

Town Planning Committee

Thursday, 17th May, 2012

MEETING OF TOWN PLANNING COMMITTEE

Members present: Councillor L. Patterson (Chairman);
The Deputy Lord Mayor (Alderman R. Patterson);
Alderman Rodgers; and
Councillors Austin, M. E. Campbell, Curran,
Garrett, Hanna, Hussey, Kingston, Lavery, McCabe,
McCarthy, McNamee, Mullan, A. Newton, O'Neill
and Spence.

In attendance: Mrs. P. Scarborough, Democratic Services Section,
Mr. P. Montgomery) Divisional
Ms. E. Hanratty) Planning Office.
Mr. S. Kendall)

Declarations of Interest

No declarations of interest were reported.

Routine Correspondence

It was reported that correspondence had been received in respect of the following:

Notification from the Roads Service regarding the proposed provision of a disabled parking bay at 13 Windsor Road; and

Notification from the Department for Social Development in respect of a Notice of Application for a Vesting Order for land at 38 Bank Street.

Copies of the letters, maps and orders relating to the above-mentioned matters were made available at the meeting for the information of the Members.

Noted.

Presentation by the Planning Service – Houses in Multiple Occupation Subject Plan

(Mr. S. Kendall, Department of the Environment, Planning Service attended in connection with this item.)

The Committee was reminded that, at its meeting on 16th February, it had agreed that a request would be made to officials from the Planning Service inviting them to attend a future meeting to update Members on the progress achieved to date in respect of the Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO) Subject Plan. Accordingly, it was reported that Mr. S. Kendall from the Department of the Environment's Planning Service was in attendance and he was welcomed to the meeting by the Chairman.

Mr. Kendall reminded the Committee that the HMO Subject Plan had been prepared by the Planning Service, in conjunction with an Inter-Agency Strategic Group which had been established by the Council with input from a range of representatives of its services such as Environmental Health, Cleansing, Pollution Control, Building Control and Waste Management, as well as external agencies which included the Police Service for Northern Ireland, the Northern Ireland Office, the Community Safety Unit and the Universities. The purpose of the Subject Plan was to inform the general public, statutory authorities, developers and other interested bodies of the policy framework that would be used to guide planning decisions in relation to Houses in Multiple Occupation within the Council area.

Mr. Kendall pointed out that, since the Draft HMO Plan for Belfast had been published in 2006, two hundred and eighty-seven applications had been referred to the HMO Team, the majority of which (two hundred and sixty two) had been within the Botanic, Holylands and Rugby designated HMO Policy Area. He reminded Members that the HMO Strategy had been developed to protect the amenity, to accommodate need, to focus on regeneration and to promote purpose built accommodation to meet the needs of student housing requirements. He added that the HMO Subject Plan aimed to adopt a balanced approach to HMO development by seeking to influence positively and shape the market for HMOs while controlling and curtailing further development in areas where such accommodation was concentrated currently.

Mr. Kendall referred to the document entitled "Belfast: A Learning City - Holyland and Wider University Area Strategic Study" which had been published by the Council in March and suggested that the proposals therein would enable the issue of HMOs to be managed positively within a multi-agency approach. He outlined the principal aspects of the Plan which sought to:

- identify appropriate housing opportunities;
- provide policy advice on the conversion of existing premises;
- develop a student housing accreditation scheme;
- promote housing regeneration;
- encourage neighbourhood management initiatives;
- integrate transport;
- provide public realm environmental improvements; and
- improve safety within an area.

Mr. Kendall informed the Committee that an HMO monitor was currently in operation which provided an annual update to the Inter-Agency Group. The monitor had identified a significant reduction in HMO related applications, with fourteen approvals having been granted within the last six years.

Mr. Kendall then answered a number of questions put by Members in relation to the need for consideration of housing to accommodate those students who would be attending the University of Ulster's new York Street campus and the necessity for greater accountability to be levied upon landlords in relation to the maintenance and upkeep of HMOs to encourage a higher standard of cleanliness and to reduce any adverse environmental impact.

The Chairman thanked Mr. Kendall for his presentation and he then left the meeting.

Noted.

Requests for Deputations

The Committee noted that no requests for deputations had been received.

Consultation on draft Supplementary Planning Guidance on PPS 4 Economic Development

(Mr. M. McKenna, Planning and Transport Assistant, attended in connection with this item.)

The Committee considered the undernoted report:

"1 Relevant Background Information

- 1.1 The Department of the Environment (DoE) on 26th March 2012 released for public consultation draft Supplementary Planning Guidance on Policy PED 8 of PPS 4 'Development incompatible with Economic Development Uses'.
- 1.2 The draft Supplementary Planning Guidance aims to provide clarity to PPS 4 Policy PED 8 with particular attention paid to clarifying the circumstances when certain economic development uses will be considered incompatible with an existing or approved 'sensitive industrial enterprise' and should be refused planning approval.
- 1.3 Due to the four week consultation period provided by the DoE a Belfast City Council officer response was submitted pending Committee consideration and ratification by full Council.
- 1.4 Appendix 1 contains the Officer response for consideration by Members.

2 Key Issues

- 2.1 During consultation with internal Council Departments a number of issues were identified with the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance. The main issues are summarised below and identified in full detail in Appendix 1.**
- 2.2 The consultation paper seeks to prioritise ‘sensitive industries’ ahead of other various types of other economic development uses. The DoE list of sensitive industries which would be protected includes pharmaceutical companies; medical products; food processing; electronics; and ICT. There are concerns that in the absence of clarification the proposed approach complicates the decision making process rather than offering clarity for these types of developments.**
- 2.3 For the guidance to be effective it will require the Department to compile, maintain and make publicly available a list of what is considered to be sensitive industrial enterprises. The initial response suggested that there should be engagement with industry regulators to help formulate this list along with local councils.**
- 2.4 The draft guidance recommends that the proposal is considered in relation to its proximity to the sensitive industrial enterprise. The document provides no further information on what will be considered a ‘safe’ distance in which a development use deemed incompatible will be able to gain planning permission. In this respect the supplementary planning guidance provides less clarity for developers and decision makers.**
- 2.5 Whilst it is recognised that there may be very few cases where this policy guidance will deem a proposed use as incompatible, caution must be exercised in application of the policy in order to avoid any potential unintended consequences such as blighting of land or the migration of industry to less sustainable, more rural locations where there is a perception of better air quality.**
- 2.6 There are a number of issues with the consultation document in terms of the Council’s current responsibilities and potential future responsibilities. It is in the context of meeting various EU recycling and energy from waste requirements that there would be concerns in respect of this supplementary planning guidance placing an emphasis against perceived unclean land uses like waste management facilities.**

- 2.7 The Council have received various expressions of interest from research and development companies and institutes keen to locate within the Council area. The Council would want to ensure that new environmental technology dealing with waste or renewable energy production is encouraged as it can create new jobs and generate significant economic activity and could be considered of high value in its own right.
- 2.8 The initial response advocated that the Department seeks to strike a balance in their approach to ensure new economic development activity is not compromised unnecessarily.

3 **Recommendations**

Members are requested to consider the response in Appendix 1 and agree a final response to be sent to the Department of Environment.

Appendix 1

**Response to the DoE public consultation
on draft Supplementary Planning Guidance on
Policy PED 8 'Development incompatible with
Economic Development Uses'**

1. **Introduction and Background**
- 1.1 In March 2012 the Department of the Environment (DoE) released for public consultation draft supplementary guidance on Policy PED 8 of PPS 4 'Development incompatible with Economic Development Uses'.
- 1.2 This document is a response from Belfast City Council to the DoE's Planning Policy Division on the above consultation.
- 1.3 The background to this draft Supplementary Planning Guidance is that in November 2010 Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 4 'Planning and Economic Development' was published by the DoE, which contained amongst other things, Policy PED 8 'Development incompatible with Economic Development Uses'.
- 1.4 The draft Supplementary Planning Guidance which is being consulted upon aims to provide clarity to PPS 4 Policy PED 8 with particular attention paid to clarifying the circumstances when certain economic development uses will be considered incompatible with an existing or approved 'sensitive industrial enterprise' and should be refused planning approval.

- 1.5 Policy PED 8 of PPS 4, which will remain unchanged, currently states that a proposal in the vicinity of an existing or approved economic development use may be refused if it is deemed incompatible with that use or would prejudice its future operations. Policy PED 8 allows the Department to refuse planning permission for new development to avoid jeopardising employment in the existing / approved enterprise.
- 1.6 The Council, having considered the consultation document, have identified a number of issues which are detailed in the response below.
2. Content of the Consultation Paper
 - 2.1 The consultation paper, with reference to the public interest, seems to prioritise 'sensitive industries' ahead of other various types of other economic development uses. The Department's list of sensitive industries includes pharmaceutical companies; medical products; food processing; electronics; and ICT. The Council is of the opinion that the proposed approach complicates the decision making process rather than offering clarity for these types of developments.
 - 2.2 The draft Supplementary Planning Guidance considers that waste management uses would be one type of development to be considered incompatible with 'sensitive industries'. Whilst waste management uses such as open landfill sites could perhaps be considered as a source of air contamination modern waste processing activity is changing with emerging cleantech technology. Where waste management proposals can demonstrate that they meet the regulations on emissions, odours and dust and have no adverse impact on the surrounding environment there should be no issue of incompatibility.
 - 2.3 There is an assumption that 'sensitive industries' are of higher value to the local economy. In this respect it must be recognised that waste management facilities are an integral part of local economies that have a crucial role to play in meeting of EU Targets and avoidance of EU surcharges related to waste diverted to landfill and energy from renewable sources. The value of waste management facilities to the economy must be considered both in terms of employment, sustainability and resource savings from avoiding EU charges.

- 2.4 Paragraph 1.5 of the consultation document states that the Department will consider the application of Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations (Northern Ireland) 1999 at an early stage of the application. The Council would consider that EIA screening should already take place for all applications likely to give rise to the prescribed emissions, not just applications in the vicinity of a 'sensitive industry'. Inclusion of this paragraph seems unnecessary and risks complicating the EIA screening process.
- 2.5 In paragraph 1.6 of the consultation document it is suggested that the requirements of existing non-planning legislation may not be of a sufficient standard to limit the contaminants in the air. It must be noted that the Council's Health and Environmental Services, a statutory consultee, can only consider planning proposals against the relevant legislation such as the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act (Northern Ireland) 2011 and relevant EU Directives such as Directive 2008/50/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 21st May 2008 on ambient air quality and cleaner air for Europe, and cannot expand its comments to potential impact on the output of adjacent economic uses. In this light it must be clarified how the Department will assess what standard of air will be acceptable, how the acceptable level of air quality will be established and what will prevent existing uses demanding unreasonable levels of air quality. If the existing legislation is met in terms of odours and other emissions should the responsibility not lie with the existing business to take steps to ensure suitable working environments.
- 2.6 The draft guidance expands upon the three tests established in Policy PED 8. The first test considers whether the proposal is in the vicinity of an existing or proposed economic use. The Council would consider that it is essential for the Department to compile, maintain and make publicly available a list of what is considered to be sensitive industrial enterprises. The Council would recommend engagement with industry regulators to help formulate this list along with local councils. Clearer guidance is required to assist the categorisation and identification of 'sensitive industries' in order to provide greater certainty for developers and effective decision making.
- 2.7 The consultation document provides further guidance on the second policy test which will assess compatibility of the proposed use. Local Councils' Environmental Health Departments are identified as a key consultee for this policy test. As stated above the Council's Health and Environmental Services Department will comment on the planning

application on the merits of the specific proposal as it would any other similar application regardless of the proximity of 'sensitive industries'; with consideration of the relevant legislation and council responsibilities in relation to public health, noise and odour issues. It is not within the Council's remit as part of the statutory planning consultation process to consider whether productivity and future operations of adjacent business uses could be impacted upon. In this regard, unless the Department indicates otherwise, the Council's role remains unchanged.

- 2.8 The draft guidance recommends that the proposal is considered in relation to its proximity to the sensitive industrial enterprise. The document provides no further information on what will be considered a 'safe' distance in which a development use deemed incompatible will be able to gain planning permission. In this respect the supplementary planning guidance provides less clarity for developers and decision makers. Whilst the Council acknowledges the Department's assertion that there will be very few cases where this policy will deem a proposed use as incompatible, caution must be exercised in application of the policy in order to avoid any potential unintended consequences such as blighting of land or the migration of industry to less sustainable, more rural locations where there is a perception of better air quality.
- 2.9 In addition to consulting with NIEA the Council would recommend that the relevant industry regulator is also consulted. This will enable the Department to ascertain if a certain use should be considered a sensitive industry, suitable for protection by Policy PED 8, whilst assisting the assessment of the potential impact of the proposed use on the existing / approved business.
- 2.10 The third policy test seeks to assess the potential impacts of the proposed use on the future operations of existing or approved sensitive industrial enterprise. Land acquisition and site availability are likely to be only two of the many challenges to be encountered by the Department when assessing the potential for diverting proposed investment to alternative sites as recommended in the draft guidance. The draft guidance suggests that the existing enterprise may be willing and able to take remedial steps in order to render the proposed use acceptable / compatible. How this would work in practice and be enforced is unclear and could prove extremely problematic from the perspective of both the existing business and the proposed development. There could be situations where the existing business decides not to take the necessary remedial action and could therefore be

able to veto or stymie the proposed development. A suitable alternative to planning conditions for this type of arrangement has not been suggested but is required. The sensitive industry should take responsibility for all necessary measures to ensure the requisite working environment is present regardless of adjacent uses, this should be encouraged in future planning approvals or support provided to sensitive industries by the Department.

- 2.11 The Department must be cautious in relation to placing economic interests above social and environmental interests. Compatibility with existing industries does not preclude compliance with all other planning policy and other requirements such as those in PPS 1, PPS 3 and PPS 11.
- 2.12 Paragraph 1.13 of the consultation document states that the planning authority will, along with the applicant, consider alternative sites. As referred to earlier in this response consideration of an alternative site will not be a straightforward process and obstacles such as land ownership, site acquisition and site location will have to be overcome and in many cases there may not be a practical solution as proposals are often developed on the basis of existing ownership or land availability. It is not clear how the potential differential costs between alternative sites would be considered or addressed.
- 2.13 Future planning approvals by the Department of sensitive industries must take into consideration the potential impact of future development of surrounding lands. The Department must be clear on how it intends to ensure approval of one sensitive development will not prejudice the development of large areas of land in the vicinity.

3. Operational Issues for Belfast City Council

- 3.1 The Council note a number of issues with the consultation document in terms of our current responsibilities and potential future responsibilities. The Council recognise that the Supplementary Planning Guidance does not change Policy PED8 of PPS 4 however it does place an emphasis on protection of what might be considered 'clean industries' compared to what seem to be perceived as 'dirty' industries of waste management and agri-food which could rightly be considered of extremely high value and very much in the public interest.
- 3.2 The Department will be aware that the Council are responsible for waste collection, amongst other things. The Department should also be aware that the EU Waste Framework Directive and Landfill Framework Directive require certain targets to be met on recycling rates and diversion of waste from landfill

respectively, upon which the Council are obliged to act. It is in the context of meeting the aforementioned EU requirements that the Council would be reluctant to see this supplementary planning guidance placing an emphasis against perceived unclean land uses. There is a recognised need for Waste Management Facilities identified in the RDS and the EU requirements, not only on landfill and recycling but also in relation to renewable energy sites for waste management facilities, that should translate into adequate protection of lands for this use. As long as waste management proposals can demonstrate that they can meet the regulations on emission, odours and dust, and have no adverse impact on the surrounding environment as required by PPS 11 there should be no issue of incompatibility except in very exceptional circumstances.

- 3.3 In respect to the Northforeshore site which has employment & industrial land use zoning with a key site requirement for waste management uses in the dBMAP, the Council would want to ensure that economic development is not prevented if the private sector developers are prepared to co locate waste management facilities i.e. Anaerobic Digester or bio-mass CHP Plant with glass houses for hydroponic / aquaculture food growing purposes. This is an emerging sector where there are business synergies between the two activities i.e. utilization of heat for growing and plant waste recycled into power.
- 3.4 The Council have received various serious expressions of interest from research and development companies and institutes keen to locate within the Council area in a business cluster that could have a mix of cleantech waste management activity with R&D, data storage, renewable energy, manufacturing and similar uses. It is important to ensure that not all R&D activity is considered to be incompatible with waste management / renewable energy activity. The Council would want to ensure that new environmental technology dealing with waste or renewable energy production is encouraged as it can create new jobs and generate significant economic activity and could be considered of high value in its own right. This is very much a new sector, and the Council would encourage the Department to strike a balance in their approach to ensure new economic development activity is not compromised.
- 3.5 In terms of the Council's Health and Environmental Services Department role as a statutory consultee on many planning applications the supplementary planning guidance does not

change the remit of the Council Department's response. As mentioned above, impact of a proposed use on an existing operator in terms of its economic output, is not a consideration for the Environmental Health team.

4. Conclusions and Recommendations

- 4.1** Belfast City Council welcomes attempts to clarify existing policy where there will be a clear benefit to developers, decision makers, and the public interest in general. However as identified above the Council has a number of issues and questions about the draft supplementary planning guidance.
- 4.2** The Council recognises the need to grow the NI economy but it also wants to avoid priority being unfairly given to one particular type of economic use above another. With the improvements in environmental technologies and the growth in that sector as a high value industry the Council do not want to see the planning system unintentionally deter this type of development. The Council would therefore request that this supplementary guidance is only used in exceptional circumstances where all the detailed information has been considered by the Department and suitable consultees. In cases where sensitive industries are involved the Council see it as beneficial to consult with the relevant industry regulator to aid the decision making process and the establishment of baseline information.
- 4.3** The draft supplementary guidance lacks a suitable definition of what will be considered a sensitive industry. The examples of sensitive industries provided in the consultation are extremely wide ranging and vague. It would be beneficial for the final document to be more precise either in its list of potential sensitive industries or in how it will identify the existing sensitive industries. In relation to compiling a list of the existing sensitive industries the Council would see this as essential and would consider again that engagement with relevant industry regulators could enhance this list before being made publicly available.
- 4.4** The list of potential sources of 'harmful air contamination' takes no account of the advances in waste management and renewable energy technologies. Refusal of planning permission on the basis of incompatibility must only be issued after all relevant information has been considered. Suggesting certain types of industries are incompatible with some high value uses could have serious consequences for existing sites, including reducing the development potential and land value because of existing uses.

- 4.5 The draft guidance provides very little information on what will be considered as an acceptable distance away from a sensitive industry for a potentially incompatible use to locate. The worst case scenario in his respect would be for large swathes of land adjacent to sensitive industries to be considered incompatible and therefore blighted. It will be a difficult task for the Department to assess the economic benefit of the existing use against the loss of development of land adjacent to this use.
- 4.6 It is unclear how the Department will process situations where there is an extant approval for a sensitive industry which has not yet been developed and a potentially incompatible use applies for planning permission with the intention of developing the proposal as soon as possible. It is not clear whether or not the Department could refuse a planning application based on the existence of a planning approval that has not yet been built and is close to expiring.
- 4.7 There are some key sites within the Council boundary which have the potential to accommodate a range of uses including a mixture of R&D, waste recovery and industry. It is with sites like this mind that the Council would request the guidance states that all applications will be considered on its own merits. What might be incompatible in one location and for one enterprise may not be incompatible in a different location.
- 4.8 The draft proposals for the planning authority to seek specialist advice when assessing applications (para 1.10, 1.11, 1.12), may be a prudent suggestion. However, the cost implications, together with the additional staff resource that may be required to assess these proposals would place an extra burden on the planning authority. The DoE do not currently have the specialist resources and Councils may not have the resources or the funding to assess the applications as per the guidance either now or on the transfer of planning functions under RPA.”

After discussion, during which the Members expressed concern in relation to the shorter than usual response time, that is four weeks, which had been set by the Department of the Environment, and the need to incorporate the Members' concern within the response, together with a comment in relation to the possible displacement of current businesses if planning permission were granted to certain entertainment facilities, the Committee adopted the recommendations.

Deferred Items Still Under Consideration

The Committee noted a list of deferred items which were still under consideration by the Belfast Planning Office.

Appeal Dates Notified

The Committee noted information which had been received regarding the date for the holding of a future appeal.

Streamlined Planning Applications - Decisions Issued

The Committee noted a list of Streamlined Planning Applications' Decisions which had been issued by the Planning Service during the period from 24th April until 8th May.

New Applications

The Committee noted a list of planning applications which had been received by the Belfast Planning Manager for the Council area for the period from 24th April until 30th April and 1st May until 7th May.

Reconsidered Items

Z/2010/0838/F - Ground Floor of 165 Ormeau Road and first and second Floors of 165-169 Ormeau Road

The Committee considered further a planning application in relation to the proposed change of use to a backpackers' hostel in respect of which the Divisional Planning Manager had offered an opinion to approve.

After discussion, it was

Moved by Councillor McCarthy,
Seconded by Councillor Lavery,

That the decision of the Divisional Planning Manager to approve the application for the proposed change of use to a backpackers' hostel at the above-mentioned location be rejected on the grounds that such a development, if permitted, would result in an over-development of the site due to its scale and mass and would set an unacceptable precedent for future development within the vicinity.

On a vote by show of hands fourteen voted for the proposal and one against and it was accordingly declared carried.

(As the decision was not unanimous it was subject to ratification by the Council.)

Z/2010/1632/O - Land bounded by Library Street, Stephen Street and Kent Street

The Committee considered further a planning application in relation to the proposed demolition of an existing warehouse to enable the construction of an eight storey residential development, comprising ninety-three apartments with basement parking below and associated landscaping, in respect of which the Divisional Planning Manager had offered an opinion to approve.

After discussion, it was

Moved by Councillor Lavery,
Seconded by Alderman Rodgers,

That the decision of the Divisional Planning Manager to approve the application for the proposed demolition of an existing warehouse to enable the construction of an eight storey residential development, comprising ninety-three apartments with basement parking below and associated landscaping, at the above-mentioned location be rejected on the grounds that such a development, if permitted, would result in an over-development of the site due to its scale and mass and would set an unacceptable precedent for future development within the vicinity.

On a vote by show of hands nine voted for the proposal and none against and it was accordingly declared carried.

(As the decision was not unanimous it was subject to ratification by the Council.)

Schedule of Planning Applications

Z/2011/1507/F - Footpath of Glentilt Street, south-east of junction at Agnes Street

The Committee considered a planning application which had been submitted on behalf of Vodafone UK Limited for the erection of mobile telecommunications equipment, in respect of which the Divisional Planning Manager had offered an opinion to approve.

After discussion, the Committee agreed, with one Member voting against, to adopt the opinion of the Divisional Planning Manager to approve the application.

(As the decision was not unanimous it was subject to ratification by the Council.)

Schedule of Planning Applications - Applications Withdrawn

**Z/2011/0199/F - Garden to rear of Saint Malachy's
College Old Boys' Association, 442 Antrim Road**

At the request of the Applicant, the above-mentioned planning application to raise the height of the fence in the rear garden of 442 Antrim Road, in respect of which the Divisional Planning Manager had offered an opinion to refuse, had been withdrawn from the schedule.

**THE COMMITTEE DEALT WITH THE FOLLOWING ITEMS IN PURSUANCE
OF THE POWERS DELEGATED TO IT BY THE COUNCIL**

Reconsidered Items

The Committee considered further the undernoted applications and, after discussion, adopted the recommendations of the Belfast Planning Manager thereon:

| <u>Site and Applicant</u> | <u>Proposal</u> | <u>Divisional Planning Manager's Opinion</u> |
|---|--|--|
| 142 Haypark Avenue McGuinness Architects | Erection of two storey side and rear extension and replacement garage. | Approval |

Schedule of Planning Applications

The Committee considered a schedule of planning applications which had been submitted by the Divisional Planning Manager in respect of the Council area and agreed to adopt the recommendations therein, with the exception of those referred to below:

| <u>Location</u> | <u>Proposal</u> |
|---|--|
| 3 Sunningdale Gardens Robert Gilmour Architects | Replacement of existing dwelling with two detached dwellings and one pair of semi-detached dwellings within gated mews type development. [Deferred at the request of the Chairman, Councillor L. Patterson, to enable an office meeting to take place.] |
| Springfield Builders Supplies, 23-25 Springfield Crescent McGirr Architects | Demolition of all existing structures and the construction of six, three bedroom and three, four bedroom houses with associated landscaping and car parking. [Deferred at the request of Councillor Hartley to enable an office meeting to take place.] |

Location

Proposal

Adjacent to 77 Knockeden Park,
Surveying and Architectural
Management

Redevelopment of rear garden space
to provide a new detached dwelling.
[Deferred at the request of Councillor
Mullan to enable an office meeting to
take place.]

35 Orangefield Road
MBA Design Services

Erection of single storey rear
extension.
[Deferred at the request of Alderman
Rodgers and Councillor McNamee to
enable an office meeting to take
place.]

Chairman