with the surrounding area and that they were deemed of appropriate quality by officers.

In response to a Member's query regarding the rationale for the 90 day stay limit, the Planning Manager pointed out that the emerging Local Development Plan (LDP)

F  
1144

**Planning Committee**  
**Tuesday, 16th February, 2021**

included the same guidance. The Director of Planning and Building Control added that a 90 day limit was widely used by planning authorities in London boroughs.

Moved by Councillor Groogan,  
Seconded by Councillor Matt Collins,

That the Committee agrees to refuse the application as it is contrary to policies BH 11 and 12 of PPS 6, in that the height, scale and massing of the proposed thirteen storey building, in relation to the listed buildings and to the Conservation Area, is inappropriate, and would detract from them, and delegates power to the Director of Planning and Building Control for the final wording of the refusal reasons.

On a vote, five members voted for the proposal and six against and it was declared lost.

Moved by Councillor Hussey,  
Seconded by Councillor McCullough,

That the Committee agrees to grant approval to the application, subject to the imposing of the conditions set out within the case officer's report and delegates power to the Director of Planning and Building Control for the final wording of the conditions.

On a vote, seven members voted for the proposal and five against and it was declared carried.

**LA04/2020/1022/F - Demolition of existing vacant buildings and structures to the rear of the site and alterations, refurbishment and extension to existing terraced dwelling at 1 Canada Street to provide 6no. apartments plus associated site works at 1 and 1a Canada Street**

Before presentation of the application commenced, the Committee agreed to defer consideration of the application to enable a site visit to be undertaken to allow the Committee to acquaint itself with the location and the proposals at first hand and to request further information on sustainable transport.

The Committee noted, as the application had not been presented, that all Members' present at the next meeting, would be able to take part in the debate and vote on this item.

**LA04/2019/1797/F & LA04/2019/1795/LBC – Redevelopment of listed buildings and lands to the rear for a residential development comprising of 7no. townhouses and 34no. apartments (41 Units) with associated landscaping, parking and site works on derelict lands at and to the rear of Nos 34-36 The Mount**

The Principal Planning officer provided the Committee with an overview of the application.

She reported that the main issues to be considered in the assessment of the scheme included the principle of development, the design and impact on the character and appearance of the area, the impact on listed buildings, the impact on neighbouring amenity, density, private and shared amenity space and access, movement and parking.

The Members were advised that the application site was within Belfast Urban Area Plan 2001 (BUAP) as zoned within a Housing Action Area and, within the Draft BMAP (2004), the site was designated as Land Zoned for Housing. The Planning Appeals Commission (PAC) made no reference to proposed land use designation within BMAP enquiry, indicating no objections were received regarding land zoning, within the dBMAP 2015 the site was zoned as land for housing.

The proposal had been assessed against and was considered to comply with PPS3, PPS6, PPS7, PPS7 Addendum, PPS8, PPS12, PPS15 the SPPS, BAUP 2001 and Draft BMAP 2004.

The Principal Planning officer explained that the proposal would contribute to the restoration of a Georgian terrace, which would provide 12 units, and that the restoration of the Listed Building element would be secured by a Section 76 Legal Agreement. The remainder would be built to form a quad within the Mount, with a central amenity and parking area. She explained that the site would result in 41 new homes and was acceptable in terms of density, design, amenity provision, highway safety, parking and flooding. The Committee was advised that officers had concluded that the scheme would bring a positive benefit to the site and locality, given that it had been vacant for many years, and that the Listed Buildings were in a state of disrepair.

The Members were advised that the scheme would include 34 parking spaces within the site and a number of travel cards for residents, which considered acceptable given its location within a highly accessible location close to bus, rail, the city centre and district centres.

She reported that Rivers Agency, Historic Environment Division, NI Water, BCC Environmental Health and DfI Roads Service had been consulted and had offered no objection to the proposal.

The Committee was advised that nine letters of objection had been received, with stated concerns from six individuals. The issues raised included road safety, parking congestion, social housing provision, noise impact on human health, loss of greenspace/wildlife, overlooking, density and impact on listed buildings. The Planning officer explained that the issues had been addressed within the Case officer's report. She added that, following amendments to the scheme, only one repeat objection had been received, regarding a loss of greenspace.

The Committee's attention was drawn to the Late Items pack, whereby Members noted that reports had been submitted to Environmental Health and remediation

F  
1146

**Planning Committee**  
**Tuesday, 16th February, 2021**

conditions would therefore be applied. The Principal Planning officer explained that conditions would be finalised prior to the Decision Notice being issued under the authority delegated to the Director.

The Principal Planning officer explained that, in relation to the Section 76 Agreement, delegated authority was sought for the Director of Planning and Building Control to finalise the wording to secure the works to the listed building and to include Travel Passes for nine properties within the proposed development.

The Chairperson commended the applicant and architect on the impressive design for the scheme.

The Committee granted approval to the application, subject to the imposing of the conditions set out within the case officer's report and delegated power to the Director of Planning and Building Control for the final wording of the conditions and to finalise the Section 76 Agreement if required, subject to no new substantive planning issues being raised by third parties.

**LA04/2021/0035/F - House Extension at  
74a Shandon Park**

The Committee was provided with the details of the application.

The Principal Planning officer explained that the application was before the Committee as, under Section 3.7.5 (b) of the Scheme of Delegation, applications made by Council staff at senior management grade (PO12) or above were not delegated and were required to be considered by the Committee.

She outlined that the proposed extension would not adversely impact the character and appearance of the surrounding area. It was considered to be sympathetic in its built form, scale, massing and appearance with the existing property and with surrounding neighbouring properties. It was considered that the proposal would not raise any issues in relation to overshadowing or loss of light to neighbouring dwellings as the 60 degree angles test had been satisfied. The Members were advised that the proposal would fall within the scope of permitted development under the General Permitted Development Order.

The Principal Planning officer clarified that, contrary to an error within the report, no objections had been received in respect of the application.

The Committee granted approval to the application, subject to the imposing of the conditions set out within the case officer's report and delegated power to the Director of Planning and Building Control for the final wording of the conditions.

**LA04/2020/0845/O - Outline planning permission for a mixed use  
regeneration proposal with all matters reserved for retirement  
living at plot 6, medical or health services at plot 9, multi storey car  
park, local retail uses, restaurant and cafe uses, leisure and gym  
facilities at plot 8, associated internal access roads, associated**



**new public realm and amenity open space including central plaza and access from Upper Lisburn Road (as per planning approval reference LA04/2018/0040/F); and no matters reserved for residential development (81 apartments) at plot 3 with ground floor local retail use/restaurant and cafe uses/leisure and gym facilities, associated landscaping, car parking and access from Upper Lisburn Road (as per planning approval reference LA04/2018/0040/F) and reconfiguration of temporary car park to the rear of King's Hall (approved under LA04/2018/0040/F)**

The Planning Manager provided the Members with the key aspects of the application for a mixed use regeneration proposal which included:

- all matters reserved for retirement living at Plot 6, medical or health services at Plot 9, multi storey car park, local retail uses, restaurant and cafe uses, leisure and gym facilities at Plot 8, associated internal access roads, associated new public realm and amenity open space including central plaza and access from Upper Lisburn Road (as per planning approval LA04/2018/0040/F); and
- no matters reserved for residential development (81 apartments) at Plot 3, with ground floor local retail use/restaurant and cafe uses/leisure and gym facilities, associated landscaping, car parking and access from Upper Lisburn Road (as per planning approval LA04/2018/0040/F) and reconfiguration of temporary car park to the rear of King's Hall (approved under LA04/2018/0040/F).

The Committee was advised that the application was accompanied by an Environmental Statement and a suite of supporting documents including a Masterplan and Parameter Plan, which set out the proposed maximum height. The Planning Manager advised that a Design Code had also been provided, which set out key design principles for each plot. He outlined that subsequent Reserved Matters applications would be required to follow the principles set out in the Design Code, which would be required by planning condition, in order to give certainty regarding the final quality and cohesion across the development.

The Members were provided with the main issues which had been considered during the assessment of the application, including height, scale and massing; design, layout and materials; impact on surrounding amenity; impact on the Listed King's Hall; access, movement and parking; and drainage.

The Committee was advised that three objections had been received raising concerns regarding the access arrangements into the King's Hall Site from Balmoral Avenue. The Planning Manager outlined that the site would be accessed from the Lisburn Road, via a new signalised junction, which had been approved under Phase 1 (LA04/2018/0040/F). He advised the Members that consideration of access arrangements to/from Balmoral Avenue had previously been considered in the context of earlier applications for Phase 1, the independent living units and the care home. He explained that no through access was proposed from the Balmoral Avenue access

to the new signalised junction on the Lisburn Road, and, therefore, traffic would be segregated.

The Planning Manager advised the Committee that the application was a standalone application in its own right and was not dependent on other development on the wider site.

He pointed out that consultees had no objections to the proposed development. Following re-consultation, after the submission of further information, he explained that a final consultation was pending from DFI Roads, which would include proposed conditions. The Members were advised that DFI Roads had advised in a previous consultation response that it had no objections.

The Planning Manager drew the Committee's attention to the Late Items pack, whereby the applicant had submitted a rooftop plan. He explained that the plans had been uploaded to the Planning Portal and demonstrated that the elements on the roof of Plot 3 related to lift overruns, which would extend 500mm above roof level, but would sit below the parapet level of the building and would therefore be screened from view.

A Member raised concerns with the 607 parking spaces which were proposed as part of the application, in that it would result in an increase in traffic congestion at an already busy junction, as well as the impact it would have on air pollution. He highlighted that the air pollution in the Stockman's Lane area of Belfast was already extremely high and he was surprised that the report only seemed to focus on the air pollution as a result of the short term construction works and did not highlight the long term effects that the development would have on air quality.

In response, the Planning Manager advised the Committee that DFI Roads had considered the Transport Assessment for the application in terms of its impact on the wider road network, and that it did not consider there to be any overriding concerns. He also advised the Members that the Environmental Statement had been scrutinised by Environmental Health officers and that they had no technical objections to the application, including impact on air quality, given the number of proposed mitigation measures. He confirmed that the site was in a particularly sustainable location, given its proximity to bus and rail routes, and provided good access to local amenities. He added that the site was outside the Air Quality Management Area.

The Chairperson welcomed Ms. E. Walker and Mr. M. Gordon, agents, and Mr. A. Murray, architect, to the meeting. Ms. Walker advised the Committee that:

- the Transport Assessment which had been submitted with the application assessed the entire development of the King's Hall site to ensure that the cumulative impact of traffic generation was assessed;
- the traffic generated from the entire site had been included within the modelling for the air quality assessment, which had been subject to scrutiny from Environmental Health;
- a Construction Environmental Management Plan would be provided, including details to be signed off by Environmental Health such as dust management and traffic control during the construction period;

- only the appropriate number of car parking spaces to serve the development were included, in order to keep traffic to a minimum; and
- the Travel Plan included access to sustainable transport and cycle parking, and the site was in a sustainable location.

A number of Members expressed concerns in relation to the impact that the application could have on air quality and pointed out that the site was around 170metres from an Air Quality Management Area. A number of Members queried whether the mitigation measures proposed went far enough.

The Planning Manager advised the Committee of Environmental Health's response to the application and that there were no grounds to refuse permission because of concerns about air quality. He suggested that the Committee proceeded to determine the application as it stood but might wish to consider holding a separate training session on Air Quality at a future Workshop.

Moved by Councillor Maskey  
Seconded by Councillor Groogan and

Resolved - That the Committee agrees:

- to defer consideration of the application to enable a site visit to be undertaken to allow the Committee to acquaint itself with the location and the proposals at first hand;
- that further information be submitted in respect of air quality; and
- that an Environmental Health officer would attend the meeting in respect of the application.

**LA04/2020/0679/F – Replacement spectator stand (1246) to include parking provision, changing rooms & associated required football rooms, offices on upper floors, new vehicle access off Shore Road & relocating 1 floodlight as previously approved under application Z/2015/0018/F at Crusaders Football Club, St Vincent Street**

(Councillor Nicholl left the meeting at this point in proceedings)

The Senior Planning officer provided the details of the application to the Committee. She outlined that the main issues which had been considered during the assessment case included the principle of development, impact on the character and appearance of the area, impact on amenity, health considerations and road safety.

She explained that the proposal was for the same scheme that had previously been approved under reference Z/2015/0018/F, with the exception of the relocated floodlight. The Committee was advised that the current application had been submitted prior to the expiry of the previous permission and was essentially an in-time renewal. Given that there had been no material change in policy context or site circumstances since the previous decision, the current proposal was still considered acceptable.

She drew the Members' attention to the Late Items pack. She explained that, as there was a small portion of flood plain under the existing stand, and that the replacement stand would cover the same footprint, there was no increase in flood risk. However, she explained that a Drainage Assessment condition had been recommended to ensure adequate measures were put in place to ensure appropriate drainage for the site.

She outlined that one letter of objection had been received relating to traffic, congestion and the potential impact from floodlights.

The Committee was advised that Environmental Health had been consulted and was content with the proposal subject to a condition being attached to the decision requiring a Construction Environmental Management Plan to be submitted prior to the development commencing, to minimise any potential construction impacts.

The Senior Planning officer added that Environmental Health was content with the proposal in terms of the impact of noise and potential impact from floodlights. As there was no increase in the capacity of the stadium, the proposal was not considered to result in any material increase in potential noise being generated over the existing established football stadium. Additionally, due to the floodlights being positioned below the height of the proposed stand, light spill was not considered to be an issue.

NIEA, DfI Roads and NI Water had also been consulted in respect of the application and had offered no objection.

The Committee granted approval to the application, subject to the imposing of the conditions set out within the case officer's report, and delegated power to the Director of Planning and Building Control for the final wording of the conditions.

**LA04/2020/1417/F - Part of the Forth Meadow Community Greenway project, section 1 proposes new footpaths, path widening and resurfacing, a new park entrance and new wayfinding signage and street furniture at the boundaries of or adjacent to Glencairn Park as well as at the Forthriver Road and Forthriver Crescent (Project previously known as PEACE IV Shared Spaces project)**

(Councillor McCullough left the meeting at this point in proceedings)

(Councillor Maskey, having declared an interest in the item, left the meeting for the duration of the discussion and did not participate in the vote.)

The Senior Planning officer provided the Committee with an overview of Belfast City Council's proposal for an environmental improvement scheme at three entrances to Glencairn Park. Two of the entrances were from Forthriver Crescent while the other was accessed from Forthriver Road. She explained that the works included new footpaths, path widening and resurfacing, a new park entrance and new wayfinding signage and street furniture.

The Members were advised of the issues which had been considered during the assessment, including the principle of development, the design and the impact on Glencairn Historic Park.

The Senior Planning officer outlined that Glencairn Park was designated as lands reserved for landscape, amenity or recreation use in the BUAP and as open space in draft BMAP.

The Committee was advised that officers felt that the proposals would complement and improve the area and complied with the relevant policy and area designations.

The Members were advised that DFI Roads and NIEA had been consulted and had offered no objection to the proposal.

The Committee granted approval to the application, subject to the imposing of the conditions set out within the case officer's report and delegated power to the Director of Planning and Building Control for the final wording of the conditions.

**LA04/2020/1322/F - Various park entrances  
and signage/wayfinding installations bordering  
at the Forthriver Linear Park as well as at  
Somerdale Park and the Crumlin Road**

(Councillor Maskey re-joined the meeting at this point)

The Committee was provided with the key aspects of the Belfast City Council proposal for an environmental improvement scheme at three locations on the Crumlin Road, Somerdale Park and within the Forthriver Linear Park.

The Senior Planning officer outlined the issues which had been considered during the assessment, including the principle of development, the design of the proposal and the impact on a site of Local Nature Conservation Importance.

She advised the Members that Forthriver Linear Park was designated as lands reserved for landscape, amenity or recreation use in the BUAP. The Committee was advised that the Crumlin Road was designated as an arterial route while the Forthriver Linear Park was designated as open space and a Site of Local Nature Conservation Importance within draft BMAP.

The Members were advised that officers felt that the proposals would complement and improve the area and comply with the relevant policy and area plan designations.

She reported that DFI Roads and NIEA had been consulted in respect of the application and had offered no objection to the proposal.

The Committee granted approval to the application, subject to the imposing of the conditions set out within the case officer's report and delegated power to the Director of Planning and Building Control for the final wording of the conditions.

**LA04/2020/2216/F - Replacing existing kiosk  
with upgraded kiosks which includes covered  
area on lands in front of Calvert House, 23 Castle Place**

The Senior Planning officer provided the Committee with the details of the application which sought the replacement of an existing kiosk with upgraded kiosks which included a covered area. She explained that the proposal to replace the kiosk had ultimately arisen from the negative impacts on the city centre felt by the Primark Fire and the Covid-19 pandemic.

The Members were advised that the overarching aim was to encourage local communities, pedestrians and shoppers back into the city centre, particularly back to Castle Place, building on previous successful attempts to reactivate and pedestrianise this key node of Belfast city centre.

The Senior Planning officer explained that the site was located within the Belfast City Centre Conservation Area and that, overall it was felt that the proposal would enhance the character and appearance of the Conservation Area and would not be detrimental to the setting of nearby listed buildings, amenity of neighbouring properties or harmful to highway safety.

She outlined the key issues in the assessment of the proposed development and highlighted that it was considered to comply with the SPPS, BUAP, Draft BMAP, PPS3 and PPS6.

The Committee was advised that Historic Environment Division, Environmental Health and Conservation and Heritage had been consulted and had offered no objections. The Senior Planning officer explained that while a response from DFI Roads was outstanding, it had indicated that it was unlikely to object to the application.

The Committee granted approval to the application, subject to no objection from DFI Roads and to the imposing of the conditions set out within the case officer's report and delegated power to the Director of Planning and Building Control for the final wording of the conditions.

Chairperson