

# Planning Committee

Tuesday, 19th May, 2015

## MEETING OF PLANNING COMMITTEE

Members present: Councillor Garrett (Chair);  
Alderman McGimpsey;  
Councillors Armitage, Bunting,  
Campbell, Heading, Magee, McAteer,  
McDonough-Brown and Mullan.

In attendance: Mr. C. McIlwaine, Area Planning Manager; and  
Mr. B. Flynn, Democratic Services Officer.

### **Apologies**

Apologies were reported on behalf of Aldermen L. Patterson and R. Patterson, together with Councillor Johnston.

### **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting of 23rd April were taken as read and signed as correct. It was reported that those minutes, with the exception of the matters which had been delegated to the Committee, had been adopted by the Council at its meeting on 5th May.

### **Declarations of Interest**

Regarding item Z/2014/1491/F, that is, the application for the construction of ten dwellings with associated car parking and landscaping at 268 to 287 Beersbridge Road, Councillor Mullan declared an interest in that she had had requested that the application be deferred when it had been presented to the former Town Planning Committee.

### **Routine Correspondence**

The Committee noted the receipt of correspondence from Transport NI in respect of the following matters:

- the provision of accessible parking at 46 Wellington Park and 6 Willowholme Parade;
- the introduction of 'School Keep Clear' restrictions at St. Joseph's Primary School; and
- the proposed introduction of waiting restrictions at Balmoral Park, Gordon Street and at Stranmillis Embankment.

**Appeal Decisions Notified**

No notifications had been received.

**Delegated Decisions**

The Committee noted a list of decisions which had been issued under the Delegated Scheme between 1st April and 12th May.

**Northern Ireland Environment Agency  
Proposed Listing of Buildings**

The Committee was reminded that the former Shadow Planning Committee, at its meeting on 11th March, had agreed to support proposals which had been formulated by the Northern Ireland Environment Agency (NIEA) to list the corporate headquarters of the Danske Bank in Donegall Square West and the headquarters of the Belfast Telegraph in Royal Avenue/Library Street. At the meeting of the Council on 1st April, that decision had been referred back to the Planning Committee for further consideration to enable deputations from both the Danske Bank and the Belfast Telegraph to attend a future meeting to outline their concerns in this regard.

**Belfast Telegraph**

The Chairperson welcomed Mr. R McClean, Managing Director of Independent News and Media NI, together with Mr. D. Stelfox, who was acting as a consultant for the group in this matter. The Committee was advised that the Belfast Telegraph site comprised of a number of buildings, including an original four-storey 1886 Victorian redbrick building and four extensions. Mr. Stelfox gave an overview of the architectural merits of the buildings. He acknowledged that, whilst the original redbrick Victorian building was of historical and architectural interest, the various extensions were not of such importance to be afforded listing status. He therefore requested that the Committee would agree only to support a proposal that the original 1886 building be listed.

Mr. M. Deery, Assistant Director with the DoE's Historic Environment Division, outlined the rationale which had been utilised by the Department in determining how buildings were considered for listing status. Regarding the Belfast Telegraph buildings, the Committee was advised that the principal interest was in the original 1886 building, but that an extension which had been completed in 1907 complemented its character and the existing streetscape, which contained the Belfast Central Library and the former Frames Complex. The views of the Committee on the listing of that extension would also be considered. He added that the other buildings within the Belfast Telegraph site were not being proposed for listing.

Moved by Councillor Armitage,  
Seconded by Councillor McAteer and

Resolved – that the Committee agrees, given their architectural and historical importance, to support the proposals of the Northern Ireland Environment Agency to list the 1886 original Belfast Telegraph building in Royal Avenue, together with the associated 1907 extension in Library Street.

### **Danske Bank – Donegall Square West**

The Committee then received Dr. T. Quinn, Planning Consultant with Braniff Associates, who was in attendance to outline, on behalf of Danske Bank, their opposition to the proposals to list the bank's corporate headquarters in Donegall Square West. The Committee was advised that the proposal to list the building would be unnecessary for the following reasons:

- there were sufficient safeguards to protect the building in that it was located within a Conservation Area, which prevented it from being demolished and which meant that only sympathetic modifications could be made to its exterior;
- the Northern Ireland Environment Agency report which had set out the rationale for listing the premises had failed to note that it had been altered significantly in 2008 through the addition of a sixth floor and the infilling of the central area, which had undermined its architectural merits for listing; and
- the Danske Bank, as one of the largest employers in the City centre, would be opposed to having unnecessary constraints imposed upon its business operations.

Mr. Deery indicated that the Agency had considered the architectural and historical merits of the building and, given that it was regarded a unique example of mid-twentieth century modernism, it was being proposed that it be afforded listing status.

### **Proposal**

Moved by Councillor Hutchinson,  
Seconded by Alderman McGimpsey,

That the Committee agrees not to support the proposal of the Northern Ireland Environment Agency to list the corporate headquarters of the Danske Bank in Donegall Square West.

On a vote by show of hands, five Members voted for the proposal and six against and it was declared lost.

### **Further Proposal**

Moved by Councillor McDonough-Brown,  
Seconded by Councillor Armitage,

That the Committee agrees, given the architectural and historical merit of the building, to support the proposal of the Northern Ireland Environment Agency to list the corporate headquarters of the Danske Bank in Donegall Square West.

On a vote by show of hands, five Members voted for the proposal and five against. There being a parity of votes, the Chairperson exercised his second and casting vote in favour of the proposal and it was declared carried.

**Pre-Application Community Consultation Process**

(Mr. I. Harper, Building Control Manager, attended in connection with this item.)

The Committee considered the following report:

**“1.0 Relevant background information**

- 1.1 Section 27 of the Planning (NI) Act 2011 (‘the 2011 Act’) places a statutory duty upon applicants for planning permission for major applications to consult the community in advance of submitting an application.**
- 1.2 Major applications are larger applications such as housing developments with more than 50 units, or large retail, leisure or entertainments units which exceed 1000sq meters in area.**
- 1.3 The applicants must submit a Proposal of Application Notice (‘PAN’) to the Council at least 12 weeks in advance of the submission of any major planning application. The PAN should outline the detail of the proposed application and what consultation is to be undertaken.**
- 1.4 The minimum standard of consultation requires the applicant to:**
  - Hold one public event in the locality in which the proposed development is situated**
  - Publish a notice in one local newspaper seven days in advance of the event.**
- 1.5 Within 21 days of receipt of the PAN the Council can ask for further individuals or organisations to receive the notice or for additional consultation to be carried out.**
- 1.6 When the formal application is submitted, it must include a written report which demonstrates how the applicant has complied with their pre application consultation obligations. The suggested minimum requirement is for the applicant to:**
  - specify who has been consulted**
  - set out what steps were taken to comply with the statutory requirements and those of the planning authority**
  - set out how the applicant responded to the comments made, including whether and the extent to which the proposals have changed as a result of PAC**
  - provide appropriate evidence that the various prescribed steps have been undertaken – e.g. copies of advertisements of the public events and reference material made available at such events; and**

- demonstrate that steps were taken to explain the nature of PAC, i.e. that it does not replace the application process whereby representations can be made to the planning authority.

1.7 The Council will assess the report and determine if the consultation undertaken meets the requirements set out above and can request further information or decline the application if it deems those requirements have not been fulfilled.

## 2.0 Key issues

2.1 The purpose of having the community consultation process is to ensure that people:

- have access to information about major applications in their area;
- can put forward their own ideas about the proposed application and feel confident that there is a process for those ideas to be considered; and
- have an active role in developing proposals and options to ensure local knowledge and perspectives are taken into account.

2.2 The consultation is carried out at pre-application stage and comments made to the applicant are not representations to the Council. However during the full application process public advertisement and neighbour notification will take place and representations can be made to the Council during that formal process.

2.3 While the minimum requirements are set out in the 2011 Act and The Planning (Development Management) Regulations (NI) 2015, the Council can also notify the prospective applicant that it requires it to carry out additional notification and/or consultation if it is not satisfied with the proposals set out in the PAN.

2.4 In considering whether to give such notification the Council is to have regard to the nature, extent and location of the proposed development and to the likely effects, at and in the vicinity of that location, of it being carried out.

2.5 Similar legislation exists in Scotland and contact was made with Scottish councils to explore how they deal with this piece of legislation. The feedback received, in particular from City of Edinburgh Council and Aberdeen City Council, indicates that they do have further standard requirements such as the PAN to be sent to local elected members, for additional events to be held, or for additional publicity of events such as leaflets and posters.

- 2.6 In some more contentious cases City of Edinburgh Council will also state in its response that a fuller consultation programme including feedback events may be required, dependant on the feedback from the initial events held. They may also ask for other events such as manned or unmanned exhibitions to be held.
- 2.7 The major difference in Scotland is the existence of Community Councils which have a statutory right to be consulted. They play a key role in the PAC process, helping to identify these additional engagement requirements on a case by case basis.
- 2.8 Given the absence of Community Councils and the desirability for better connections with local communities, it is proposed that the Council adopts a similar approach to City of Edinburgh Council by requesting that PANs are sent to elected members in the area of the proposed development, and that additional publicity be used to ensure that communities are aware of the event(s) taking place in all instances.
- 2.9 Senior Planning officers will meet to consider each PAN that is submitted to determine what, if any, additional requirements are to be requested, over and above those outlined by the applicant and the additional requirements in 2.8 above. To ensure that the all relevant factors have been considered and that decisions are informed by local knowledge Community Services or other relevant council officers may also be consulted, where required. For example this may include requesting a copy of the PAN be provided to local area partnerships. Prospective applicants will be made aware of the Councils response to the proposed consultation as set out in the PAN within 21 days.
- 2.10 It is estimated that there could be up to 300 major applications in any year, based upon the previous definition for major applications and a comparison to 2014 applications. This will have a resource implication for both Planning Service staff and Community Services and this will be monitored on an ongoing basis.
- 2.11 Given that members will now be receiving PANs for developments in their areas, it is proposed to issue a briefing note to all members outlining the key issues, process and the roles and responsibilities of council.
- 2.12 Having reviewed how various councils in Scotland give guidance on the PAC process, it was noted that they provide guidance on their websites including access to documents. The following documents have been prepared for Belfast Planning Service and will be available on the website:

- Belfast City Council Guidance pack: Pre-Application Community Consultation
- Proposal of Application Notice (PAN)
- Template newspaper advert

2.14 The wider development industry is being advised of this change through the information on the website, through written correspondence and through workshops being held on wider planning issues.

### 3.0 Resource Implications

3.1 This is a new element of work for the Planning Service and Community Services and the impact of the additional workload involved in assessing PAC will be kept under review.

### 4.0 Equality and Good Relations Considerations

4.1 There are no direct equality implications arising from this report. However, the Council will use the opportunity to promote equality by asking developers to be mindful of the need to ensure equality of access to consultation and engagement in the PAC guidance.

### 5.0 Call In

5.1 Yes

### 6.0 Recommendations

6.1 Members are asked to note and approve:

- The proposed method of assessing the adequacy of proposed consultations for major applications;
- The proposals in relation to determining the nature of any additional consultation required by the Council including requesting that the PAN be sent to elected members in the area and for additional publicity to be provided by the prospective applicant;
- A review to be carried out after six months to ensure that the approach being undertaken is consistent and ensures that communities are given adequate opportunity to comment on proposals at this early stage.”

The Committee adopted the recommendations.

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

**Z/2014/1398/F - 9 to 21 Adelaide Street**

1. **Z/2014/1398/F – 9 to 21 Adelaide Street (application for the demolition of existing building and the erection of a nine-storey office development).**

The Planning Officer reported that the proposal had adhered to planning policies BH12 and BH14 of PPS 6. It was pointed out that the statutory consultees had offered no objections to the proposal and that there existed a history of similar planning approvals at the site. Therefore, subject to the imposing of relevant conditions, it was recommended that approval be granted.

**The Committee granted approval, subject to the imposing of the conditions as outlined within the Case Officer's report.**

2. **Z/2014/1555/F – Former Harland and Wolff Headquarters Building and Drawing Offices at Queen's Road (change of use to an eighty-four bed boutique hotel plus heritage/tourist facilities).**

The Committee was apprised of the main aspects of the proposal, which was for the development of a boutique-style hotel at the site of the former Harland and Wolff headquarters within the Titanic Quarter. It was explained that the application, if approved, would necessitate work to be undertaken to the listed building at the site and that aspect of the application would be determined under the Council's Delegated Scheme. The Planning Officer reported that no objections had been received and the application had been recommended for approval.

**The Committee granted approval, subject to the imposing of the conditions as outlined within the report.**

**Z/2014/0057/F - Dargan Road Waste Transfer Station**

3. **Z/2014/0057/F – Dargan Road Waste Transfer Station, 2a Dargan Road (amendments to Waste Transfer Station to regularise current operations).**

The Committee was advised that the application had been assessed against the principle of the permitting additional waste types at the site and associated development. The additional waste materials which would be accepted would be electrical and electronic equipment, plasterboard and metals. It was reported that these would not pose any demonstrable harm to human health, nor would they affect the local environment. It was reported that the statutory consultees had offered no objections and that no representations had been received. Therefore, it was recommended that approval be granted.

**The Committee granted approval, subject to the imposing of the conditions as outlined within the Case Officer's report.**

**Items 4 and 5 - 55 to 63 University Street / 101 to 111 Botanic Avenue**

The Committee then considered items four and five together, which had been submitted by The Queen's University of Belfast (QUB):



4. **Z/2012/1428/DCA – 55 to 63 University Street and 101 to 111 Botanic Avenue and Queen’s University Garage University Square Mews (application for demolition to enable development of twelve HMO townhouses and three apartments to provide purpose built student accommodation); and**
5. **Z/2013/0012/F – 55 to 63 University Street (application for the erection of purpose-built student accommodation).**

The Committee was informed that application Z/2012/1428/DCA had sought full planning permission for the demolition of five buildings in University Street, with facade retention for one of those buildings; the demolition of a garage in University Square Mews; and the demolition of six buildings on Botanic Avenue, with facade retention. The demolition, if permitted, would facilitate the development of twelve HMO townhouses and three apartments, which would provide 71 purpose-built spaces for student accommodation with associated car parking.

The Planning Officer reported that the case to demolish the buildings had not been demonstrated convincingly by the applicant. Whilst the applicant had submitted additional reports and information, it was considered that the buildings made a positive contribution to the Queen’s Conservation Area and that no overwhelming evidence had been presented to justify their demolition. It was reported that the replacement scheme would not preserve or enhance the Conservation Area, but would result in harm.

The Chairperson welcomed Mr. T. Gallagher, Pro-Vice Chancellor of QUB, together with Mr. P. Fleming, who was acting as a consultant for the University. Mr. Fleming advised that the proposal, if approved, would help to transform the area and enhance the amenity of the locality by encouraging residential use of the vacant properties. Mr. Gallagher added that the investment in the site would enhance Belfast’s status as a learning City.

The Committee was then addressed by Mr. M. Patton, Chairperson of the Northern Ireland Historic Buildings Preservation Trust, who pointed out that similar-type refurbishments had been carried out within the University Street area which had not necessitated the demolition of the interior of the buildings. He indicated that the buildings in question were of such character and significance that any proposals which would impact on their internal structures would be opposed by the Trust.

**The Committee refused the application for demolition as it was deemed contrary to Planning Policy Statement 6, Planning, Archaeology and Built Heritage as set out in the Case Officer’s report**

**The Committee refused the full application for the replacement scheme for purpose built student accommodation as it was deemed contrary to Planning Policy Statement 6, Planning, Archaeology and Built Heritage as set out in the Case Officer’s report**

**Z/2014/1491/F - 236 to 287 Beersbridge Road**

6. **Z/2014/1491/F – 236 to 287 Beersbridge Road (Construction of ten dwellings with associated car parking and landscaping).**

(Councillor Mullan, who had declared an interest in this application, withdrew from the table whilst it was under discussion and took no part in the discussion or decision-making process.)

The Planning Officer reported that the application, in respect of which no representations had been received, had been assessed against the principle of developing housing at the location, its potential impact on the residential amenity; and the potential impact on the character of the vicinity.

The Committee was advised that the site was located on land which had been zoned for social housing within the Belfast Metropolitan Area Plan. The Planning Officer reported that, in principle, the Department had no issues associated with the development of social housing at the location.

The Planning Officer reported that the scheme had been the subject of a pre-application discussion, during which the Department had indicated to the applicant that the scheme was unacceptable since it would not result in a quality residential development. The scheme had been discussed further at an office meeting and the applicant had been given the opportunity to submit an amended scheme. However, nothing further had been received subsequent to the meeting. In addition, the proposal had been assessed against the criteria as set out in Policy QD1 of Planning Policy Statement 7, and it had been deemed that the proposal would result in unacceptable damage to the local character and create an undesirable living environment due to an unsatisfactory layout and inadequate provision of amenity space at the site. Accordingly, the application had been recommended for refusal.

The Chairperson welcomed Mr. C. Hughes, who was acting on behalf of the applicant, Oaklee Housing Association. He advised the Committee that the houses which had been proposed had incorporated a unique design which was sympathetic with the local character and environment. He added that there existed significant support and a demonstrable need in that area for the development and he requested that the Committee would agree to reject the opinion to refuse the application.

**The Committee noted the comments of Mr. Hughes but agreed to adopt the recommendation to refuse the application on the grounds which had been outlined specifically within the Case Officer's report.**

(Councillor Mullan returned to the Committee table at this point.)

**Z/2014/1685/F - 184 Upper Newtownards Road**

**7. Z/2014/1685/F – 184 Upper Newtownards Road (Change of use to a HMO).**

The Planning Officer reported that the application had been recommended for approval since it was in accordance with the policy as set out within the HMO Subject Plan. The main issues which had been considered, she reported, related to the principle of the establishment of an HMO unit at that location and its impact on the local amenity. The site, it was reported, lay within HMO Development Node 04/10, which covered the area in which the building was situated. The application had complied with that policy.

It was reported also that 89 objections had been received to the application. Those had referred to issues regarding the prospective impact on the local residential amenity, the character of the area, parking and traffic control, the number of HMOs within the general area, the transient nature of the tenants, together with issues regarding the devaluation of property prices and the precedent for the establishment of further HMOs.

The Chairperson welcomed to the meeting Mr. C. Lyttle, MLA, and Mr. C. Nicholl, who were in attendance to outline concerns on behalf of local residents. They referred specifically to road safety and parking issues which would arise should the application be approved. In addition, it was suggested that the amenity of the area would be affected by the establishment of the HMO and that the safety of children could be compromised by the additional traffic within the area.

**The Committee agreed to defer the application to enable further information and clarity to be provided by Transport NI in respect of its assessment criteria for road safety and parking issues, specifically as they related to Houses in Multiple Occupation.**

**Z/2014/1720/F - 6 Cutters Lane, Malone Lower**

**8. Z/2014/1720/F – 6 Cutters Lane, Malone Lower (Retrospective change of use from dwelling to HMO).**

The Planning Officer reported that the pertinent matters in the application had related to the principle of establishing an HMO unit in the area and its impact on the local amenity. The application was assessed against HMO 5, which had set out a 10% maximum threshold for HMOs within any street outside a defined HMO area or Node. In Cutters Lane there were 25 dwellings and, therefore, up to two conversions to HMOs could be approved within guidelines. There was no record of any other HMOs within the street and, as such, the application could be approved within the 10% restriction. It was reported that 14 objections had been received concerning the intensification of traffic, the lack of car parking space, access for emergency vehicles, together with a change of character to the area, excessive noise and general disturbance.

The Committee was advised that the Council's Health and Environmental Services Department and Transport NI had offered no objections on the change of use to the property. Accordingly, since the application would be consistent with current policy and would not result in a detrimental impact on the character of the area, nor to the amenity of neighbouring residents, the Committee was recommended to approve the application.

The Chairperson welcomed to the meeting Ms. C. Magee and Ms. C. Doherty, who were in attendance to outline concerns on behalf of local residents. The objectors referred specifically to road safety and parking issues which would arise should the application be approved. They suggested that the amenity of the area would be affected by the establishment of an HMO and that the safety of children could be compromised by additional traffic within the area.

**The Committee agreed to defer the application to enable further information and clarity to be provided by Transport NI in respect of its assessment criteria for road safety and parking issues, specifically as they relate to Houses in Multiple Occupation.**

**Z/2015/0167/F - 179 and 181 Lisburn Road, Malone Lower**

9. **Z/2015/0167/F – 179 and 181 Lisburn Road, Malone Lower (Change of use and external alterations to provide three apartments and three bedsits).**

The Planning Officer reported that the proposal was deemed unacceptable since there was a lack of sufficient private amenity space, a poor outlook for Unit 3, and unacceptable living standards for Unit 4. The proposal was contrary to both PPS 1 and PPS 7, which related to General Principles and Quality Residential Environments. The Committee was advised that the proposal would result in demonstrable harm to the quality of the living environment and the residential amenity of prospective residents. Therefore, the Committee was recommended to refuse the application.

The Chairperson welcomed Mr. T. Stokes, who was acting on behalf of the applicant, and who was in attendance to outline objections to the opinion to refuse the application. He indicated that revised plans and drawings had been submitted for the Council's consideration on 14th May and requested that the Committee might exercise its discretion and consider the amended scheme.

During discussion, the Committee noted that the amended scheme could not be considered as the plans had been submitted after the schedule of applications had been finalised and circulated. It was noted further that there was a requirement on the Planning Service to re-advertise and notify neighbours of any amended plans received and despite the fact that those may not generate any representations from the public, it would set an inappropriate precedent should the Committee accede to Mr. Stokes' request to consider the amended scheme outside the existing process

**The Committee adopted the recommendation to refuse the application.**

**(The Committee adjourned for ten minutes.)**

**Z/2015/0141/F - Victoria Park Coffee Kiosk**

10. **Z/2015/0141/F – Victoria Park (application for approval for a mobile tea/coffee kiosk).**

The Committee was informed that the operation of a mobile unit was considered acceptable and not likely to affect adversely the character of the park. It was indicated that the proposal had complied with all of the relevant planning policies and that statutory consultees had offered no objections.

**The Committee granted approval.**

**Z/2015/0144/F - Cherryvale Playing Fields Coffee Kiosk**

11. **Z/2015/0144/F – Cherryvale Playing Fields (application for approval for a mobile tea/coffee kiosk).**

The Committee was informed that the operation of a mobile unit was considered acceptable and not likely to affect adversely the character of the park. It was indicated that the proposal had complied with all of the relevant planning policies and that

statutory consultees had offered no objections. The Committee was advised that one letter of objection had been received from a local church which had outlined its concerns that the kiosk might affect outreach activities.

**The Committee granted approval, subject to the imposing of a condition which related to the regulation of noise which would be transmitted to surrounding premises.**

**Z/2015/0142/F - Waterworks Park, Antrim Road - Coffee Kiosk**

**12. Z/2015/0142/F – Waterworks Park Antrim Road (application for the provision of a mobile tea/coffee kiosk in the park).**

The Committee was informed that the operation of a mobile unit was considered acceptable and not likely to affect adversely the character of the park. It was indicated that the proposal had complied with all of the relevant planning policies and that the statutory consultees had offered no objections. The Committee was advised that two letters of objection had been received, which had expressed concerns regarding the impact of the kiosk on the character of the park and which had suggested that the development could result in additional traffic problems and create litter issues.

**The Committee granted approval.**

**Z/2015/0143/F - Dunville Park Coffee Kiosk**

**13. Z/2015/0143/F – Dunville Park Coffee Kiosk (application for the provision of a mobile tea/coffee unit).**

The Committee was informed that the operation of a mobile unit was considered acceptable and would not impact adversely on the character of the park. It was indicated that the proposal had complied with all relevant planning policies and that the statutory consultees had offered no objections. Members were advised that one letter of objection had been received which had suggested that the unit would have a negative impact on the character of the park and could impact on surrounding businesses.

**The Committee granted approval.**

**Z/2013/0627/F - Colaiste Feirste - Beechmount House**

**14. Z/2013/0627/F – Colaiste Feirste, Beechmount House (application for an extension to existing school building).**

The Planning Officer outlined the principal aspects of the application and indicated that the proposed alterations to the listed building would be determined under the Council's Delegated Scheme. It was pointed out that the NIEA had no objections to the proposal. The application had complied with PPS 1 - General Principles; PPS 3 - Parking, Access and Movement; and PPS 8 - Open Space, Sport and Recreation. It was reported that no representations had been received and the Committee was recommended to approve the application, subject to the conditions as outlined within the Case Officer's report.

**The Committee granted approval, subject to the imposing of the conditions as outlined within the report.**

**Z/2014/1741/F - 2 Whiterock Close re: Glor na Mona**

- 15. Z/2014/1741/F – Lands 50 metres due south of 2 Whiterock Close (change of design from previously approved scheme for a single-storey Irish Language and Youth Community Centre).**

The Planning Officer reported that approval had been granted previously at the site for a two-storey Irish language youth centre and that the proposal, if approved, would make amendments in terms of its size, height and materials to be used. It was pointed out that the statutory consultees had offered no objections to the proposal and that no representations had been received.

**The Committee granted approval to the application subject to conditions as outlined in the case officer report.**

**Z/2014/1221/O - North Boundary Street**

- 16. Z/2014/1211/O – Lands between North Boundary Street (Renewal of planning permission for construction of a four-storey 96-bedroom nursing home).**

The Committee was informed that the application submitted had been for a renewal of previously granted outline permission for a four-storey 96-bedroom nursing home, with associated car parking and landscaping. It was reported that the statutory consultees had offered no objections and, subject to the imposition of conditions, it was recommended that the application be approved.

**The Committee granted approval, subject to conditions as outlined within the Case Officer report.**

**Z/2014/1223/F - Macrory Memorial Presbyterian Church**

- 17. Z/2014/1223/F – Macrory Memorial Presbyterian Church (renewal of planning permission for construction of a three storey building).**

The Planning Officer indicated that the application had sought permission for a three-storey building comprising of 12 two-bedroom apartments with access from both Duncairn Gardens and Hillman Street. The principal issues which had been considered in the assessment of the proposal had related to the demolition of the church to permit the re-development of the site. The Planning Officer indicated that the principle of re-development had been established previously through planning approval Z/2008/1584/F. Since there had been no subsequent change in planning policy, the development was considered acceptable in terms of its scale, massing and design. It was pointed out that consultees had offered no objections and that no representations had been received.

During discussion in the matter, a number of Members suggested that further consideration might be given to preserving the church as part of the development. It was suggested that the application could be deferred for a month to seek the view of the

Northern Ireland Environment Agency on the architectural and historic importance of the church and to enable the Committee to make a decision within that context. Further Members sought clarity in respect of the current ownership of the property.

**The Committee deferred, to its meeting in June, consideration of the application for the reasons outlined.**

**Z/2015/0086/F - 159 Sandy Row**

- 18. Z/2015/0086/F – 159 Sandy Row (Change of use from vacant retail unit to hot food takeaway).**

The Committee was informed that the application had complied with the local area plan and relevant planning policies. The Planning Officer indicated that consultees had offered no objections and that no third party representations had been received.

**The Committee granted approval, subject to the imposing of the conditions as outlined within the report.**

**Z/2012/1421/F - Land at East Bridge Street - 'Market Tunnels'**

- 19. Z/2012/1421/F – Land within existing archways under East Bridge Street, known as the Markets Tunnels (Conversion of, and extension to, existing archways to provide a mix of uses).**

The Committee was informed that the application sought to redevelop eight derelict tunnels to enable a range of uses. The site, it was reported, was situated on un-zoned land within development limits as designated within the Belfast Metropolitan Area Plan. The Planning Officer reported that the proposal had been assessed against PPS 1 and was considered acceptable within a mixed-use area. It was indicated that no representations had been received and, subject to the imposition of conditions relating to contamination investigation and appropriate mitigation, it was recommended that the application be approved with conditions.

**The Committee granted approval, subject to conditions as outlined within the report.**

**Z/2014/1012/F - Sir Thomas and Lady Dixon Park**

- 20. Z/2014/1012/F – Sir Thomas & Lady Dixon Park (Alterations of existing road access onto Malone Road).**

The Planning Officer indicated that the application had sought to alter the existing road access from the park to the Upper Malone Road. It was pointed out that appropriate landscaping would be undertaken to address any loss of vegetation and to reduce and detriment to visual impact. The proposal complied with policy and would result in a safer access and exit since the entrance would be widened. The Committee was informed that the proposal would, if permitted, benefit users of the park and the wider public. It was indicated that no objections had been received and, accordingly, the Committee was recommended to approve the application.

**The Committee granted approval to the application.**

**Z/2014/0794/F - Ulster Independent Clinic, 245 Stranmillis Road**

**21. Z/2014/0794/F – Ulster Independent Clinic 245 Stranmillis Road (two-storey extension with basement to provide additional hospital facilities)**

It was reported that the application had been assessed to establish if the scale of the proposed building would be acceptable at the site, together with the associated impact upon protected trees in the vicinity and the setting of the existing listed buildings. As such, the proposals were deemed to be in compliance with the relevant policies. The statutory consultees had raised no objections to the proposal and, accordingly, the application had been recommended for approval with conditions imposed to ensure that there was no adverse impact on protected trees and the listed building.

**The Committee granted approval, subject to conditions as outlined.**

**Z/2014/1753/F - Lands at Rossmore Drive**

**22. Z/2014/1753/F – Lands on Rossmore Drive (renewal of planning approval for development of five townhouses and three apartments).**

The Planning Officer reported that the application had been assessed against the principle of housing at that location, the previously approved planning application and the scale and design of the scheme within the Rosetta Area of Townscape Character.

The Committee was advised that the proposal had adhered to relevant planning policies and material considerations and would not cause demonstrable harm. It was pointed out that the statutory consultees had offered no objections to the scheme and, subject to the implementation of standard conditions, approval was recommended.

**The Committee granted approval to the application.**

**Y/2015/0019/F - Play Park at Gilnahirk Park**

**23. Y/2015/0019/F – 75m due west of 37 Gilnahirk Park (Play area including a range of low-level equipment).**

The Planning Officer reported that the site in question was located within an existing area of open space and recreation land as zoned within the local development plan. The proposal had complied with relevant policies. However, 27 letters of objection had been received with regard to parking issues and road safety, the necessity for the development, together with issues which related to litter, flooding and the prior refusal of housing within the vicinity.

The Committee was informed that the principle of establishing a play park was considered acceptable. Since the proposal would affect 150 square metres of land, it was considered that it would not impact significantly upon the existing flood zone. The Planning Officer added that the existing area of open space and the modest scale of the development would not result in any significant adverse impact. Statutory consultees, it was pointed out, had offered no objections.

**The Committee granted approval.**



**Z/2014/0759/F - 1b Erinvale Drive**

**24. Z/2014/0759/F – 1b Erinvale Drive Belfast (Change of use from vacant unit to hot food bar).**

It was reported that the applicant has sought approval to substitute - and to have revoked - a previous approval, that being Z/2013/1056/F, at 1c Erinvale Drive. The Planning Officer outlined the main aspects of the application and reported that one objection had been received in respect of the potential for smell, noise and the cumulative impact of three hot food bars in the area. It was pointed out that the Council's Environmental Health Department had no objections to the proposal, but it had recommended conditions to mitigate noise and smell.

**The Committee granted approval with conditions, subject to the previous planning approval, i.e., Z/2013/1056/F being revoked.**

**Z/2014/1243/F - 2 Windsor Road**

**25. Z/2014/1243/F – 2 Windsor Road Belfast (Erection of eight 2.5 story terraced houses)**

The Committee was advised that the application had been assessed against the principle of redevelopment of the site for housing and its potential impact on the neighbouring area. The Planning Officer indicated that the proposal had complied with relevant planning policies and would not impact negatively on the amenity of existing residents. It was reported that there no representations had been received and that statutory consultees, including Transport NI, had offered no objections to the proposal.

**The Committee granted approval, subject to conditions as outlined within the report.**

Chairperson