Planning Committee

Tuesday, 13th February, 2024

HYBRID MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Members present:	Councillor Garrett (Chairperson); Aldermen Lawlor, McCullough and Rodgers; Councillors Anglin, Bell, Bradley, T. Brooks, Carson, Doherty, P. Donnelly, S. Douglas Doran, Ferguson, Groogan, Hanvey, Maskey, McCann, Nic Bhranair and Whyte.
Also present:	Councillor Flynn.
In attendance:	Ms. K. Bentley, Director of Planning and Building Control; Ms. N. Largey, City Solicitor; Mr. K. McDonnell, Solicitor (Regulatory and Planning) Mr. E. Baker, Planning Manager (Development Management); Ms. C. Reville, Principal Planning Officer; Ms. U. Caddell, Senior Planning Officer; Mr. R. Taylor, Senior Planning Officer; Ms. L. Walshe, Senior Planning Officer; and Ms. C. Donnelly, Democratic Services Officer.

Apologies

No apologies for inability to attend were reported.

Minutes

The minutes of the meetings of 16th and 23rd January, 2024 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, 2024, subject to the omission of those matters in respect of which the Council had delegated its powers to the Committee.

Declarations of Interest

Alderman Lawlor declared an interest in relation to item 8d on the agenda, LA04/2023/4021/F - Change of use from dwelling to 5 Bed House in Multiple Occupation (amended description) - 166 Upper Newtownards Road, in that his employer, Mr. G. Robinson MLA, had submitted a letter of objection to the application.

Councillor T. Brooks declared an interest in relation to item 2c on the agenda, Proposed pre-emptive Committee Site Visit for: LA04/2023/3778/F - Demolition of existing Russell Court buildings and re development of existing surface car park to accommodate two new buildings for the QUB Institute of Research Excellence for Advanced Clinical Healthcare (iREACH Health), including landscaping, parking, and servicing. 38-52 Lisburn Road, Malone Lower, Belfast, BT9 6AA, in that she was employed by Queen’s University.

Committee Site Visits

Note of Committee Site Visits

The Committee noted the Committee site visits.

Proposed briefing and pre-emptive Committee Site Visit for:LA04/2023/2459/F - Redevelopment of the NICSSA pavilion complex within the Stormont Estate creating a centre of excellence for sport. The development will comprise of demolition of the existing pavilion building and replacement with new 2 storey building providing state of the art indoor sports halls, changing accommodation, function/meeting space offering improvements to the existing offering. Site works will include the demolition and site clearance of the Dundonald House site to facilitate the extension and development of new international standard outdoor multi-sports playing, training and ancillary facilities. Day to Day operation of the site will be improved by way of improvements to internal road network via new access/egress arrangements from the existing Stoney Road junction, additional car and cycle parking and new waste/recycling areas.'(Further Information received). Lands within the Stormont Estate to include

The Committee agreed to hold a briefing and undertake a site visit.

Proposed pre-emptive Committee Site Visit for: LA04/2023/3778/F - Demolition of existing Russell Court buildings and re development of existing surface car park to accommodate two new buildings for the QUB Institute of Research Excellence for Advanced Clinical Healthcare (iREACH Health), including landscaping, parking, and servicing. 38-52 Lisburn Road, Malone Lower, Belfast, BT9 6AA

The Committee agreed to undertake a site visit.

Notifications of Provision/Removal of Accessible Parking Bays

The Committee noted the provision of accessible parking bays at the following locations:

- 22B Cloghan Park;
- 34 Lothair Avenue;
- 4 Paxton Street; and
- 30 Hillview Avenue.

Notifications from Statutory Bodies: Abandonment and Extinguishment

Abandonment at Cairnmartin Crescent

The Committee noted the proposed abandonment.

Abandonment at Parkgate Avenue

The Committee noted the proposed abandonment.

Appeals

The Committee noted the appeals decisions.

Planning Decisions Issued

The Committee noted the planning decisions issued in January, 2024 and, at the request of Councillor Carson, agreed that the monthly report would be presented to future meetings of the Committee in a dashboard format.

Miscellaneous Reports

Delegation of Local Applications With NI Water Objections

The Committee agreed to delegate authority to the Director of Planning and Building Control, those Local planning applications to which NI Water had objected to.

DFI Consultation on review of the Development Management Regulations

The Planning Manager outlined the undernoted report to the Committee:

"1.0 Purpose of Report or Summary of Main Issues

1.1 To report on the Department for Infrastructure's public consultation on its review of the Development Management Regulations.

1.2 The Committee is asked to agree the Council's response to the consultation.

2.0 Recommendation

2.1 That the Committee gives delegated authority to the Director of Planning and Building Control to respond to the public consultation as per the 'Assessment' section of this report (pars. 3.7 to 3.30).

3.0 Main Report

Background

3.1 The Planning (Development Management) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2015 ('Development Management Regulations') set out the following provisions:

- **Hierarchy of development – the definition of Major development**
- **Regionally significant applications – to require consultation with DfI on applications for Major development of a certain scale to ascertain whether they will be 'called in' and determined by DfI as regionally significant**
- **Proposal of Application Notices (PANs) – the content of PAN applications required to be made to the Council. PAN applications set out the proposals for Pre-application Community Consultation relating to applications for Major Development**
- **Pre-application Community Consultation – requirements for Pre-application Community Consultation including holding a public event and publicising the proposal in a newspaper**
- **Duty to decline to determine applications where section 27 is not complied with – specifying a period of 21 days for the Council requiring additional information before declining to determine an application for Major development where the requirements of the PAN process were not followed**
- **Pre-Determination Hearings – the requirement to hold a Pre-Determination Hearing for applications notified to DfI but which it returns to the council for determination**
- **Schemes of delegation – requirement for Councils to prepare a scheme of delegation that sets out the classes of Local development that are to be determined by officers. Prevention of such applications being determined by an officer where the application is made by the council or an elected member, or the council has an estate in the land. Requirement to send a copy of the scheme of delegation to DfI and not to adopt it until it has been approved by DfI. Requirement to publish the scheme of delegation, making it available in the office and publishing it on the council's website. Requirement for the council to prepare a scheme of delegation at intervals of no greater than 3 years.**
- **Transition provisions – the requirement for Pre-Application Community Consultation to only apply to**

applications for Major development submitted on or after 1st July 2015.

Public Consultation

3.3 The Department for Infrastructure ('DfI') is consulting on its review of the Development Management Regulations as part of the regional Planning Improvement Programme (PIP). The PIP is a response to recommendations of the Northern Ireland Audit Office and Public Accounts Committee reports published in 2022, which seek significant improvement of the NI planning system.

3.4 The consultation proposes changes in three areas:

- **a review of the classes of development to ensure they reflect current and future development trends and that the associated thresholds take a balanced approach to community consultation in planning applications for major development;**
- **proposals to make pre-determination hearings discretionary for councils which will help focus resources and reduce delays in issuing planning decisions for some planning applications; and**
- **proposals to introduce online/digital methods into the pre-application community consultation (PACC) process, to enhance accessibility and encourage participation in the planning process by a broader range of people.**

3.5 DfI announced the public consultation in December 2023 with the closing date for comments of 3rd March 2024.

Assessment

3.7 It is proposed that the Council responds to the public consultation as set out below.

Review of classes of development

3.8 The consequence of development being classified as 'Major' is twofold. Firstly, that the applicant is required to carry out formal pre-application community consultation before submitting the application to the council. Secondly, that the decision on the application cannot be delegated to officers but must be made by the planning committee.

3.9 In its consultation, DfI suggests that proposals for Major development '…*require considerably more assessment and processing resources than local developments which, by comparison, are less complex and, on the whole, raise fewer public interest issues*.' (par. 2.2).

3.10 However, this is not always the experience of the Planning Service. Applications for Local development, such as housing schemes of less than 50 residential units, can often be equally complex and raise more public interest issues than Major applications. Whilst the current thresholds for Major development are generally considered to be appropriate, consideration should be given to the requirement for secondary 'lighter touch' mandatory pre-application community consultation on certain scale Local applications. Local applications can have a significant impact on local people, particularly in locations such as Belfast which comprise many areas of tight-knit and dense communities where changes to the built environment can have considerable consequences. There should be a formal opportunity for those communities to engage with developers to help shape proposals for the better.

3.11 Conversely, there are examples of Major development proposals, such as larger commercial buildings on industrial estates, where the value of mandatory pre-application community consultation is questionable. There should be the provision for the council to advise that pre-application community consultation is not required in specific cases or for a council to be able to publish 'local guidance' on when pre-application community consultation is necessary (this would be criteria based similar to a scheme of delegation).

3.12 Officers recognise that consideration of these issues cannot be separated from the work to date of the regional Planning Engagement Partnership, which published its report: Planning Your Place: Getting Involved in March 2022. The report made various recommendations on how to improve public engagement in the planning process including the pre-application community consultation process.

3.13 It is noteworthy that BCC's Planning Service no longer places emphasis on whether a proposal falls under the 'Major' or 'Local' development categories, but whether a proposal is of 'strategic' importance to the city. For example, there are many examples of Local applications which are of strategic significance to Belfast and Major applications which are not necessarily of strategic importance, classified as 'technical Major applications' by virtue of their scale, particularly those relating to change of use of a large area of land.

3.14 Nevertheless, there is often a perception of the importance of a Major application and in this regard, the Department may wish to consider increasing the types of energy infrastructure development, particularly renewables, that fall

within the Major development category in order that they are prioritised. Although this needs to be balanced against the commercial disadvantages of making applicants have to go through the 12 - week Proposal of Application (PAN) process in terms of added time to the process when the regional objective is to facilitate such proposals in an efficient and timely manner.

3.15 Officers welcome the proposed introduction of a 'mixed development' category of Major development for the avoidance of any doubt – the Planning Service has experience of applicants trying to argue that their proposal is not Major development because it is a mixed-use scheme which does not fall within any of the specific current categories even though it is of considerable scale.

3.16 Clarification should be provided in the updated regulations of the category of development that Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) fall under to avoid future potential confusion.

3.17 In relation to category 6 'Housing', a significant upward change in the threshold for definition of major housing developments could result in virtually all residential developments proposed being classified as 'local' with resultant implications for the time available for processing and the removal of the need for pre-engagement processes such as PAD and PAN along with the requirement to consider masterplanning. This would therefore not be supported.

3.18 Regarding category 7 'Retailing, Community, Recreation & Culture', consideration should be given to splitting 'Retailing' into a separate category since retail development presents distinct issues from the other forms of development in this category including retail impact.

3.19 Consideration should be given to increasing the 1 ha threshold for Major developments to 2 ha as some Major applications are considered 'technical Major applications' because of their scale but not their impact. Typically, this relates to proposals for a change of use of land or proposals such as 'environmental improvements' relating to public realm.

3.20 Officers have no observations in relation to the current thresholds for consulting DfI on potentially regionally significant planning applications.

Pre-application Community Consultation

3.21 Officers recognise the significant merits of online and digital consultation in reaching a wider and in some cases younger population. However, this it is not considered that this should be a substitute for face-to-face public events because of the value of in-person communication and commitment to genuine engagement that face to face meetings can demonstrate. The Council should therefore support 'Option 1' of the consultation, which is to require both an in-person public event and online/digital consultation. Option 2, which is to give the developer discretion as to whether to carry out in-person consultation or online/digital consultation is not considered appropriate.

3.22 The requirements of the pre-application community consultation process should be re-examined having regard to the *Planning Your Place: Getting Involved* report. Consideration should be given to prescribing further publicity requirements including 'leaflet drops' to local property and site notices to be erected by the applicant.

3.23 It is also essential that pre-application community consultation is much more than a simple 'tick box' exercise carried out by the applicant. The bar for Pre-Application Community Consultation (PACC) reports submitted with applications is arguably too low. There must be a mandatory requirement for applicants to set out the views of local people and interested parties in the report, how they have responded to each of the points, and where changes were not made to address them, to clearly explain and justify the reasons why.

3.24 There should also be an automatic requirement for the applicant to notify the locally Elected Members for the area of the pre - application community consultation.

Pre-Determination Hearings

3.25 DfI is proposing to remove the requirement for councils to hold a Pre-Determination Hearing (which in turn requires a further meeting of the Committee to retake the decision) when an application is returned to the council for determination following notification to DfI. The current requirement is an unnecessary administrative burden which adds to delays to the application process and creates considerable uncertainty for applicants, an anathema for investors.

3.26 The proposal to remove the requirement for statutory Pre-Determination Hearings under such circumstances

and to instead give councils the power to hold a discretionary Pre - determination Hearing is very much welcomed with officers having lobbied Dfi for this change for many years.

Other points

3.27 Officers welcome the proposal for a third category of development, perhaps titled 'Minor' development, for smaller scale proposals such as householder, advertisement, Listed Building Consent and Conservation Area Consent applications. This recognises that the definition of 'Local' development is currently far too wide, ranging for an application for single storey extension or satellite dish to 49 dwelling units, and does not permit meaningful interrogation of performance. There should in turn be an even shorter statutory target for determination of such Minor applications, which is less than the 15 weeks average processing time currently prescribed to Local applications.

3.28 Consideration should also be given to removing the requirement for all applications for Major development to be decided by a planning committee. This should be a matter for each council to decide and set out in its scheme of delegation.

3.29 The regulations relating to schemes of delegation should also be amended. Unlike in NI, there is no requirement in England and Wales for councils to have their schemes of delegation approved by central government. This is a localised decision-making matter and the current requirements are one of too many examples of the Department's over-interventionalist role in the planning system in NI. DfI could perhaps amend the legislation to enable it to intervene if it considers an individual council's scheme of delegation to be inappropriate. In practice, it is questioned how many times the Department has not approved a council's scheme of delegation since 2015.

3.30 Importantly, the Council's proposed response to this focused consultation should not be considered to conclude that these regulations (and others applicable to the development management process) do not need further consideration and potential amendment.

4.0 Financial & Resource Implications

The changes proposed by the consultation have the potential to streamline legislative processes and in turn have a positive impact on finances, resources and performance.

5.0 Equality or Good Relations Implications / Rural Needs Assessment

5.1 There are no equality or good relations / rural needs implications associated with this report."

The Committee delegated authority to the Director of Planning and Building Control to respond to the public consultation as per the assessment outlined within the report.

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

Planning Applications Previously Considered

LA04/2022/0646/F - Application under Section 54 of the planning (Northern Ireland) Act 2011 to vary Condition 2 of planning permission LA04/2017/2753/F (relating to details of public realm improvements) - 30-44 Bradbury Place

The Planning Manager explained that the application has been approved by the Committee at its meeting in August, 2022, subject to conditions and a Section 76 planning agreement. He reported that the Section 76 planning agreement had been signed, but that the decision had yet to be issued due to the need to resolve the details of the public realm required by condition two of the previous permission, including the timing of its implementation.

He stated that the matters had been resolved and the application was before the Committee for reassessment against the Plan Strategy, which had been adopted in May, 2023.

He informed the Committee that the applicant had advised that the public realm would be completed prior to occupation, however, tree planning would be delayed until October, 2024.

He reported that officers had advised that, in order to build in contingency in case of slippage, condition two should be reworded to the following:

> *'The public realm improvements along the Bradbury Place frontage as highlighted in yellow on Drawing No.01A shall be implemented in accordance with the details approved under discharge of condition application LA04/2021/0917/DC approved on X and completed prior to 31st July 2024 of the hereby approved development, save for the tree planting which shall be carried out during the first planting season following afterwards.'*

He stated that it was recommended that the application be approved with conditions.

The Committee approved the application, subject to conditions and a Section 76 planning agreement, and delegated authority to the Director of Planning and Building

Control to finalise the wording of the conditions and Section 76 planning agreement and to deal with any other issues that might arise, provided that they were not substantive.

LA04/2023/2418/F - Demolition of existing retail units and vehicle drop off area of 215-225 Castlereagh Road, Belfast and erection of 4 storey apartment building containing, 16 no apartments with associated development and ancillary works. - 215-225 Castlereagh Road

The Senior Planning Officer provided the Committee with an overview of the application and highlighted the following key issues for consideration:

- Principle of development;
- Design, scale, layout and impact upon the character and appearance of the area including residential amenity;
- Impact on amenity;
- Affordable housing and housing mix;
- Accessible and adaptable accommodation;
- Climate change;
- Drainage;
- Traffic, movement and parking;
- Waste-water infrastructure; and
- Noise, odour and other environmental impacts.

He explained that the density, design and amenity were acceptable, and that the application had met the housing mix provision with 20% affordable housing. He added that no objections had been received from consultees, and that six third party objections had been received and fully assessed.

He stated that the application was considered acceptable and that it was recommended that the Committee approve the application, subject to conditions.

Proposal

Moved by Councillor T. Brooks,
Seconded by Councillor Bell,

"That the Committee refuses the application on the basis of the height, scale and massing of the proposal, and delegates authority to the Director of Planning and Building Control to finalise the wording of the refusal reasons."

On a vote, four Members voted for the proposal and 16 against and it was declared lost.

Accordingly, the Chairperson put the officer recommendation to the Committee and the Committee agreed to grant planning permission, subject to conditions and a Section 76 planning agreement, and delegated authority to the Director of Planning and Building Control to finalise the wording of the conditions and Section 76 planning agreement and to deal with any other issues that might arise, provided that they were not substantive.

LA04/2022/0097/F - Proposed three and a half storey residential development comprising of 18no. units (3no. wheelchair apartments and 15no. Category 1 - Social Housing) and associated access, bin storage, boundary treatments, bike stands, car parking and site and landscaping works (Amended Drawings) - 22-30 Hopefield Avenue

The Senior Planning Officer outlined the application to the Committee and highlighted the following key issues:

- Principle of development;
- Affordable housing and housing mix;
- Design, layout and impact on the character and appearance of the area of townscape character;
- Accessible and adaptable accommodation; and
- Access and parking.

He explained that four objections had been received in relation to character, residential amenity, overdevelopment, parking and damage to street trees and referred the Committee to the case officer response which addressed those objections. He added that no objections had been received from consultees, with the exception of NI Water, which had advised that there was insufficient wastewater treatment capacity.

He stated that, having regard to the development plan and other material considerations, the proposal was considered acceptable and that it was recommended that planning permission be granted, subject to conditions.

The Chairperson welcomed Mr. M. Collins, Collins Rolston Architects, and Mr. D. Erskine, NB Housing, to the meeting.

Mr. Erskine explained that the scheme design was fully supported by the Northern Ireland Housing Executive (NIHE) and was designed to meet DfC and NIHE standards. He added that there was a travel plan that would have three-year benefits for Translink, Belfast Bikes and car sharing.

He highlighted that the design evolution facilitated the relocation of the entrance in order to limit damage to the street trees.

Mr. Collins addressed potential concerns from local residents and stated that care had been taken to respect the character of the neighbourhood and would create an open space for residents as well as providing high quality vegetation and planning to the front and rear of the proposal.

The Committee granted planning permission, subject to conditions and a Section 76 planning agreement, and delegated authority to the Director of Planning and Building Control to finalise the wording of the conditions and Section 76 planning agreement and to deal with any other issues that might arise, provided that they were not substantive.

LA04/2023/4021/F - Change of use from dwelling to 5 Bed House in Multiple Occupation (amended description). - 166 Upper Newtownards Road

The Planning Manager provided the Committee with an overview of the application and explained that the application site was within an Intensive Housing Node where Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs) were acceptable, in principle, under Policy HOU11.

He highlighted the key issues to be considered that included the impact on the surrounding residential amenity/character, traffic, parking, access, waste and refuse collection and over-occupation and antisocial behaviour.

He stated that the proposal complied with the relevant space standards and the location site was highly accessible and sustainable and that DfI Roads had offered no objections.

He added that there was adequate provision made for bin storage and that bicycle storage could be provided within the garage and secured by a planning condition.

The Planning Manager stated that, having regard to the development plan and other material considerations, the proposal was considered acceptable and it was recommended that planning permission be granted, subject to conditions.

The Chairperson welcomed Mr. Adam Larkin, Planning Agent, Ms. L. Rogers and Mrs. F. Rogers, the applicants, to the meeting.

Ms. Rogers explained that she ran seven other HMOs and targeted young professionals as occupants as there was a huge demand for HMO accommodation from those who could not afford to rent an entire property. She stated that young professionals were easy to manage and that the perception that the property would be used for student accommodation was untrue and that it was not an ideal location for students.

She stated that she deliberately chose HMO properties on the Glider routes and only within the HMO Planning Nodes to allow tenants ease of access to the city centre. She added that the property was located less than 100 metres from a greenway and would facilitate tenants who may chose to cycle or work to their place of work.

She outlined the changes that were made to the application in response to local objections that included converting one of the bedrooms back to a garage for in curtilage parking and bike storage and highlighted that there was no requirement to provide additional parking.

She pointed out that the property was residential and therefore would have no more bins than any other property within the location.

Ms. Rogers stated that, as a licensed HMO, the operation of the property would be heavily monitored by the Council and that an antisocial behaviour plan would have to

be submitted and adhered to, as a condition of the license, and that, in the eight years of operating HMO properties, she has never received a complaint from any neighbour or authority about antisocial behaviour.

She concluded by stating that there would be no impact from tenants requiring parking, the bins that were currently provided, would be the same quantity as the neighbouring properties and that there was a misconception that the property would be used by students engaging in antisocial behaviour.

The Committee granted planning permission, subject to conditions and a Section 76 planning agreement, and delegated authority to the Director of Planning and Building Control to finalise the wording of the conditions and Section 76 planning agreement and to deal with any other issues that might arise, provided that they were not substantive.

New Planning Applications

LA04/2020/0568/F and LA04/2020/0569/LBC - Change of use (including refurbishment of and 9 storey extension to rear) of former police station to 74 bedroom hotel with associated restaurant, bar & ancillary facilities. - 21 Queen Street

The Planning Manager provided an overview of the application to the Committee and highlighted the following key areas for consideration:

- The principle of a hotel at this location;
- Impact on the character and appearance of the Conservation Area;
- Impact on the special architectural and historic qualities of the Listed Building;
- Archaeology;
- Ancillary open space;
- Climate change;
- Traffic, movement and parking;
- Environmental impacts;
- Drainage and flood risk; and
- Natural heritage.

He explained that the building was Grade B1 Listed, located in the City Centre Conservation Area and on the heritage risk register.

He stated that the principle of hotel use in the location was considered acceptable and that the proposed alterations to the Listed Building were sympathetic and the proposal would help to secure the future of the Listed Building at risk.

He reported that no objections had been received from DfI Roads, DfC Historic Environment Division, DfI Rivers, NI Water, BCC Environmental Health or third parties, however, the Urban Design Officer and internal conservation advice had expressed concerns with regard to some aspects of the design.

He stated that, having regard to the Development Plan and other material considerations, the proposal was considered acceptable and that it was recommended that planning permission and Listed Building consent were granted, subject to conditions.

In response to a question from a Member with regard to the issues raised by the internal conservation advice and Urban Design Officer, the Planning Manager explained that, although concerns had been raised, it was a question of judgement as to whether the application was considered policy compliant and acceptable, and that, since the planning officers had concluded that the proposal was acceptable, it was not considered necessary to require the applicant to make a detailed enabling case for the proposal.

Proposal

Moved by Councillor Groogan,
Seconded by Councillor T. Brooks,

"That the Committee defers consideration of the application until further information is received with regard to concerns raised from consultees in relation to some aspects of the design of the proposal."

On a vote, four Members voted for the proposal and 14 against and it was declared lost.

Accordingly, the Chairperson put the officer recommendation to the Committee and the Committee agreed to grant planning permission and Listed Building Consent, subject to conditions and delegated authority to the Director of Planning and Building Control to finalise the wording of the conditions and to deal with any other matters that may arise, provided that they are not substantive.

LA04/2022/1384/F - Residential development of 10 no. apartments within a single building, including demolition of existing structures, car parking and relocation of existing access, and all other associated siteworks. – Lands at 12 Inverary Avenue

The Committee agreed to defer consideration of the application in order to undertake a site visit.

LA04/2023/4219/F - Single storey extension to rear and side. Changes to side elevation. Demolition of existing garage (amended description). - 6 Haddington Gardens

The Committee considered the application and granted planning permission, subject to conditions and delegated authority to the Director of Planning and Building Control to finalise the wording of the conditions and to deal with any other matters that may arise.

LA04/2023/3319/F - Proposed change of use from an existing dwelling to a house of multiple occupancies – 27 Ponsonby Avenue

The Committee agreed to defer consideration of the application in order to undertake a site visit.

LA04/2023/3481/F - Change of use from dwelling to 6 bed HMO (sui generis) - 272 Limestone Road

The Committee agreed to defer consideration of the application in order to undertake a site visit.

LA04/2023/4592/f – change of use from Retail (A1) to Community facility (D1) – Ground Floor 102 Royal Avenue

The Senior Planning Officer outlined the application to the Committee and provided a site location plan, existing and proposed elevations and a proposed floorplan.

He explained that there were no physical alterations to the building in the proposal and all installations were internal and temporary.

He reported that, having regard to the development plan and other material considerations, it was recommended that the application was approved, subject to conditions.

The Committee granted planning permission, subject to conditions and delegated authority to the Director of Planning and Building Control to finalise the wording of the conditions and to deal with any other matters that may arise.

LA04/2023/3646/F - Proposed outbuilding to provide ancillary office space and meeting room - The Stableyard, Barnett's Demesne Malone Road

The Senior Planning Officer provided an overview of the application to the Committee and highlighted the following key issues in the assessment of the proposed development:

- Principle of development;
- Impact on amenity;
- Impact on rural character of the area and design;
- Lagan Valley Regional Park; and
- Climate Change.

He explained that the site was located to the rear of the existing Stableyard and was currently an area of hardstanding which had been occupied by Belfast Activity Centre, a charity that provided outdoor adventure and learning.

He reported that the proposal was neighbour notified and advertised and that no representations had been received.

He stated that, having regard to the development plan and other material considerations, the proposal was considered acceptable.

The Committee granted planning permission, subject to conditions and delegated authority to the Director of Planning and Building Control to finalise the wording of the conditions and to deal with any other matters that may arise prior to issuing the decision, provided that they were not substantive.

Chairperson