

Planning Committee

Tuesday, 15th August, 2017

MEETING OF PLANNING COMMITTEE

Members present: Councillor Lyons (Chairperson);
Alderman McGimpsey;
Councillors Armitage, Bunting, Carson,
Dorrian, Garrett, Hussey, Hutchinson,
Johnston, Magee, McAteer, and Mullan.

In attendance: Mr. P. Williams, Director of Planning and Place;
Mr. J. Walsh, City Solicitor;
Ms. N. Largey, Divisional Solicitor; and
Ms. E. McGoldrick, Democratic Services Officer.

Apologies

An apology was reported on behalf of Councillor McDonough-Brown.

Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of 20th June 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 July, subject to the omission of those matters in respect of which the Council had delegated its powers to the Committee.

Declarations of Interest

Councillor Armitage declared an interest regarding item 11.c) LA04/2015/1465/F Demolition of rear hall and provision of annexe at Bloomfield Presbyterian Church, in that he had met with residents regarding the application, however, he indicated that, during those discussions he had not committed himself to any particular course of action in relation to the application.

Regarding item 11.c) LA04/2015/1465/F Demolition of rear hall and provision of annexe at Bloomfield Presbyterian Church, Councillor Dorrian declared an interest, in so far as he had received contact from residents, however, he indicated that he had not committed himself to any particular course of action in relation to the application.

Regarding item 11.d) LA04/2015/0773/F Demolition of existing building and erection of new building to extend the facilities within the existing orthodontic clinic located at 218 Ormeau Road, Councillor Lyons, declared an interest, in so far as he had discussed the proposal with local residents. He also declared an interest in relation to items 11.i) LA04/2017/0361/F and 11.j) LA04/2016/2360/F - Subdivision of retail unit 1 into 2 retail units at Hillview Retail Park, Crumlin Road, in that he had previously had a working relationship with objectors, however, he indicated that he had not committed himself to any particular course of action in relation to the application.

Recruitment of Operational Director of Planning and Building Control

The Committee was reminded that, at its meeting on 23rd June, the Strategic Policy and Resources Committee had agreed that the selection panel to recruit the post of Operational Director for Planning and Building Control in the new Place and Economy Department would be constituted by the Planning Committee at its meeting in August 2017.

It was reported that the Committee should nominate and agree three elected members for this selection panel who, along with the Chief Executive and City Solicitor, would balance the panel in terms of gender and community background.

The Committee agreed that:

- the composition of the selection panel to recruit the post of Operational Director for Planning and Building Control would be three elected members, along with the Chief Executive and City Solicitor;
- the panel would comprise of the Chairperson and the Deputy Chairperson of the Planning Committee (or their nominees) and a third elected member (either Cllr. Johnston or Cllr. Carson, or their nominees) with the Human Resources Section liaising with the Members to ensure the selection panel was balanced both in terms of gender and community background; and
- a targeted and timely proactive executive search approach be initiated to ensure a strong and competent applicant field for the job.

Quarter 1 – Finance Update

The Committee noted the contents of a report which provided an overview of the financial position of both the Planning and Licensing Committees, as at the end of the first quarter of the financial year. It was noted further that, as at 30th June, there had been a net over-spend of £141k, however, the forecast year-end departmental position was an under-spend of £61k (4.2%).

Committee Site Visit

Pursuant to its decision of 20th June, it was noted that the Committee had undertaken a site visit on 8th August in respect of planning application LA04/2016/0487/F - Change of use from dwelling to coffee shop, single storey side and rear extension at 1 St. Agnes Drive, Andersonstown Road.

Section 29 Directions – referral to Department for Infrastructure for determination

LA04/2017/0474/F – Casement Park Stadium

It was reported that correspondence had been received from the Department for Infrastructure (Dfi) notifying the Council of the regional significance of an application

which proposed re-development of Casement Park to provide a new Stadium (capacity of 34578) at lands at 88-104 Andersonstown Road and between 36-42 Morreland Park and 202-206 Stockman's Lane (full description available [here](#)). As a result of it being classified as 'Regionally Significant' under Section 26 of the Planning Act (NI) 2011, Dfl would be responsible for determining the application.

Noted.

LA04/2017/1388/F – Transport Hub

It was reported that correspondence had been received from the Department for Infrastructure (Dfi) notifying the Council of the regional significance of an application which proposed a new integrated public transport interchange at lands to the east of the Westlink (A12) (full description available [here](#)). As a result of it being classified as 'Regionally Significant' under Section 26 of the Planning Act (NI) 2011, Dfi would be responsible for determining the application.

Noted.

Response to consultation requests from Department for Infrastructure

LA04/2017/0474/F – Casement Park Stadium

The Committee was advised that a consultation request had been received by the Department for Infrastructure for the proposed application for the Re-development of Casement Park to provide a new Stadium (Capacity of 34578). The development included the demolition of the existing facilities; construction of new pitch, boundary wall and stands, incorporating bar/restaurant and ancillary kitchen areas, conference, training, community and cultural heritage and education facilities, ancillary offices, player accommodation and welfare facilities, press/media and broadcast facilities, replacement floodlighting, stadium/event management suite, ground support facilities including new arrangements for vehicles and pedestrians, electronic display installations, storage, surface and undercroft car parking, hard and soft landscaping, new landscaped pedestrian access from Mooreland Park to Stockman's Lane, together with use of the stadium for up to three outdoor music concerts in any calendar year.

The Committee agreed that the response, as outlined in the report, be issued to the Department for Infrastructure's Strategic Planning Division on behalf of the Council, with emphasis of the following points:

- Further detailed cross sections through the entire site and surrounding properties as a whole was recommended;
- In addition, in terms of wider visual effect, it was recommended that further images were required to demonstrate the impact on the skyline and on key views, both near and distant; and
- Greater certainty around travel, transport and traffic should also be provided at this stage.

LA04/2017/0878/F - power generation station site located on lands at Airport Road West Belfast Harbour Estate

The Committee was advised that a consultation request had been received from the Department for Infrastructure (DfI) for the proposed application for the Erection of 480MW Combined Cycle Gas Turbine Power Station comprised of turbine hall/heat recovery system generator building with 50m exhaust stack, air cooled condenser, 2 storey administration building, 2 storey workshop building, gas insulated substation, gas compressor station, gas pressure reduction station, associated water and fuel tanks and other associated infrastructure and ancillary development including provision of site access and road works to facilitate extension to pedestrian footways and delineation of a right hand turn lane. Construction of new Above Ground Installation (AGI) at Kinnegar Army Barracks and new underground pipeline along Airport Road West, Esplanade Road with option of also following Heron/Moscow Road and which would connect the Power Station Site to the existing gas transmission infrastructure at Kinnegar Barracks.

The case officer informed the Committee that, after the agenda had been published, additional information had been received from AES UK and Ireland, in response to comments from Belfast Power Limited in the case officer's report regarding Kilroot Power Station, which suggested that the forecasted reduction in capacity and eventual closure of Kilroot was inaccurate due to recent legislative changes and planned technological upgrades. She advised that these comments would be relayed to DfI.

After discussion, the Committee agreed that the response, as outlined (copy available on the Council's website), be issued to the Department for Infrastructure's (DfI) Strategic Planning Division on behalf of the Council.

LA04/2016/0421/F- Multi-purpose facility at D3 for berthing of cruise ships

The Committee was advised that a consultation request had been received from the Department for Infrastructure (DfI) for the proposed application for the construction of a new multi-purpose facility at D3 for berthing of cruise ships, and for lay-by and transient storage of project cargo, break bulk and dry bulk during cruise ship off season. The development comprised of the construction of 340m long solid quay with mooring dolphins, dredging of the berthing pocket and infilling behind the new quay wall using imported clean fill materials, construction of a 25m wide piled relieving slab along the quay length, with heavy duty paving surfacing on the quay/slab hinterland, access road, security gates, access barrier and kiosk at Airport Road West, modular terminal building, shore side facilities, lighting, fencing, and landscaping. (Amended Description).

The Committee was reminded that previous notification had been received from DfI and had been reported at the Planning Committee in June, 2016. This further consultation had now been received following the receipt of further environmental information resulting in updates to the Environmental Statement and an addendum.

The Committee agreed that the response, as outlined (copy available on the Council's website), be issued to the Department for Infrastructure's (DfI) Strategic Planning Division on behalf of the Council.

Statutory Consultee Annual Report

The Committee was reminded that Section 229 of the Planning (Northern Ireland) Act 2011 (Duty to respond to consultation) placed the previous administrative consultation arrangements in the development management process for planning applications on a statutory basis. It was reported that consultee bodies that had been identified in Schedule 3 of the Planning (General Development Procedure) Order (Northern Ireland) 2015 (“the GDPO”) were statutory consultees, and therefore subject to the duty to respond to statutory consultation requests from another district council, or the Department, acting as the relevant planning authority.

It was reported that the Statutory Consultee Annual Report, as outlined in Appendix A, outlined the Council’s performance for 2016/17 and highlighted that the Department for Infrastructure had acknowledged that there had been shortcomings with the consultation process and would be establishing a task and finish working group to identify and introduce improvements, to which an officer from the Council had been nominated to attend.

The Committee noted the contents of the report and agreed to the submission of the Statutory Consultee Annual Report to the Department for Infrastructure as outlined in Appendix A of the report. (Copy available [here](#)).

Planning Appeals Notified

The Committee noted the receipt of correspondence in respect of a number of planning appeals which had been submitted to the Planning Appeals Commission, together with the outcomes of a range of hearings which had been considered by the Commission.

Planning Decisions Notified

The Committee noted a list of decisions which had been taken under delegated authority by the Director of Planning and Place, together with all other planning decisions which had been issued by the Planning Department between 12th June and 7th August, 2017.

Departmental Performance Update

The Development Engagement Manager provided the following information on the Department’s performance up to 31st July, 2017:

Planning Applications

- 191 applications had been validated in July, 2017;
- 277 applications had been validated in June, 2017; and
- Overall numbers of applications validated this year had increased by 13% on the same period last year.

Planning Decisions

- 131 decisions had been issued in July, 2017;
- 220 decisions had been issued in June, 2017;
- 96% approval rate;
- 95% decisions had been issued under delegated authority; and

No. of applications in system by length of time

- 971 live applications were in the system at end of July, 2017;
- 71% of applications were in the system for less than 6 months; and
- 14 legacy applications were outstanding.

Performance against statutory targets (un-validated management information)

- The statutory target for processing major development planning applications from the date valid to decision issued or withdrawal date was within an average of 30 weeks. Up to the 31st July, 2017, the average processing time to decide major applications was 60. This, however, included legacy applications and those Major applications which had been delayed whilst a Section 76 agreement had been put in place;
- The statutory target for processing local development planning applications from the date valid to decision issued or withdrawal date was an average of 15 weeks. Up to the 31st July, 2017, the average processing time to decide local applications was 16.7 weeks; and
- The statutory target was that 70% of all enforcement cases are progressed to target conclusion within 39 weeks of receipt of complaint. Up to the 31st July, 2017, 70% of enforcement cases had been concluded within 39 weeks.

The Committee also noted that the amount of legacy applications that had been completed and that remained in the system, would be included in the performance report next month.

Proposed Abandonments and Extinguishment of Public Rights of Way

The Committee noted the receipt of correspondence from the Department for Infrastructure which related to the Extinguishment of Public Rights of Way at:

- Beechpark Street and Beechnut Place;
- Jamaica Road;
- Lawther Court;
- Slievegallion Drive; and
- The Village.

The Committee also noted the receipt of correspondence from the Department for Infrastructure which related to the proposed abandonment of Public Rights of Way at:

- Lisburn Road, Turning Circle.

Miscellaneous Items

Listed Buildings

The Committee was advised that correspondence had been received from the Northern Ireland Environment Agency (NIEA) seeking the Council's views in respect of proposals for the listing of a number of buildings in Belfast.

The Committee was reminded that Article 80 (3) of the Planning Act (NI) 2011 required the Agency to consult with the Council before placing any building on the statutory list of buildings of special architectural or historic interest.

The Committee noted the contents of the report and supported the proposed listings of the following buildings by the Department for Communities:

- 22A Cadogan Park;
- 22 – 24 Windsor Park;
- 26 Windsor Park;
- 28 Windsor Park;
- 30 Windsor Park;
- 32 Windsor Park;
- 114 Marlborough Park Central; and
- 47 Derryvolgie Avenue.

The Committee also agreed to defer consideration of the listing of 30 Malone Park so that further clarification could be sought from the Historic Environment Division regarding the process that had been undertaken to list the property.

Update on Local Development Plan

The Committee considered the following report:

“1.0 Purpose of Report or Summary of main Issues

The purpose of this report is to update members on the progress of the new Belfast Local Development Plan (LDP) and outline the next steps in the plan development process.

2.0 Recommendations

It is recommended that Members note the progress on the LDP. The main issues to report include:

- The Preferred Options Paper (POP) Consultation Report and now been completed and has been published on our website.
- Note progress on a number of commissioned research studies including the Strategic Housing Needs Assessment (SHNA), Urban Capacity Study for residential and employment land, a Retail and Leisure Capacity Study, the Open Spaces Strategy and the Blue and Green Infrastructure masterplan
- Work is ongoing on the preparation of the draft Plan Strategy and members will be invited to workshops in the Autumn as policy is being composed

3.0 Main report

Background and Context

3.1 Draft POP Consultation report was presented to Committee in June. Work on this report has now been completed at was published on our website on Wednesday 26 July. The feedback from this consultation process will now feed into the development of the draft plan strategy.

3.2 It is necessary to continue to build upon this extensive evidence base as we work towards the preparation of the draft Plan Strategy – the first of the two development plan documents that will form the final LDP. In accordance with regional policy and best practice in plan preparation, a need has been identified for a further three inter-related pieces of research. These can be summarised as follows:

- Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) – Whilst the Housing Growth Options report considered the overall number of housing units required in Belfast to 2035, the Strategic Planning Policy Statement (SPPS) requires the completion of a Housing Needs Assessment (HNA) and Housing Market Analysis (HMA) to consider the right mix and balance of housing required in terms of tenures, types and sizes. Whilst much of the HMA work was undertaken to inform the Housing Growth Options Study, this will now be built upon to provide a detailed assessment of need. This will provide robust evidence in relation to the mix of houses of different sizes required and the balance of tenures, such as open market housing, social housing, and other affordable housing types. It will also consider needs associated specialist

housing types, such as homes for older people, private rented accommodation, student housing and needs associated with the Traveller community.

- **Urban Capacity Study (UCS) – The SPPS for Northern Ireland requires that an UCS be completed to “assess the potential for future housing growth within the urban footprint and the capacity for different types and densities of housing.” In addition, the SPPS requires that “LDPs should identify previously developed land within settlements for potential economic development” with the need to “offer a range and choice of sites in terms of size and location.” An UCS has been commissioned to assess in detail the development potential, suitability, availability and achievability of different forms of residential and economic development across the City. The study comprises six key components including:-**

1. Methodology Report
2. Site Identification
3. Windfall Assessment
4. Site Assessment
5. Assessment Review
6. UCS Report

To date a draft Methodology Report prepared and work is ongoing on data sharing. An assessment of existing densities ongoing and the initial site identification has been completed. Preparation for site assessment has also begun.

- **Retail and Leisure Capacity Study – The SPPS requires councils to “undertake an assessment of the need or capacity for retail and other main town centre uses across the plan area” when preparing LDPs. The Retail and Leisure Capacity Study will therefore provide an assessment of retail and leisure needs and capacity in the period up to 2035, reviewing the current performance of Belfast City Centre and other neighbourhood/local centres across the Council area and will provide the evidence to guide the detailed planning policies for Town Centre retail and leisure developments.**

- The remit of the consultant is to review and analyse existing floorspace, diversity of uses and extent of activity across the council area; define a network and hierarchy of centres; define the mix and proportion of uses; identify and appraise future retail and leisure development sites and undertake a review of existing policies and advise on the plan strategy. The consultant will work collaboratively with Council staff, attend workshops and present to senior management and will attend future examinations of the plan.
- The consultant met with council staff on 28th July discussing the diversity of use survey and has completed a householder's survey as of 7th August. The study is expected to be completed by the end of September 2017.
- Green and Blue Infrastructure Masterplan establishes principles guiding the continued protection, management and expansion of our green and blue network. It includes all green and blue spaces in and around the city and enables the consideration of the collective value of all of these spaces together. Constituent elements of green and blue infrastructure include parks, private gardens, agricultural fields, hedges, trees, woodland, green roofs, green walls, rivers and ponds regardless of its ownership, condition or size. The Open Spaces Strategy is one of the key components of the masterplan and is required by the SPPS as a constituent part of the LDP. Work has commenced on the preparation of the Green and Blue Masterplan. A draft of the study is expected to be completed by the end of September 2017. A workshop for key stakeholders of the open space strategy is scheduled for the 14 Sept with a view to completion towards the end of this year.

3.3 Financial and Resource Implications

There are no additional resource implication arising from the reports.

3.4 Equality or Good Relations Implications

There are no direct equality and good relations implications associated with this report. However, it should be noted that the Housing Needs Assessment work will consider the need for specialist housing types,

such as homes for older people and traveller accommodation, helping to provide the evidence required to ensure the LDP fulfils its obligation to such groups. The Plan Strategy and Local Policies Plan, which will make up the final LDP and which will be informed by this research, will also be subject to Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) processes.”

Noted.

Local Development Plan - Metropolitan Area Spatial Working Group

The Committee was reminded that, at its meeting on 7th June, it had been agreed that the Council would participate in a joint working group linked to the preparation of the Local Development Plans, which would comprise of the planning authorities in the Metropolitan area and that the Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson of the Planning Committee had been nominated to serve on the working group.

It was reported that the inaugural meeting was scheduled for 4th September, 2017 and a draft agenda had been included in the report which included the following items: Membership and governance for the group; Terms of Reference; Timetables for each Local Development Plan; Information availability and sharing; Individual council priorities and potential synergies, together with key areas of discussion, such as the environment, housing, retail, transport and infrastructure.

Noted.

Additional Item – Planning Staff Rotation

With the permission of the Chairperson, the Director of Planning and Place provided the Committee with an update regarding the rotation of staff on the Strategic and Major Planning Application Team, and the Local Planning Application Team, within the Planning and Place Department.

The Committee noted the update and that contact details for the teams would be sent to the Members in due course.

Planning Applications

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

LA04/2016/2267/F - Erection of an office building (ranging in height from four to six storeys) and associated access road, re-configuration of existing car park and ancillary works at Site C Gasworks Office Park.

The Committee was reminded that the application had been on the agenda and case officer reports had been published in March and April, 2017, however, the application had not been presented at either of the Committee Meetings.

The Committee was also reminded that, at its meeting on 13th April, before presentation of the application commenced, the Committee, given the issues which had been raised regarding the ratification of the Gasworks Masterplan, the relationship between the proposed tower block and the impact on the surrounding housing, and consistency in the approach to major developments, had agreed to defer consideration of the application to enable a site visit to be undertaken to acquaint itself with the location and the proposal at first hand.

The case officer informed the Committee that, after the agenda had been published, the following additional information had been received from the Northern Ireland Housing Executive, which raised the following points:

- high social housing need in the local area (104 applicants on waiting list, 84 in housing stress and 20 allocations over the previous year (September, 2016);
- the site was located within a larger social housing zoning; and
- BMAP was the primary consideration in determining planning applications unless material considerations dictated otherwise.

The case officer outlined the response of the Planning Department to the aforementioned issues raised, as outlined in the Late Items Report Pack.

She presented the application and highlighted that further consideration had been given to the application in the second addendum report, in light of additional and changes to the material circumstances.

She concluded that the public consultation exercise had been conducted in line with legislation and advised that the proposal for an office development at this location was recommended for approval.

The Chairperson advised that deputations who wished to speak on the application should deal with the technical aspects and planning considerations of the application.

The Committee received a representation from Councillor Hargey. She outlined a range of objections to the case officer's recommendation for approval. She suggested that the Belfast Metropolitan Area Plan (BMAP) should be a material consideration as it was the most recent planning document and zoned the entire site for housing, and applications for the site should not be considered until an overall masterplan had been agreed and adopted. She also suggested that there was a high need for social housing in the area and 86 families were in housing stress, mainly needing three bedroom houses. She raised concerns regarding land which had been zoned for housing being changed for business interests, and suggested that there was a lack of respect for inner city communities and their needs.

During points of clarification, she also suggested that there had been disparity between how the Committee dealt with sites zoned for housing, especially when the sites were located in the City centre.

The Committee also received representation from Ms. N. McFall, representing the Markets Development Association (MDA), and Ms. C. Bailey, MLA.

Ms. McFall outlined a range of objections to the proposal. She questioned the pre application community consultation report and whether regular meetings with stakeholders, which had been stated in the applicants report, had taken place. She suggested that there was a sustained housing need in the area and that as the site was zoned for housing under BMAP, it should still carry weight and was a material consideration in the decision making process. She suggested that there should have been meaningful discussion with the Northern Ireland Housing Executive (NIHE) in regards to the development of housing on the site and there had been a lack of consistency with decisions made by the Planning Committee. She also suggested that the Committee should refuse the application to allow time for the Gas Works Masterplan to be agreed by all those affected.

Ms. Bailey, MLA explained her objections to the proposal, as follows:

- The scale, massing and design of the proposal;
- Issues with the land height and the potential for the buildings to intrude on the surrounding residential properties;
- Loss of light and dominance - The case officers report had already identified this as a problem and would create a barrier;
- Suggested the removal of existing walls instead of building higher ones;
- Issues with the access road and its potential to create an infrastructure barrier for the residents and community; and
- Suggested that the Committee should support the inner city communities' views and refuse the proposal, as without a masterplan being agreed for the other plots of the site, she believed it would be the wrong way to start the development.

During points of clarification, Ms. McFall also suggested that she was not aware of the existence of the Gasworks Residency Committee and Gasworks Security Forum which had been stated in the applicants report regarding the pre application community consultation.

At this point, the City Solicitor clarified that the adoption of the Belfast Metropolitan Area Plan (BMAP), which had been referred to by the objectors, had been challenged by the Council in respect of a Sprucefield Development related issue. He stated that the Belfast Urban Area Plan (BUAP) was out of date, and BMAP continued to have significant weight in terms of planning considerations due to it having undergone a public inquiry, a number of internal department processes and was at an advanced stage. He explained that there had been a Joint Ministerial Statement on the matter, which indicated that the further stages that BMAP had reached in the process prior to adoption, the more weight it should be given, in terms of planning decisions. He advised that this position was still relevant, therefore, BMAP was of significant weight in the Committee's decision making process and that only one aspect of BMAP was contentious.

The Committee also received representation from Councillor Craig who outlined a range of support for the application which included investment, job creation, together with rent and rates income for the Council. He suggested that the length of time it had taken to consider the application at the Planning Committee would create fear for further investment in the city and was disappointed it had taken so long. He suggested the proposal would create Grade A office space which would occur without the need for public funding and the developer had a prospective tenant for the proposal. He suggested that the Northern Ireland Housing Executive had suggested that this particular site might be too contaminated to build housing on.

The Committee also received representation from Mr. C. Bryson, Strategic Planning, acting on behalf of the applicant and Mr. N. McLaren, the applicant, representing Inislyn Limited.

Mr. McLaren outlined a range of support for the application. He suggested that the proposal would generate revenue for the City and that the development company had a long standing and successful relationship with the Gasworks site and the Council, having previously developed the Radisson Blue Hotel and the Lighthouse Building on the site, together with two car parks. He suggested they were committed to working alongside the Council as they developed the Masterplan for the area. He suggested that the proposal would provide high quality office and working space for approximately 550 people, during construction approximately 50 Construction jobs, and generate approximately £750,000 via various income streams. He suggested that the applicant was in the final stages of securing two prospective tenants. He suggested that they were local developers who take pride in the projects they undertook and this proposal would enhance the area. He confirmed that the Developer Contribution proposed for this development included a combination of physical works and community initiatives.

Mr. Bryson outlined his support for the planning officer's recommendation to approve the proposal. He suggested that it was in keeping with the surrounding land uses and character of the area, was in full compliance with the relevant area plan and other material considerations. He suggested that after it had been adopted, BMAP had been quashed, and it could not be a material consideration in the determination process and the court judgement was clear on that point. The site was zoned for offices in the last adopted plan, BUAP, as it was in a draft BMAP in 2004. He suggested there had been no objections from the closest 8 houses on McAuley Street to the application site. He suggested that the Northern Ireland Housing Executive consultation response of 9th June, 2016 made it clear that the high levels of contamination associated with the previous land uses had meant that other recent social housing schemes had incurred high costs and led to difficulties delivering housing in the area. He suggested that there would be no adverse impact on residential amenity and the design had included obscure glazing and planting which would ensure there would be no overlooking.

During points of clarification, Mr. McLaren suggested that the total proposed investment would be £12-13 million for the office element and confirmed that the consultation groups referred to in their report were the Gasworks Residents Committee, (attendees included Business Tenants of the Gasworks), and the Gasworks Community Forum (attendees included commercial tenants, PSNI, along with local community groups). He suggested further that the MDA had been invited to this Forum, however,

did not attend the meetings. He also suggested that his comments regarding the legalities of which area plan was relevant to the application were different from the Council's.

During discussion, the case officer explained that a Pre Application Notice had been served by the Council for a mixed used development which included offices, housing and retail on the remainder of the land. She provided an overview of the statutory requirements of the consultation process and advised that a condition had been applied to the recommendation regarding the remediation of contamination at the site.

The City Solicitor was requested to clarify his advice on the relevant Area Plan for the site. He advised that the BUAP was 16 years old, and the data that underpinned it was out of date. He reiterated that BMAP had to be given significant weight in terms of a planning decision, however, if there were circumstances when the Committee might wish to depart from policy, then the Committee was legally permitted to do so, as long as it gave appropriate reasons for its decision.

During further discussion, the Director highlighted paragraph 19, as outlined in the case officer's report, which stated that the Council had expressed a commitment, as of the Council Meeting on 3rd July, to move forward with an Outline Planning application for a comprehensive mixed use development for the lands, and a PAN had now been served to that affect. He advised that if approval was granted for the proposal, it would not prejudice the opportunity to deliver a master plan or the inclusion of residential use in the mixed use development.

Proposal

Moved by Councillor Bunting, and
Seconded by Alderman McGimpsey,

That the Committee agrees to grant approval to the application, subject to the imposing of the conditions set out in the case officer's report and, in accordance with Section 76 of the Planning Act (Northern Ireland) 2015, delegated power to the Director of Planning and Place, in conjunction with the City Solicitor, to enter into discussions with the applicant to explore the scope of any Planning Agreements which might be realised by way of developer contributions and, if so, to enter into such an Agreement on behalf of the Council and delegate power to the Director of Planning and Place for the final wording of the conditions.

On a vote by show of hands eight Members voted for the proposal and five against and it was declared carried.

(The meeting was adjourned for 10 minutes.)

LA04/2016/2360/F Subdivision of existing retail unit 1 into 2 no. new retail units (with provision of new 1st floor mezzanine level at new unit 1B for storage); re-cladding works to existing units 2-5; demolition and reconfiguration of the front façade treatment to the elevations of new units 1A and 1B; new rear single storey extension into the service yard of unit 1B to facilitate servicing and deliveries; new dock leveller at the rear of proposed unit 1B; 1 new drive-thru restaurant unit; 1 no. new drive-thru café/restaurant pod; 1 stand-alone restaurant unit; 1 no. new car sales premises; reconfiguration of existing car parking areas at Hillview Retail Park, Crumlin Road; and

LA04/2017/0361/F Subdivision of retail unit 1 into 2 retail units with mezzanine at new unit 1b, single storey rear extension with dock leveller, elevation changes including re-cladding, reconfiguration of existing car parking at Hillview Retail Park, Crumlin Road

The Committee agreed to deal with the applications together, however, noted that separate decisions were required for each of the applications, and that deputations who wished to speak had been allocated double the standard allocated time to make their representations.

The Chairperson advised the Committee that a late request to speak had been received from Councillor McCusker. Accordingly, the Committee agreed that he could make representation regarding the applications.

The case officer presented the aforementioned application - LA04/2016/2360/F, followed by the second application relating to the same retail park - LA04/2017/0361/F.

He informed the Committee that, after the agenda had been published, an additional 5 objections had been received regarding LA04/2016/2360/F and LA04/2017/0361/F, together with a petition, which raised the following points:

- the site was an opportunity to address housing inequality in North Belfast;
- Section 75 of the Northern Ireland Act 1998 required due regard to the promotion of equality of opportunity;
- the district centre status of the site in BMAP was of declining influence. The site had been vacant for 10 years and the district centre use was not needed;
- approving the application would use up limited space required for housing and to tackle housing inequality in North Belfast. The Planning Committee had stated there was a need to address housing need through the emerging Local Plan;
- requested copies of the equality screening template, and any other records kept of compliance with the statutory equality duty, in relation to the work which had been undertaken under the Council's functions in relation to processing, consideration and recommendations on the two Hillview planning applications;
- raised concerns regarding the Council's obligation to fulfil human rights and equality obligations, and not discriminate on grounds of religious belief or political opinion and compliance with the Section 75 Equality Duty;
- the adverse impact on existing retailing in the locality; and
- clarification had been sought on question 25 of the planning application form (average no. of vehicles/ persons attending premises daily); and

- suggested that a transport assessment form should be required.

The case officer outlined the response of the Planning Department to the aforementioned issues raised, as outlined in the Late Items Report Pack. He highlighted that the proposal for consideration was for a retail development and the site was zoned as a District Centre in BMAP.

The Committee received representations from Councillors Collins, Clarke, McCabe, Campbell and McCusker. They outlined a range of objections to the case officer's recommendation for approval, as follows:

- zoning of housing in North Belfast;
- support and need for social housing in North Belfast and cases of homelessness in the area;
- procedural flaws regarding use of the relevant plan (BUAP and BMAP) and that the BUAP shouldn't be discounted;
- application and policy flaws;
- that there was no mention of asbestos in the case officer's report;
- the development would prejudice discussions with NIHE;
- potential of vesting the land for social housing;
- oppose the development on behalf of local residents;
- the previous retail outlet had been a failed venture;
- cross community work and consultation was needed on what form the site should take and the need for community to be on board
- questioned if the meeting date had been changed;
- suggested that not enough consideration had been given to 6.270 of the Strategic Planning Policy Statements (SPPS) regarding support and vibrancy of town centres;
- questioned the lawful use of the site;
- lack of communication throughout the process; and
- clarification on the case officer's comments in relation to aspects of the application that did not require planning permission.

During points of clarification, the Director reminded Members of the Committee cycle and the dates which had been published in relation to the August Committee.

After the deputation had spoken, one Member asked for clarification from the City Solicitor regarding evidence of a housing application for the site. The City Solicitor confirmed that there was currently no evidence to suggest interest from a Statutory Body in vesting of the site, therefore, it could not be a material consideration in the context of the application.

The Committee also received representation from Ms. G. Owens (resident), Ms. C. Ní Chuilín MLA, and Mr. S. Brady (representing Participation and the Practice of Rights) who outlined a range of objections to the proposals.

Ms. Owens suggested that her current social housing accommodation in North Belfast was inadequate and was causing her family ill health. She suggested there was a need for housing in the area, and the Equality Campaign that she was involved with

had delivered a petition to the Northern Ireland Housing Executive and the Department of Communities in this regard. She suggested that the site would be one of the last places that families like hers could have any hope of a home and the Committee should refuse the application.

Ms. Ní Chuilín MLA suggested that there was concern from various equality campaigners that the application site had been designated for retail only use. She suggested that a full Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA) was needed regarding the proposal and failure to do so would be contrary to the spirit of Section 75. She raised concerns regarding the consultation that had taken place by the developers, the low quality of drawings and the design of the proposal. She suggested that there were opportunities on this site for mixed use, to provide employment but also social housing.

Mr. Brady outlined his objections to the proposal which included flaws in the Planning policy and procedures, and the complaints process. He suggested that he had been given the wrong date of the Planning Committee by a Council Official. He suggested that the Chief Executive of the Housing Executive had written to families in 2014, detailing that she had wished, at the time, to build homes on the site. He also suggested that a Housing Association had also brought forward an application to the Housing Executive for homes on the site in 2014. He suggested that the campaign against the proposals had drawn upon the support of 5 Political Parties and represented thousands of constituents in need. He suggested that they had carried out their own consultation forums across North Belfast and had designed a better, alternative plan for the site. He suggested that the Committee should vote on the needs of the community and refuse both applications.

The City Solicitor advised that policies that underpin Planning had been taken through the EQIA process, such as the SPSS and the Planning Statements, BMAP and the BUAP, which was what had been required in terms of legal compliance.

During points of clarification, the objecting deputation provided further information regarding their objections to both applications; problems with the consultation and planning process; the potential of Council vesting the land; and reiterated their suggestion for an EQIA for the applications.

The City Solicitor reminded the Committee that the site was owned by a private third party and was not under public authority ownership, therefore, it would be treated differently in terms of equality screening.

The Committee received representation from Mr. T. Stokes (TSA Planning, Planning Agent) and Mr. S. Beattie QC (representing the applicant) who outlined a range of support for the case officer's recommendation for approval.

Mr. Stokes provided an overview of the Planning History of the site and suggested that BMAP had zoned the site as a district centre and it was an existing, unrestricted, open class A1 retail park. He suggested that there had been strong interest from retailers, and complimentary café/restaurant/drive thru's which would help the performance of the District Centre. He suggested that the smaller application was submitted to advance discussions with a specific interested retailer and speed up the application process. He suggested it was a commercial application which aimed at bringing the Retail Park back into use, and strengthen the future performance of the

designated District Centre. He acknowledged that there was a need for Social Housing in the area, however, suggested that there was no policy basis for refusing permission for the current proposals based on this need.

Mr. Beattie QC provided background regarding the outcome of the Judicial Review and court of appeal regarding the relevance of the draft BMAP and the statutory BUAP. He explained his support for the application as follows:

- in BMAP, the site had been zoned as a District Centre, and in the BUAP it had been zoned a Whiteland;
- the guiding principle under the SPSS was that there was a presumption in favour of development for a proposal which was consistent with the up to date plan (e.g. BMAP);
- considerable weight should be given to the draft BMAP and there had been no objection to the designation of this site as a District Centre;
- there were no policy presumptions against this development under the BUAP's zoning of whiteland of the site either;
- no statutory agency had objected to BMAP, therefore it should get considerable weight in planning decisions;
- planning policies raised by the objectors had not counter balanced the presumption in favour of development for a proposal which was consistent with either of the area plans;
- there had been no proposals from NIHE for this site, and it was not the fault of the Council or the Developer;
- the proposition to refuse the application to facilitate the vesting process, would be an illegal, inappropriate and improper motive;

In relation to the objectors' comments, Mr. Beattie suggested SPSS 2.670 did not displace the presumption in favour of development; the equality legislation issues raised by objectors had been raised in the process of BMAP and that his client also had rights under the prevailing policies and that the proposal was policy compliant, lawful, and should be approved.

During points of clarification, the deputation supporting the applications provided further information and suggested there was no policy requirement for a Section 76 agreement, a housing proposal at the site would be inconsistent with policy, and there had been no discussions regarding social housing because of the zoning of the site. Mr. Beattie also suggested that business sustainability of the proposed retail park was not a material consideration for the applications and that the District Centre designation was at a higher level of protection from local centres, as within BMAP policy, whereas town centres had a separate policy that protected them.

After the deputations had concluded, the Development Engagement Manager advised that there was nothing to prevent the occupation of existing site as retail units. He advised that the issue of asbestos had been dealt with in the report and Environmental Health had no objections. He reminded Members that they should

determine the application on material considerations and that a Local Development Plan that was being prepared was the forum for addressing issues such as housing need.

Proposal

Moved by Councillor Magee, and
Seconded by Councillor McAteer,

That the Committee, given the issues which had been raised regarding the housing need and equality, in regards to applications LA04/2016/2360/F and LA04/2017/0361/F, agrees to defer consideration of the applications to permit a site visit to be undertaken to allow the Committee to acquaint itself with the location and the proposal at first hand, together with information from officers to be provided on the requirement for an equality impact assessment.

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

Application LA04/2016/2360/F

Proposal

Moved by Councillor Bunting, and
Seconded by Alderman McGimpsey,

That the Committee, agrees to grant approval to the LA04/2016/2360/F application, subject to the imposing of the conditions set out within the case officer's report.

On a vote by show of hands seven Members voted for the proposal and six against and it was declared carried.

Application LA04/2017/0361/F

Proposal

Moved by Councillor Bunting, and
Seconded by Alderman McGimpsey,

That the Committee, agrees to grant approval to the LA04/2017/0361/F application, subject to the imposing of the conditions set out within the case officer's report.

On a vote by show of hands seven Members voted for the proposal and six against and it was declared carried.

Reconsidered Item - LA04/2016/0051/F - Alterations to internal layout (demolition) facilitating new residential building consisting of 5 apartments (4 one bed and 1 two bed). (Amended proposal and Scheme) at Eglantine Avenue.

(Alderman McGimpsey and Councillors Carson, Dorrian, Lyons and Mullan took no part in the discussion or decision-making of the application since they had not been in attendance at the meeting on 16th May when it had originally been considered).

The Committee was reminded that the application had been originally presented to the Planning Committee on 16th May and had been deferred so that a site visit could be undertaken and also for information to be submitted from the applicant regarding reflective glazing.

He highlighted that the case officer's report of 16th May had included a recommendation to refuse the application, however, subsequently, amended application form and drawings had been submitted which had reduced the number of apartments from 6 to 5, together with details of the proposed reflective glazing. He pointed out that the amended application had been re-advertised and the neighbours re-notified and no further objections had been received.

He advised that the amended plans fully addressed the Planning Department's concerns regarding the proposal and it was now recommended for approval.

The Committee agreed (with one Member opposed) to grant approval to the application, subject to the imposing of the conditions set out within the case officer's report.

LA04/2017/0106/F Change of use from a retail unit to place of worship including refurbishment and redeveloped with a two storey rear extension, single storey side extension and elevation changes at 208-212 Lisburn Road

The Committee considered the aforementioned application.

The case officer advised that the following condition outlined in 12.0 of the report was no longer required: *'16. Tree numbers 22 and 24 as shown on approved drawing 15A, date stamped 28 February 2017, shall be retained and protected in accordance with the tree protection measures as set out in "The Tree Survey Report" date stamped 23 December 2016. Reason: To protect bats.'*

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

LA04/2017/0707/F Redevelopment of Andersonstown Leisure Centre

The case officer outlined the proposal for the redevelopment of Andersonstown Leisure Centre to include demolition of existing leisure centre and Ulster Bank and the erection of a new multi-purpose leisure facility building, including family leisure water

provision, 25m swimming pool, learner pool, fitness suite, fitness studios, ancillary rooms and associated works, public and service vehicles access via Andersonstown Road and secondary service vehicle access from Owenvarragh Park. External facilities included 2 five-a-side pitches, cycle and car parking, coach drop off points, landscaping, external water slide flumes and plaza area to the front of the centre and open space at the rear.

It was noted that the application, in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation, had been presented to the Committee since the Council was the applicant and it was also a major application.

During discussion, Members were apprised of information regarding the car parking ticketing system, flood lighting and the proposed opening hours of the complex and the case officer highlighted the planning conditions which related to these issues under 12.0 in the case officer's report.

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

LA04/2017/0461/F- Extensions / Alterations to Oyster House and Royston House comprising of extensions to the 7th floor and 1 additional floor above for offices, an 8 storey lift core extension within the courtyard, creation of roof terrace, alterations to existing elevations and reconfiguration of ground floor to form 2 new retail units and entrance lobby on lands at 12 to 30 Wellington Place (Oyster House) and 42-46 Upper Queen Street (Royston House)

The Committee considered the aforementioned application.

The Case Officer advised that the Council's Conservation Officer had objected to the proposed extensions as they considered that it would have a negative impact on the interpretation of the Conservation Area as a late Victorian / Edwardian commercial city centre. He advised that these concerns had been carefully considered by Officers, however, taking into account the context of the existing building and the heights and roof forms of adjoining buildings with the main views of 9 Donegall Square West (Grade A listed building) which would remain uninterrupted, along with the upgrade secured to the ground floor shop units, the impact on the conservation area was considered to be acceptable and not considered in this case to result in harm.

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

LA04/2016/0400/F - Apartment development (28 units) on lands at 230 Belmont Road

The Committee considered the application for an apartment development (28 units) with associated car parking, landscaping and amendments to existing access (renewal of approved application Z/2008/2449/F).

During discussion, the Committee raised issues regarding access, car parking and the replacement of trees.

After discussion, given the issues which had been raised regarding the traffic and impact on the trees, the Committee agreed to defer consideration of the application to enable a site visit to be undertaken to allow the Committee to acquaint itself with the location and the proposal at first hand. The Committee also agreed that the Council's Tree Officer be invited to attend the site visit and Transport NI be asked for clarification on their position and attend the next Planning Committee, if possible.

LA04/2015/1465/F - Demolition of rear Hall and provision of annexe at Bloomfield Presbyterian Church

The case officer advised that the site was located within the curtilage of a Grade B1 Listed Building – Bloomfield Presbyterian Church, and the Cyprus Conservation Area.

The Committee granted approval to the application, subject to the imposing of the conditions set out within the case officer's report.

LA04/2015/0773/F - Demolition of existing building and erection of new building to extend the facilities within the existing orthodontic clinic located at 218 Ormeau Road

(Councillor Lyons, who had declared an interest in this application, took no part in the debate or decision-making process, and left the table. Councillor Johnston acted as Chairperson for this application.)

The Case officer advised that the site was located within the settlement development limits of Belfast as defined in the Belfast Urban Area Plan (BUAP) and Draft Belfast Metropolitan Area Plan, and was within the North Parade/South Parade Area of Townscape Character (Draft BMAP).

During discussion, the case officer advised that although the existing building contributed strongly to the character of the area and also to the character and setting of Cooke Centenary Presbyterian Church (Grade B1 Listed Building), a structural engineer's report had been obtained which demonstrated that it was not feasible to retain the existing building, given the level of structural defects identified. He explained that the proposed replacement building and the proposed commercial use were considered to be acceptable given the planning history on the site, the business uses in the surrounding area and the fact that this was an extension of an existing business.

Proposal

Moved by Councillor Hussey, and
Seconded by Councillor Dorrian,

That the Committee agrees to approve the application, in line with the draft conditions outlined in the addendum report, and delegate authority

to the Director of Planning and Place to agree and finalise the planning conditions

On a vote by show of hands eight Members voted for the proposal and four against and it was declared carried.

(Councillor Lyons returned to the Committee table at this point)

(The meeting was adjourned for 10 minutes.)

LA04/2017/0573/F - Conversion of dwelling to HMO at 9 Euterpe Street

The case officer outlined the proposal for the conversion of a dwelling to a HMO.

The case officer explained that, after assessment, the application had been recommended for refusal on the grounds that the proposal was contrary to Policy HMO 1 of the Houses in Multiple Occupation Subject Plan for Belfast City Council Area 2015, in that the number of HMO dwelling units in the Donegall Road HMO Policy Area (HMO 2/07) already exceeded the 30% threshold and no further HMO development was permitted.

The Committee refused the application for the reasons as set out in the case officer's report.

LA04/2016/1439/F - 24 semi-detached dwellings and associated car parking and landscaping with alterations to existing on-street car parking layout at Corner site to south of junction of Forthriver Road and Forthriver Way.

The Committee considered the aforementioned application.

The case officer informed the Committee that, after the agenda had been published, a revised landscape plan had been received which showed additional planting, of which neighbours had been notified. She advised that the neighbour notification period expired on 21st August and that additional planting was unlikely to raise any new issues.

The Committee granted approval to the application, subject to the imposing of the conditions set out in the case officer's report and delegated power to the Director of Planning and Place to deal with any further comments or issues that might be received regarding the application.

LA04/2017/1125/F - Replacement of 22.25 linear metres of 1.8m high steel bow-top fencing with 2.45m high paladin fencing at Lenadoon Millennium Park

It was noted that the application, in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation, had been presented to the Committee since the Council was the applicant.

The Committee granted approval to the application, subject to the imposing of the conditions set out within the case officer's report.

LA04/2015/0670/F Residential development of 53 units comprising 33 detached, 4 semi-detached and 16 apartments on lands at Castlehill Manor, Castlehill Road

The case officer outlined the proposal for 53 dwellings comprising of 34 semi-detached dwellings, 3 detached, and 16 two-bed apartments, in addition to open space, landscaping, and associated access infrastructure. He advised that the proposal had been reduced from 74 dwellings in the original submission.

He informed the Committee that, after the agenda had been published, an additional 3 objections had been received, which raised the following points:

- impact on protected wildlife species;
- contrary to PPS7 and LC1 of a PPS7 – loss of privacy and overshadowing;
- impact on character – high density;
- impacts of traffic and potential impact on road safety; and
- construction and stability issues.

The case officer outlined the response of the Planning Department to the aforementioned issues raised, as outlined in the Late Items Report Pack.

After discussion, the Committee, given the issues which have been raised regarding access and drainage at the site, agreed to defer consideration of the application to enable a site visit to be undertaken to allow the Committee to acquaint itself with the location and the proposal at first hand.

LA04/2017/0523/F - Warehouse unit and secure yard for use as a depot for mobile shredding vehicles and on-site shredding and baling of waste facility (Part Retrospective) at Unit 3 Block B at 6-16 Duncrue Crescent

The Case officer advised that the application proposed the erection of a warehouse unit and secure yard for use as a depot for mobile collection and shredding vehicles with on-site shredding and baling of waste facilities and its associated head office (sui generis) (part retrospective).

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

LA04/2017/1081/F - Internal reconfiguration to previously approved hotel to create an additional 31 bedrooms providing a total of 237 bedrooms at 20 Brunswick Street

The Committee considered the aforementioned application for amendments to the previously approved hotel under LA04/2015/0418/F and LA04/2016/1050/NMC to increase the number of bedrooms from 206 to 237, through a reconfiguration of the internal space (31 additional rooms).

The case officer advised that the proposed changes relate purely to internal reconfiguration works with no external alterations to the previously approved building.

The Committee approved the application, subject to the imposing of the conditions set out in the case officer's report and, in accordance with Section 76 of the Planning Act (Northern Ireland) 2015, delegated power to the Director of Planning and Place, in conjunction with the City Solicitor, to enter into discussions with the applicant to explore the scope of any Planning Agreements which might be realised by way of developer contributions and, if so, to enter into such an Agreement on behalf of the Council. The Committee also delegated power to the Director of Planning and Place for the final wording of the conditions.

LA04/2017/0288/F - Demolition of existing building at 4-5 Donegall Square South for a 9 storey mixed use development including two level basement incorporating car parking and office, A1/A2/A3 use on ground floor and 1st to 8th floor offices with associated roof external plant screen at 4-5 Donegall Square South

The Case officer advised that, after the agenda had been published, the following additional objection had been received, which raised the following points:

- the height of the development;
- impact on neighbouring properties;
- loss of light; and
- impact on the setting of listed building and the conservation area.

The case officer outlined the response of the Planning Department to the aforementioned issues raised, as outlined in the Late Items Report Pack and clarified issues regarding the height, line-up of the cornice line and set-back of the proposal.

The Committee approved the application, subject to the imposing of the conditions set out in the case officer's report and, in accordance with Section 76 of the Planning Act (Northern Ireland) 2015, delegated power to the Director of Planning and Place, in conjunction with the City Solicitor, to enter into discussions with the applicant to explore the scope of any Planning Agreements which might be realised by way of developer contributions and, if so, to enter into such an Agreement on behalf of the Council, and delegated power to the Director of Planning and Place for the final wording of the conditions.

LA04/2017/0157/F - Revision of previous approved application (Z/2012/0645/RM) and erection of 12 detached dwellings, 4 semi-detached dwellings, 3 townhouses and 18 apartments on lands south of 25 Harberton Park

The case officer outlined the proposal for amendments to a previous planning approval (Z/2012/0645/RM) to include changes to site layout, house types and modifications to plot arrangements including ancillary buildings and landscaping for phase 3 of the development comprising of 37 dwellings in total.

The Committee granted approval to the application, subject to the imposing of the conditions set out within the case officer's report.

LA04/2015/0859/F - Split level youth club building with multi-purpose spaces at 66 Ballygomartin Road

The Case officer advised that the site was located within the development limits for Belfast. The site was zoned for Industry and Commerce within the BUAP 2001. The site was within land zoned for housing (uncommitted); and was also a Site of Local Nature Conservation Importance (SLNCI) in draft BMAP. A Community Greenway also ran along the west and to the rear of the site in draft BMAP.

The Committee granted approval to the application, subject to the imposing of the conditions set out within the case officer's report.

Z/2014/1408/F - Housing development of 51 residential units comprising 46 semi-detached and 5 detached dwellings with associated access, landscaping/open space and site works at land to north of Lyndhurst View Park

The Committee considered the aforementioned application.

The Committee granted approval to the application, subject to the imposing of the conditions set out within the case officer's report.

LA04/2017/0043/F - Demolition of existing building and construction of residential development consisting of 104 apartments with associated fitness suite, car parking and landscaping at Parklands, Knocknagoney Dale

The Committee approved the application, subject to the imposing of the conditions set out in the case officer's report and, in accordance with Section 76 of the Planning Act (Northern Ireland) 2015, delegated power to the Director of Planning and Place, in conjunction with the City Solicitor, to enter into discussions with the applicant to explore the scope of any Planning Agreements which might be realised by way of developer contributions and, if so, to enter into such an Agreement on behalf of the Council, and delegated power to the Director of Planning and Place for the final wording of the conditions.

LA04/2017/0598/F - Variation of conditions 3 (construction of hard surfaced areas), 4 (cycle parking spaces) and 6 (proposed planting) to include reference in condition 3, 4 and 6 to a reconfigured hardstanding layout on lands adjacent to East Bridge Street and accessed off Laganbank Road located between former Mayfield Leisure Centre and Central Station

The Case officer advised that permission was sought to modify conditions 3, 4 and 6 of planning approval under Z/2015/0182/F to facilitate changes to the hard and soft landscaping on the development of an office block.

F
470

Planning Committee
Tuesday, 15th August, 2017

The Committee granted approval to the application, subject to the imposing of the conditions set out within the case officer's report.

Chairperson